



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 155

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 9, 2009

No. 85

House of Representatives

The House met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 9, 2009.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DONNA F. EDWARDS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2009, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 30 minutes and each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, limited to 5 minutes.

GLOBAL WATER AND H.R. 2030: SENATOR PAUL SIMON WATER FOR THE WORLD ACT OF 2009

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, as one-fifth of the world's population relies on freshwater that is either polluted or significantly overdrawn, the lack of safe water and sanitation is an ongoing threat to global security and remains the world's greatest health problem, accounting for 2 million deaths a year and half of the illness in the developing world. Before I finish

speaking, 15 more children will die needlessly from waterborne disease.

To address this slow-motion disaster, I worked with the then Chair and ranking member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Henry Hyde and Tom Lantos, and the Senate majority and minority leaders, Bill Frist and HARRY REID, to enact the Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005. This landmark, bipartisan legislation established investment in safe and affordable water for the world's poorest as a major goal of United States foreign assistance. But, sadly, with the last administration, we were slow to implement, and until last year, slow to fund it. We are more than halfway to the 2015 Millennium Development goal with mixed results, and we must redouble our effort.

A special concern is Sub-Saharan Africa that lags so far behind that we will miss our modest goal to cut the people without safe drinking water and sanitation by one-half by 2015, that Sub-Saharan Africa will miss that target date by 25 years for water and sanitation by 61 years. And these are not just numbers; these are millions of people's lives.

Some progress is being made through innovative partnerships between the United States, NGOs, businesses, and local partners. But the stark truth remains: Nearly 900 million people worldwide still lack access to safe drinking water, and two out of five people on the planet lack basic sanitation services. And this is going to become more of a challenge in the future. Because of climate change and rapid population growth, there will be further stress on water resources. By 2025, 2.8 billion people in more than 48 countries will face devastating water shortages.

To help accelerate the progress, on Earth Day I introduced bipartisan legislation, the Paul Simon Water for the World Act of 2009, along with Representatives PAYNE, ROHRABACHER,

JESSE JACKSON JR., ZACH WAMP, WELCH, BOOZMAN, BURTON, GEORGE MILLER, and FORTENBERRY. The purpose of this act is to empower the U.S. Government to respond to the pressing poverty, security, and environmental threats presented by the dire mismanagement and shortage of global freshwater. The goal for the Water for the World Act is for the United States to provide 100 million people of the world's poorest first-time access to safe drinking water and sanitation on a sustainable basis by 2015. To accomplish this goal, the legislation builds on the Water for the Poor framework for investment, expands U.S. foreign assistance capacity, and recognizes sustainable water and sanitation policy as vital to the long-term diplomatic and development efforts of the United States.

I applaud the leadership of Senators DURBIN, CORKER, and MURRAY, who have introduced companion bipartisan legislation in the Senate. This legislation will help the United States focus its efforts and fully implement a smart and efficient global water strategy that meets our commitment to extend safe drinking water and sanitation to over a billion people in need.

I urge every Member of Congress to make water policy and funding a priority, to save the life of a child every 15 seconds who dies needlessly from waterborne disease.

HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER).

Mr. BOEHNER. Madam Speaker, Republicans want to work with the President and our Democrat colleagues here in the Congress to make sure that every American has access to high-quality, affordable health coverage. On an issue like this, we need to act, but we also need to get it right.

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

Frankly, the record the Democrats have amassed this year so far shows us why we need to take our time. Think about it. On every major issue addressed by Congress and the White House this year, the middle class has taken a big hit. Middle-class Americans are paying for a trillion dollar "stimulus" package that no one read. They're paying for a \$400 billion omnibus appropriation bill with 9,000 earmarks in it. They're paying to bail out those who lied on their mortgage applications. They're paying for a government takeover of General Motors with no exit strategy. And they're paying for a budget that didn't include a tax cut that was promised for, yes, you guessed it, the middle class in America. And if Democrats get their way, they'll be paying for a national energy tax on anyone who has the audacity to drive a car or to flip on a light switch.

Over and over again, the people who follow the rules are being left behind by Washington. Are Democrats going to leave the middle class behind on health care as well?

The forthcoming plan from Democratic leaders will make health care more expensive, limit treatments, ration care, and put bureaucrats in charge of medical decisions rather than patients and doctors. That amounts to a government takeover of health care, and it will hurt, rather than help, middle-class families across our country.

The administration likes to say they can expand health care and lower costs at the same time, but I think that's just simply nonsense. You can't add millions of Americans to the government health care rolls and reduce costs unless government takes control of medical decisions, rations care, and limits treatments, all of which will reduce quality and undermine the care that Americans have come to expect.

Republicans believe there's a better way. Led by ROY BLUNT, the Health Care Solutions Group is crafting a plan that will ensure access to affordable, quality health care for every American, regardless of preexisting conditions. This plan will protect Americans from being forced into a new government-run plan that raises taxes, rations care, and eliminates coverage for more than 100 million Americans who receive their health care coverage from their employer. It will ensure that medical decisions are made by patients and their doctors, not by government bureaucrats. We want to let Americans who like their health care coverage keep it and give all Americans the freedom to choose the plan that best meets their needs. We want to improve Americans' lives through effective prevention, wellness, and disease management programs, while developing new treatments and cures for life-threatening diseases.

I hope Democrats here in Congress and the administration will work with us to make sure that we do this right. The American people, and particularly the middle class who have been left be-

hind, deserve our best effort to put these reforms in place that will meet their needs.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH) for 5 minutes.

Mr. YARMUTH. Madam Speaker, the distinguished minority leader has just expressed the desire of his party to engage us in health care reform, and I'm so gratified and happy to hear him say that. Similarly, the distinguished minority leader of the Senate, who is both my Senator and my constituent, has spent the last few days in the Senate talking about that same desire, to help us move forward in addressing what we all know is an unsustainable and dysfunctional health care delivery system.

The Senator spoke last Friday, and he said, "Americans want reform that addresses the high cost of care and gives everyone access to quality care. In America in 2009, doing nothing is simply not an option. We must act and we must act decisively. The question is not whether to reform health care; the question is how best to reform health care."

None of us in either body on either side of the aisle will argue with that statement.

Unfortunately, in the remainder of the distinguished Senate minority leader's statement, there is not the first idea about how to do that. Despite his teasing us that he is going to offer solutions, they're not. In fact, what he does is pretty similar to what the distinguished minority leader of the House just did, which was to echo the themes of a talking point paper provided by Frank Luntz, the Republican message person, which basically said the Republicans cannot afford to allow Democrats to have a victory in health care. They can't allow us to get something done for the American people. And, therefore, they are going to respond by criticizing everything we are doing as a government takeover of health care. In fact, in the distinguished Senate minority leader's statement, some version of government takeover is mentioned 11 times in 1½ half pages. So we know where they're coming from.

But the arguments that are raised are also things that require scrutiny, and as we move forward in this debate, we need to examine all of them.

For instance, the Senator says, "When most companies want to raise money, they have to show they are viable and their products and services are a worthwhile investment."

Again, nobody can argue with that. That means adding value.

"Apply this model to health care, and the government would be able to create the same kind of uneven playing field that would, in all likelihood, eventually wipe out competition, thus

forcing millions of people off the private health plans they already have and which the vast majority of them very much like."

You know, when insurance companies are forced to compete, they do very well. Senator McCONNELL and I have a common constituent, the Humana Corporation, a great corporation. When they're forced to compete, they figure out how to add value. And they're doing that right now. They are doing it with the Medicare Advantage program.

When insurance companies are forced to compete, they compete well. Right now they're not forced to compete. What many of us are proposing is that we create a public competition for them, make them compete with the public plan. And unlike what Senator McCONNELL says, if they are unable to compete, it won't be because of an unfair advantage; it will be because they are not providing the kind of coverage at the cost that the American people want. If American people want to stay in their private plans under the proposals that we're advancing, they will be able to do that. We're not forcing anyone out. Right now most Americans don't have a choice, and we are trying to provide that choice through a public plan.

In the Senator's statement, he says: "This is how a government plan would undercut private health care plans, forcing people off the plans they like and replacing those plans with plans they like less."

They're not going to be in plans they like less. They will choose the plan they like more.

□ 1045

"That is when the worst scenario would take shape, with Americans subjected to bureaucratic hassles, hours spent on hold, waiting for a government service representative to take a call, restrictions on care and, yes, life-saving treatment and lifesaving surgeries denied or delayed."

It's a nice scare tactic. Unfortunately, what he is describing is what often happens right now in the private insurance system with doctors spending endless hours trying to argue with bureaucracies about whether certain treatments or certain procedures will be covered. So what we're trying to do is to end that and to provide competition that will end that.

Finally, the Senator says, "The American people want health care reform, but creating a government bureaucracy that denies, delays and rations health care is not the reform they want." I agree with that. I agree with that.

Then he says, "They don't want the people who brought us the Department of Motor Vehicles making life-and-death decisions for them, their children, their spouses, and their parents." Well, that's a cute line, very clever.

Unfortunately, you know, the Federal Government didn't create the Department of Motor Vehicles, but the

Federal Government did create Medicare, Medicare which now serves 40 million Americans, disabled and old, and which does a very, very good job of doing that.

So I look forward to the debate we're going to continue to have with the other side on how best to create health care reform.

INTRODUCING THE RAISE ACT,
H.R. 2732

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman from Kentucky wants to know why Republicans oppose the government takeover of our health care system, I would invite him to consult the many, many refugees from Canada and Britain who have come here to America to get their health care, because they simply can't survive with bureaucrats telling them what treatments they'll get and when they'll get them.

The Republicans are proposing to bring within the reach of every American family a basic health plan that they will own, that they can change if it fails to suit them and that they will hold wherever they work and under whatever circumstances they work; but Madam Speaker, I'm here on different business this morning.

I'm here to talk about the right of workers. Their right to gather and to bargain collectively with an employer is a fundamental right of labor. It often strengthens the position of individual workers as they negotiate with a powerful employer. Yet survey after survey tells us that union members are less satisfied with their jobs than nonunion workers, and many Americans today simply refuse to work in union shops at all.

So why is it that a bargaining process designed to improve workers' satisfaction should produce such dissatisfaction?

Perhaps the answer rests with the simple human desire in each of us to excel in what we do and to be recognized and rewarded for that excellence. Collective bargaining increases the ability of workers to take a stronger position to negotiate with an employer, and this is good, but they're then left to give up any individual rewards for outstanding work.

Union workers end up trapped with a one-size-fits-all contract that denies them the dignity that comes from individual excellence and achievement. No matter how hard that worker toils or no matter how much he produces, he gets paid exactly the same as the coal worker who puts in minimal effort.

Well, why shouldn't workers get extra pay and performance bonuses beyond the union-negotiated wage base? Why does the wage floor set through union contracts also have to be a wage ceiling for those union members who go the extra mile to get ahead?

Union leaders may see value in wiping out individual initiative to build solidarity among rank-and-file members, but those workers would be far better off if they could enjoy both the advantages of collective bargaining and the additional rewards of individual performance raises and bonuses. Many unionized businesses would gladly pay individual workers more if they could. Some have tried, but over the years, the National Labor Relations Board has repeatedly struck them down.

For that reason, I have introduced the Rewarding Achievement and Incentivizing Successful Employees, or RAISE Act, H.R. 2732. It will allow working union members to escape the false choice between collective bargaining and individual reward that our outdated labor laws have forced upon them. Senator VITTER has introduced a similar bill in the Senate.

Under the RAISE Act, union members would retain all of the collective bargaining rights under current law, and employers would be bound to the wage and benefit schedules negotiated under those laws. In addition to the floor established by the union contract, employers could add bonuses for those workers who go the extra mile, combining the benefits of collective bargaining with the rewards of individual achievement.

Years ago, Admiral Grace Hopper observed that, in all of her years in the United States Navy, she had determined that the greatest impediment to human progress is the phrase "but we've always done it this way." That's the only answer we've heard so far in opposition to this simple reform, and in days like these, that's no answer at all.

CONGRATULATING MRS. KIM HENRY, OKLAHOMA'S FIRST LADY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BOREN) for 1 minute.

Mr. BOREN. Today, Madam Speaker, I rise to share a kind word and to send my congratulations to one of Oklahoma's great women, Kim Henry, Oklahoma's first lady and the wife of our outstanding Governor.

Born in Norman and raised in Shawnee, Mrs. Henry would mature into a confident and independent woman who would eventually find her calling as a public schoolteacher. Throughout her tenure as Oklahoma's first lady, she has been a devoted mother to three beautiful daughters, and has been an active member of numerous charities.

One of those prominent Oklahoma organizations is the influential Sarkeys Foundation. Formed in 1962 by S.J. Sarkeys, the Sarkeys Foundation has contributed over \$55 million to various Oklahoma cultural and economic initiatives. Last week, the Sarkeys Foundation asked Mrs. Henry to be its executive director. This is a significant moment in her life and also for the State of Oklahoma.

Congratulations to Oklahoma's first lady, Kim Henry. Your hard work and dedication to the State of Oklahoma doesn't go unnoticed.

"THE STATE OF THE UNION'S FINANCES, A CITIZEN'S GUIDE"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, Members of Congress in the House and the Senate get literature sent to them every single day. In fact, we probably get four or five books a week. I don't know how many little leaflets and pamphlets we're asked to read, but we don't have time to read them all. We ask our staff to read some of them, but we don't have a chance to really get into the minutiae of some of these brochures.

Our colleagues in both the House and the Senate got this little booklet called "The State of the Union's Finances, a Citizen's Guide." These are going to be given, I guess, to people all across this country. I hope every one of my colleagues and everybody in America gets a chance to read this little booklet. Now, this was sent to us by our colleagues FRANK WOLF, Republican of Virginia, and JIM COOPER, Democrat of Tennessee. I just want to read to you a little bit about the situation that America faces, because Americans right now, I don't think, are really aware of the fiscal problems we're facing.

As of the fall of 2008, we had \$12.2 trillion in explicit liabilities. That's publicly held debt, military and civilian pensions, retiree health benefits, and others things related to that. We had \$1.3 trillion in debt for Federal insurance, loan guaranties, leases, and so forth, and we had a \$42.9 trillion debt from Medicare hospital insurance, Medicare outpatient services, Medicare prescription drugs, and Social Security. That's a total of \$56.4 trillion in debt that we have right now, today. That amounts to \$184,000 of debt for every man, woman, and child in this country; it amounts to \$435,000 of debt for a full-time worker; for each household, it amounts to \$483,000 in debt. That's the national debt today.

George Washington said we should avoid ungenerously throwing upon posterity, our kids, the burden we, ourselves, ought to bear. In 1796, they had a deficit, and George Washington said that we can't allow this to happen because we don't want to leave a burden to our kids and to our grandkids by spending too much money.

I'm telling you right now, colleagues and anybody else who is paying attention, what we're going to leave our kids and our grandkids is something that they will curse us for because they're going to have to pay extremely high taxes, and the inflationary problems that they're going to face are going to be insurmountable.

I can't believe that we're doing this right now. We're talking about a national health care program that's going to add additional trillions of dollars. We're talking about bailouts to the financial institutions and to the auto industry. We're talking about a cap-and-trade program that's going to increase the cost of every family in America between \$3,000 and \$4,000 to turn on their lights or to buy gasoline at a service station or anything else that produces energy. We're adding about \$2 trillion a year to this debt, and it's unsustainable. It is going to affect every man, woman, and child who is living in America today, but what it's going to do to future generations is unbelievable.

We can destroy this Republic if we don't get control of spending. This is a political hyperbole. I'm telling you right now that we can destroy this form of government and this civilization we have, just like Rome did, if we don't get control of spending. It is out of control. It is out of control. We're \$56 trillion in debt today, and we're adding \$2 trillion a year, plus all of these additional programs we're coming up with. In the next 5 years, they say we're going to spend an additional \$5 trillion. We don't have it, so we're putting this burden on our kids and on our grandkids.

It's wrong. We have to do something about it. We have to do it now. We have to start getting our spending in order. My Republican and Democrat colleagues understand that. Mr. WOLF is a Republican who sent this out, and Mr. COOPER is a Democrat. They understand it. We all ought to understand it.

ENERGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KLEIN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Madam Speaker, it is an honor to be here today to talk in this House about energy. This is a moment in time when, I think, most Americans understand this great opportunity we have to really turn things around for our future in this country. It's about three principal elements that aren't just tied to the high cost of gasoline. It's about national security; it's about a better environment; and probably, as one of the most important things for this moment, it's about jobs. It's about a new economy.

We'll just talk about national security. I think all of us understand very clearly, every American, no matter where one is from, the fact that importing oil is the basis for a lot of the dependency that we have. Sixty percent or so of the oil that we take in the United States comes from outside the United States. We depend, unfortunately, on many countries that are, at best, not our friends and that are, at worst, our mortal enemies, who fund terrorism and threats against the United States and against our allies around the world. The sooner that we

can take oil out of the centerpiece of our natural resource dependency, the better. That's not to say we don't have oil in the United States and that, yes, we're going to drill more and all that kind of thing. What I'm talking about is the fact that much of our oil comes from places around the world, from the Middle East, from Venezuela and from other places that are not stable places for us to depend on this.

Number 2 is our economy. We know that we have a great opportunity in terms of this next generation of jobs to be created relating to alternative energy and to the various kinds of alternative energies that are out there right now that are being developed by our scientists, by our engineers, and by our businesspeople.

There is one thing that, I think, is just incredible and that I'll just give by way of an example because we know about solar and wind and a lot of other things. I'm from Florida, and I was speaking to one of our utility companies the other day, and they're talking about building the largest solar plant in the world in Florida. Over the years, we've heard, Oh, well, there isn't enough sun or maybe other things. Well, now there is a general recognition that anywhere in the United States there are great opportunities for solar. The technology is moving along, and we need to continue to incent that continued higher level of development of battery storage for solar and things like that.

One of the things he said to me is, in building this plant, they have to import the mirrors—these are the pieces of equipment to hold the solar and to capture the power—from Germany. Hundreds of millions of dollars of this product have to come in from Germany because we don't produce it here in the United States.

Why? Why don't we produce it? Why isn't that a job opportunity that is based right here?

I think that one of the things that's going on right now in the investment recovery act that we've put together and other things that, I think, all of us share, Democrats and Republicans and as Americans, is the idea that, if we're going to talk about energy, we have to incentivize business and industry and the engineers in our universities to develop the science, to develop the entrepreneurship, to give the tax incentives for investment for that type of energy in the United States, and to build the equipment here in the United States.

There is no reason. It costs a lot of money to ship fragile mirrors over from Germany. We can build it here. We can build it better. We can probably export it and can compete with the rest of the world.

□ 1100

I think that's a pretty exciting opportunity, and there are so many other areas. In my district off the coast of Florida, most of you have heard of the gulf stream. That's that perpetual cur-

rent, 24/7, 365 days a year, that runs up and down up to north along the east coast. Well, right now, one of our local universities, Florida Atlantic University, is developing technology where they can put turbines in the Atlantic Ocean and capture that energy.

I don't know if this is going to work long-term, but that's the kind of American ingenuity that we're looking for, and we as a government and private sector, our scientists, our entrepreneurs, we need to work together to capture that and build on that.

And of course, there's the environment. We all understand that, and there is something going on in the world on climate. People can have different opinions. I think most scientists agree there's something going on, and whatever we can do in the United States and around the world to provide leadership to reduce the impact of CO₂ and other things, it's good for all of us.

I live in a coastal area, 75 miles on the Atlantic Ocean, some of the most beautiful areas in the world. We obviously are very sensitive to the hurricane activity, to the rise of the Atlantic Ocean, things like that, but I think we all understand there's an environmental issue at the same time.

So what are we doing here in Washington? We're working very collectively, and there are a lot of business and industry actively supporting some of the various ideas that are coming forward to work on this in a very productive way to make sure that the United States is leading the world in these areas of alternative energy.

And we're debating a bill right now and I know our colleagues are asking for comments from back home. We obviously want to do it in a way that allows for appropriate levels of transition for our industries who are dependent on old fuel sources to move to new fuel sources. We need to work together to make sure that the system eases in a way that is economically competitive. That's what we need to do. At the same time, we ought to be encouraging as much as we can getting these products into play.

So I'm very excited about the fact that we can build a new energy future, and I look forward to working with all of our Members to do that.

WE NEED A NATIONAL ENERGY THAT DOESN'T PICK WINNERS AND LOSERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam Speaker, I'm here today to talk about the same issue that my colleague from Florida just talked about, and that's energy. He alluded to the energy bill that's been moving through Congress over the last several months, but he neglected to say that in that bill are some real costs for real people. And I think these are the important issues in front of our Nation today.

Energy, we found when the price of gasoline went up last summer over \$4 a gallon, we were pressed. I think appropriately, to try to find an energy future, a plan for our energy future, and we never really answered that question. Well, this morning in Charleston, West Virginia, where I'm from, the price of gasoline went up to \$2.75 and has been going up almost daily. So we need a national energy plan that doesn't pick winners and losers, that takes into account real costs for real people.

Right now, the bill that's passed out of the Energy and Commerce Committee is a national energy tax on every single American. We call it cap-and-tax. The supporters call it cap-and-trade. But what it is, in reality, is it has serious problems for States such as mine in West Virginia. Ninety-eight percent of the energy generation in our State is generated through coal. Well, naturally, we're the second largest coal-producing State in this Nation.

We've powered America for generations by giving of our natural resources across this country, and I'm proud to say we have a proud heritage, not only of turning the lights on in America but also of the coal mining jobs and the coal mining communities and families throughout my State.

But this will picks winners and losers because the heartland, of which I consider West Virginia—and we just heard the gentleman from Florida talk a lot about solar—but the heartland, which has had to rely on fossil fuels for energy generation and to keep our manufacturing jobs, we're going to be the losers here. We're going to be the ones who are going to pay the heavy price.

What kind of price are we going to pay? Number one, job loss. It's estimated that in my State alone over 10,000 jobs will be lost in our manufacturing sector because of this bill. And you ask, why is that? Well, because our industrial input will be lower because of the high cost of meeting the demands, because of the lack of a transitional period in this bill. We'll also lose probably many, many, 10s of thousands of jobs in our coal mining industry and associated industries alone.

Also, for the individuals, how is this going to impact the individual who is paying now the \$2.75 in West Virginia? In some areas of the country, that probably sounds pretty good, but in ours, it's going up. We've had the luxury of lower energy prices, and we are pleased about that. But it's escaping us, and in this bill, we will no longer have that.

If you look at the West Virginia electricity, prices under this bill will go up over 100. Think about that: 100 percent of your electricity bill, somewhere in the estimate of \$2- to \$3,000 a year.

And who's the loser there? Small businesses are the loser. They're going to lose jobs because they're going to have the higher cost of turning on their electricity, running their business. And what's that going to result

in? Job loss. That's going to result in lack of capital to invest in a small business. And then the higher cost of transportation would also hurt not only individuals but small businesses as well.

But it's also going to hurt those people who can barely afford to keep the lights on as it is, and those are our lower income folks. By the year 2020, it is estimated that with this bill, with this cap-and-tax bill, with this national energy tax, that the lower income folks across this Nation, that 25 percent of their income will go to paying for their energy costs.

Now, let's think about this. We've just gone through a housing crisis, where people are losing their homes and people are having trouble, people are losing jobs. Now, we're going to say to you, a quarter of your income is going to go to one of the basic needs that you have, and that's the basic need for energy.

Another loser are our State budgets. Think what an impact a national energy tax is going to have on every hospital, on every public school, on every university. Think of the cost of running the school buses that we've seen as the rise up in energy costs.

So I don't think that this is the kind of bill that is going to solve the problem. It sets up winners and losers, and it has real costs to real people. It does have in there a great portion of carbon capture and sequestration where we will use coal, and we will use the technology and innovation, but we need to keep moving in this direction so we can be realistic about how we're going to meet our energy needs and how we're going to transition to the next best source.

Green jobs and green future, that's what we all want. I think that it's a laudable goal, and it's one that we will reach, but we've got to do it where we're not picking winners and losers, where we realize that there are real costs to real people.

THE CURRENT ECONOMIC RECESSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Madam Speaker, as a Congressman from Virginia, also a coal-producing State, I wish to rise to address the current economic recession. We need to spur investment and create new jobs, and we need to act now. An essential part of that effort is the American Clean Energy and Security Act.

This legislation, unlike some of the statistics we've been hearing lately, recently approved by the House Energy and Commerce Committee, would reduce greenhouse gas pollution and create lots of clean energy jobs, including in the coal sector, and make polluters pay for the greenhouse gas pollution they're emitting right now.

Last week, the United States Climate Action Partnership, known as USCAP,

hosted a congressional briefing to discuss the business reasons for passing legislation to reduce global warming pollution. The USCAP is a coalition of many American businesses who support the legislation, including especially in the energy sector. They include Alcoa, BP, ConocoPhillips, Dow, Duke Energy, DuPont, Exelon, General Electric, General Motors, Johnson & Johnson, NRG Energy, Shell, and Siemens. Environmental groups are also members.

Many of these companies have built billion dollar companies through the extraction, processing, or sale of carbon-intensive fossil fuels. For example, most of BP, Shell and ConocoPhillips' business is in oil exploration and production. Duke Energy produces 75 percent of its electricity from coal. Manufacturers such as GE, Alcoa, and Dow consume a great deal of electricity and would be negatively affected by higher energy prices. They support this bill.

These businesses worked for 2 years with environmentalists and Members of Congress to develop a blueprint for legislative action that laid out a plan to reduce greenhouse gas pollution, create jobs, and spur investment in renewable energy. This blueprint for legislative action formed a foundation for the American Clean Energy and Security Act, passed by the House Energy and Commerce Committee, on a bipartisan vote I might add.

At its briefing, USCAP members emphasized the importance of the American Clean Energy and Security Act in spurring innovation and economic growth. Representatives of Dow, NRG Energy, and Shell said that without passage of this legislation to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, there simply will not be sufficient market incentive to invest in carbon capture and storage, something necessary, especially for the coal industry, Madam Speaker.

Carbon capture and storage is a technology that holds tremendous promise; it is essential to more sustainable coal-generated electricity production. The minority party claims that the American Clean Energy and Security Act will hurt coal, as we just heard, but the business community, including companies that rely principally on coal for electrical generation, support this bill.

The minority party claims that the American Clean Energy and Security Act will impair our ability to deploy American energy resources. Yet USCAP members, ConocoPhillips and Shell, for example, noted at the briefing that without this bill, they simply will not be able to develop the next generation of biofuels.

Right now, we get most of our oil from overseas, Madam Speaker, from countries like Saudi Arabia. We must end our dependence on foreign oil. By spurring development of biofuels, the American Clean Energy and Security Act would help reach that objective while creating economic opportunities here at home.

I think the business community said it best. At USCAP's recent briefing, a

member representative said, "One of the reasons that many members of USCAP are enthusiastic is because we see that it is essential for our businesses to move to a low carbon economy."

Madam Speaker, let's unleash new investments in America. Let's produce more of our energy here at home. Let's wean ourselves off foreign oil dependency. Let us create new, clean energy jobs in America. We cannot delay economic recovery, and we cannot risk further destabilization of our climate.

REPUBLICANS WANT ENERGY INDEPENDENCE FOR AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, my colleague from Indiana made some very, very eloquent and compelling remarks about the status of our economy, and my colleague from West Virginia gave valuable information on energy and called attention to some important issues.

My distinguished colleague from Florida, whom I like and admire very much, says the energy bill will create jobs, but he's wrong. It will kill jobs. He never answered his own question: Why don't we produce those mirrors in the United States? Because our taxes are high and regulations drive jobs overseas.

America, if the Democrats pass this cap-and-tax bill, get ready to pay more for electricity, a lot more. This cap-and-tax scheme, better known as a national energy tax, if it becomes law, will cost \$846 billion. That's according to the Congressional Budget Office's latest estimate. The CBO is a non-partisan organization.

Who's going to bear the brunt of this new national energy tax? Anyone who turns the lights on, but it's also going to be especially harmful for many of my constituents and all others who work in manufacturing.

As companies adjust to this new energy tax, many will be forced to ship jobs and the accompanying greenhouse emissions overseas where energy costs will be much lower. Many employers will face the tough choice of outsourcing or going out of business altogether. This destructive energy policy will kill millions of American jobs and permanently send them overseas, and I and many others cannot support this.

I want to quote from a report that came out from the Ways and Means Ranking Member DAVE CAMP, who has based his comments on this CBO report that's come out. He says that, "The facts are plain and clear: Democrats in Congress are breaking the President's pledge not to raise taxes on working families. The President has repeatedly stated married couples earning less than \$250,000 a year would not face higher taxes, but this legislation imposes an energy tax on every American

and provides no help to families making more than \$42,000 or individuals making as little as \$23,000. Increasing Americans' fuel and utility bills in this recession is not only bad policy, but it completely ignores the hardships millions of Americans are already facing. This is dangerous legislation in desperate need of closer review."

Republicans want energy independence for Americans, and we can have it but not under this cap-and-tax bill.

□ 1115

Madam Chairman, I would like to point out one other issue that is before the Congress recently, and that is money for the IMF, the International Monetary Fund, in the supplemental bill. What the Democrats want to do is cut \$5 billion from our troops in order to fund the IMF. And because any IMF member country may apply for these loans, Iran, Venezuela, Zimbabwe, and Burma are all eligible. Therefore, state sponsors of terrorism can receive American taxpayer money under the Democrats' proposal.

The New York Times reported on May 27 that Hezbollah is in talks with the IMF about continuing loans to Lebanon should they win the election. Therefore, a terrorist organization could receive American taxpayer dollars under the Democrats' proposal.

To loan the IMF \$108 billion, the U.S. will have to borrow the money from other countries, like China. A loan of this size to the IMF will put America further into debt, a cost that will be paid by our grandchildren and children, a point so well-pointed out by my colleague from Indiana. Also, according to the Center for Economic and Policy Research, American taxpayers will actually lose money by loaning it to the IMF. While countries like China, Russia, Brazil, and India have announced they will not participate in loans, the Democrats are asking Americans to support this.

Finally, the American taxpayers are sick of bailouts in their own country. How can Democrats rationalize a global bailout?

AUTOMOBILE DEALER ECONOMIC RIGHTS RESTORATION ACT OF 2009

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. MAFFEI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MAFFEI. Madam Speaker, I rise to ask Chrysler and General Motors to continue to honor their commitments to auto dealers in this country. Chrysler and GM should not deprive economic rights to profitable dealerships across this country.

Yesterday, I joined with Representative FRANK KRATOVIL of Maryland and introduced the Automobile Dealer Economic Rights Restoration Act of 2009. The act claims to restore the economic rights of GM and Chrysler dealers as they existed prior to each company's bankruptcy. We want to preserve GM and Chrysler car dealers' rights to re-

course under State law and, at the request of an automobile dealer, require GM and Chrysler to reinstate franchise agreements in effect prior to those companies' bankruptcies. These are bankruptcies negotiated with Federal officials, and taxpayer dollars are helping to maintain both companies. Therefore, these bankruptcies should not be used to change the rules that dealers have been operating under.

I first wrote a bipartisan letter with Representative CHRIS LEE of New York and more than 65 of our colleagues to the auto task force in May asking them to work with the companies to reconsider the forced closings. Since then, thousands of dealers have been informed by GM and Chrysler, through a seemingly arbitrary system, that their relationships were ending essentially immediately, leaving some dealers with millions of dollars invested in car stock with no options for consolidation and little leverage for liquidation.

In my home district in upstate New York, there is a dealership, Lewis Goodman Chrysler, which has been the cornerstone of one of our communities for 50 years. Mr. Goodman opened his dealership in 1959 in Syracuse. Two years ago, at the age of 82, Mr. Goodman passed away, but his dying wish was to make sure the dealership reached the half century mark. His widow promised to keep their dealership running at least through its 50th anniversary, which was just last week. Lewis Goodman Chrysler received a letter on May 15 informing them that Chrysler was severing their relationship. The letter gave no indication as to why this particular dealership was targeted, just that the relationship was ending.

I visited Mrs. Goodman last week to celebrate the 50th anniversary. This is a dealership that is profitable, partly because of selling preowned cars. It employs dozens of people and has been loyal to them for years. It is exactly the kind of small family business that we in this House claim to want to help, not close.

We all recognize that the economy is not favorable to the auto industry right now and especially not in certain sections of the country where the population can no longer support an extensive dealer network. We have already seen layoffs from parts manufacturers in my district, plant closings, and a Chapter 11 among one of their suppliers. In this context, across central New York 11 dealerships have closed on their own since 2007, and we expect to see other dealerships consolidate and close this year. But we do not, in the middle of a recession, need to take a hatchet to local, family-owned businesses that have supported our communities for decades when market forces are already at work. These dealerships employ hundreds of people across my district. They sponsor our local little league teams, our pancake breakfasts, and they buy ads in our local newspapers and local TV newscasts. They

have been the cornerstone of our community for generations.

I have also signed a letter with Congressman CHRIS VAN HOLLEN, Majority Leader HOYER, and over 100 of our fellow Members, and we sent it to President Obama talking about our concerns, the total lack of transparency and how this system is shutting down profitable dealerships. And we want to know, from both sides of the aisle, whether we can get more transparency and an indication of how this, indeed, saves money.

The auto companies, who are buoyed by taxpayer dollars, should be honest with the dealerships and with the American people about how these decisions are being made, and the dealerships should be negotiated with on how to consolidate dealerships in a way that will help to find a soft landing for the workers and communities, not just in my district, but across the country.

STATUS QUO IS NOT ACCEPTABLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) for 5 minutes.

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Good morning, Madam Speaker. I rise today to ask a simple question that is on every American's mind; what has been done by this administration and this Congress to fix the troubled economic system we have today?

While this administration continues to pour trillions of dollars into a flawed financial system, continues to have Washington bureaucrats take control over failed businesses, and continues to appoint czar after czar to exercise government control over our free market system, the question still remains, Madam Speaker, what has this administration done to fix this broken system, and is it working?

Government control is not the answer, as our European neighbors have figured out recently and spoken through their elections to change their left-leaning programs and political regimes.

This economic crisis was created by a flawed system, a system that is in need of structural reform. However, the administration's answer to this glaring problem is to continue to throw more money, taxpayers' money, at the problem, which essentially increases this country's unsustainable debt and increases Federal bureaucratic control over all of our private institutions.

This country must stop the taxpayer-paid-for corporate welfare from being handed out and simply return this economy to what has worked for over 200 years, a system that rewards people who take prudent risks and punishes those who take irresponsible risks.

We must return to being a frugal Nation, one where the Federal Government balances its budget, encourages savings, and reins in the \$12 trillion

worth of debt. This Nation can no longer afford one more loan from China as our credit rating teeters on the brink of failure.

This structural reform begins with the executives that are tasked with running these institutions, banks, and corporations. What this economic crisis has taught us is that these CEOs care more about their stock options, even at the expense of hiding fraudulent assets and taking bogus risks to inflate their P&L statements.

Government-guaranteed bailouts and guaranteed bonuses allow these individuals to escape their poor decisions and sidestep the economic hardship that their risky choices have created for the average American family.

I believe this starts by giving investors and shareholders more transparency into what occurs in corporate boardrooms. Shareholders and investors need greater access to information to allow their confidence in company governance determine where their investment capital is best allocated. In addition, investors, regulators, and the American people need greater transparency into the daily operation of Wall Street. It is nearly impossible for one to find information or records of a corporation's credit default swaps—who owns them, who backs them, who has issued these complex financial tools? Vital information like this will help to prevent corporations from concealing this information in their books, what they owe and how much debt they really are in? The same can be said with regard to the subprime mortgage securities, what are they worth now?

Furthermore, Madam Speaker, there is no such thing as "too big to fail." These institutions must realize that every time they make an irresponsible decision or a risky bet, the Federal Treasury will not come to their financial rescue. Financial bailouts are a slippery slope and set a dangerous precedent. When the Federal Government begins to arbitrarily pick winners and losers, fairness, equality and the free market are tossed out the window, as evidenced by Bear Stearns' government bailout and Lehman Brothers allowed failure.

This administration, the Federal Reserve, and the Federal Treasury must release their TARP records and disclose in full how the bailout money has been spent, who the money has gone to, and the reason why some received help and others were allowed to fail. This money belongs to the taxpayers; we have a right to know.

For these and other reasons, I am calling on this Congress and the administration to have a series of comprehensive hearings to determine what exactly happened, who was at fault, what is the best way to restructure this flawed system, and how are the taxpayers going to get their money back from these bailouts?

Status quo is not acceptable, and neither is bailout after bailout, leading to Federal bureaucratic control of our in-

stitutions and our banks. It is time we find answers to these problems rather than continue to throw good money after bad.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 25 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PETERS) at noon.

PRAAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, yet ever-present to Your believing people, give us the wisdom to use the time You give us wisely.

May we divide our time according to priorities, always in fair and appropriate ways.

May we share our time with those who bring out the best in us or need our attention the most.

And Lord, may we waste time only while reflecting on Your many blessings or with those we love.

For everything and everyone is such a gift. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. GRIFFITH) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GRIFFITH led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 109. Concurrent resolution honoring the 20th anniversary of the Susan G. Komen Race for the Cure in the Nation's Capital and its transition to the Susan G. Komen Global Race for the Cure on June 6, 2009, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 256. An act to enhance the ability to combat methamphetamine.

FUNDING WARS AND MOVING JOBS OVERSEAS

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

Mr. KUCINICH. It is good our administration is reaching out to the Muslim world. It is bad to spend another \$100 billion to keep wars going which will kill innocent Muslims in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Pakistan.

It is good we try to create an incentive for people to buy efficient cars. It is bad that vouchers will not be expressly for the purpose of purchase of cars made in America. It is even worse that we tie such an incentive to a war-funding bill: cash for clunkers and bunkers in the same bill; cash for more war in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Pakistan; cash to help China sell its cars to Americans.

Meanwhile, back in the U.S. of A., factories and auto dealers are closing. People are losing their businesses, their jobs, their homes, their health care, their investments, their retirement security.

Who are these people who keep coming up with these innovative ideas to keep wars going and to move jobs out of America? Who are these people?

PROVIDING AFFORDABLE, ACCESSIBLE, QUALITY HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, Republicans are eager for this discussion, this debate on health care to move forward. We are eager to talk about health care in committee, on the floor, in hearings, at news conferences, wherever people want to talk about a health care system that ensures more quality, widespread coverage, and accessibility.

In fact, we have a plan that will be based on five principles, and today I want to talk about one of those principles, which is just simply to make quality health care coverage affordable and accessible for every American, regardless of preexisting health conditions. That is a statement that almost every Member of this House I believe would agree with, and our debate is just simply how we get there.

We need to be committed to get there. We need to ensure that everybody has not just access to health care because of certain Federal regulations. Everyone can get into a health care environment if there is a crisis, but we want to be sure they have coverage that gets them into health care through their entire life and through all the needs of their health care.

Affordable, accessible, quality health care is something we are eager to debate. We have the plans that will get there, and we hope that a competitive marketplace allows more choices.

SUPPORT THE SAFER GRANT PROGRAM

(Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of a bill I have introduced to help our brave firefighters continue to protect us in these tough times. The SAFER Grant Program helps our fire departments hire the staff they need by funding some of the salaries of new firefighters.

In a district like mine, where we are fighting five wildfires as we speak, this program is crucial to ensuring our firefighters are well-staffed. With tight budgets, the cost-sharing requirement in SAFER has become too tough for our fire departments to meet. Congress waived that requirement in the Recovery Act, but did not include grants from fiscal year 2008, which are still being distributed.

My bill would extend the cost-sharing waiver to fiscal year 2008, allowing our fire departments the flexibility they need to keep us safe, especially during our fire season.

DEMOCRAT PAYGO: YOU PAY, THEY GO ON SPENDING

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, later today President Barack Obama will push Democrat lawmakers to follow pay-as-you-go budget rules. PAYGO rules, as they are known, in theory would require new Federal spending or tax cuts be offset by spending cuts or even tax increases elsewhere. Now, this may sound reasonable to some Americans, but the devil is always in the details, and the American people have reason to be skeptical about newfound calls for fiscal responsibility from this majority.

Under Democrat control, the Federal budget deficit is projected to approach nearly \$2 trillion. In the last several years, non-defense spending has increased by 85 percent. The President and the Democrat's budget just passed will double the national debt in 5 years and triple it in 10. And now calls for new budget rules?

With Democrat plans for more borrowing, more spending, more bailouts, and more debt, the Democrat definition of PAYGO is all too clear to the American people: you pay, and they go on spending.

BRINGING ABDUCTED AMERICAN CHILDREN HOME

(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission

to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I recently learned of a situation concerning a constituent of mine, Randy Collins, whose ex-wife abducted their son and went to Japan. The last time Randy Collins saw his son, Keisuke Christian Collins, was on June 15, 2008.

According to the United States State Department's Deputy Assistant Secretary for Overseas Citizens Services, the United States has received notices of 73 cases of parental abductions involving 104 children just for the country of Japan.

Unfortunately, many people are not aware of the severity of this situation and how it affects so many American lives. Once taken to Japan, American parents are unable to see their children because parental visitation rights are not recognized, they are not protected by Japan, and abduction by one parent is not considered a crime.

As an ally of the United States, I urge the Government of Japan to sign the 1980 Hague Convention on Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction and respect the rights of our American parents.

YES, MR. PRESIDENT, WE ARE OUT OF MONEY

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

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, in a recent interview with C-SPAN, the President made the very telling statement, "We are out of money."

Yes, Mr. President, as of April 27, this country ran out of money. And yet that has not stopped the liberals in this Congress from passing record-setting spending bills. These bills were sold to the American public as necessary to stimulate the economy.

Unemployment insurance claims reached a record high for the 17th consecutive week and unemployment has reached 9.4 percent, which he promised would not happen upon signing this infamous stimulus bill. The \$1 trillion spending that was supposed to stem the economic recession was nothing more than the fulfillment of a very liberal political agenda.

Reckless spending, a total disregard for fiscal accountability, and rocketing us into another inflation-debt spiral is not the solution. Now, even Socialist and Communist countries across the world are rebuking us for excessive spending and government takeover of the economy.

Bigger government is never the answer to America's biggest challenges. American individualism, innovation, and ingenuity will, even after 200 years, remain the only way to economic prosperity.

THE ROAD TO RECOVERY

(Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, it has been barely over 100 days since the Recovery Act was passed by this Congress and signed into law by President Obama. Since the recession began, Americans have understandably been worried about our Nation's future and their own economic future.

Because of the Recovery Act, we have created and saved over 150,000 jobs, cut taxes for 95 percent of Americans, and made funds available for over 4,000 transportation projects across the country. We have made progress in a short time, but there is still a lot more to do on the road to recovery. I commend President Obama on his efforts to speed up those efforts to get Americans back to work even faster.

The Department of Transportation is quickly putting \$27.5 billion to work creating jobs in my home State of Missouri and across the country to rebuild and repair highways, roads, and bridges. By the end of 2010, the funds will have created or saved an additional 150,000 jobs.

Investments in our national transportation system are critical to our long-term economic success, and part of getting there will be putting people back to work rebuilding America on the road to recovery.

CAP-AND-TRADE DESERVES TO FAIL

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

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Speaker, cap-and-trade threatens to be a well-intended disaster. Under the ruse of reducing carbon emissions to clean the environment, cap-and-trade will hobble the economy. By some estimates, it reduces GDP by \$9.6 trillion over two decades, eliminates 1.1 million jobs per year, and increases the Federal debt by 26 percent. Electricity rates jump 90 percent, gas prices 74 percent, and natural gas prices 55 percent.

Cap-and-trade is designed to disguise what it truly is, in the words of Mr. DINGELL, "a great big tax." It imposes higher taxes on producers, so producers pass higher prices to consumers. The authors are targeting the producers so that the producers increase the prices on consumers. If the authors targeted consumers rather than the producers, it would connect them too much, and therefore, they must distance themselves from the families who bear the costs.

The authors know the effects. They are hiding from them. It is underhanded, it is subterfuge, it deserves to fail.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF STAFF SERGEANT JEFFREY ALAN HALL

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

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Staff Sergeant Jeffrey Alan Hall. On June 1, 2009, Jeffrey was killed in action in Afghanistan. As north Alabama mourns this sudden, devastating loss, I would like to recognize Staff Sergeant Hall and his entire family's sacrifice.

Jeffrey was an 8-year veteran of the United States Army, earning many well-deserved awards and decorations, including two Army Commendation Medals, the National Defense Service Medal, a NATO Medal, and a Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal.

Staff Sergeant Hall is an inspiring example of someone we can all look up to and inspire to be like. He put the safety of all Americans before his own, and the people of this Nation will be forever grateful. He motivated and inspired those who were around him, and he will be greatly missed by all who knew him, as well as those who never had the honor and privilege of meeting him.

Our country has lost a great soldier and an even better son. All of us in north Alabama are deeply saddened by the loss of Jeffrey. On behalf of the entire community in the Tennessee Valley and across Alabama and the Nation, I rise today to join Huntsville Mayor Tommy Battle, the United States Army, and the family of Jeffrey Hall in honoring his service, memory, and life.

□ 1215

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the government-run health care plan that my Democratic colleagues are pushing will lead to health care rationing and, ultimately, months of wait time for patients seeking treatment.

Today, I want to read a testimonial from a Canadian citizen who has experienced firsthand the ill effects of their government-run health care.

"When I came to the major hospital in downtown Toronto with appendicitis, I had to wait overnight until a doctor saw me, but they did not have a CAT scan machine available, so they sent me home. I had to return to the hospital the next day, and at that time they rated me 'less urgent.' When I asked them why, they told me I received the less urgent rating 'because I have not died yet.' Again, it took many hours before I was able to see the doctor. Then I had to wait hours for an operating room before I was told that only those who would otherwise certainly die would receive surgery. However, the vet care in Canada is private, so there is nothing like this when it comes to taking care of my dog. The doctor is always available for a dog, but not for a human."

Mr. Speaker, health reform must not preclude man nor his best friend from access to quality health care.

H.R. 1550, THE CONSUMER ASSISTANCE TO RECYCLE AND SAVE (CARS) ACT OF 2009

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

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, today the House will consider the CARS Act of 2009. This legislation is critical, not only to spur growth in America's auto industry, but to save and create jobs throughout the economy.

History shows that one of the quickest ways to end a recession is to sell more automobiles. New car sales constitute a major percentage of the Nation's consumer spending, and increasing vehicle sales also stimulates demand for raw goods, from which automobiles are manufactured. Production of glass, steel, plastics, and other primary materials will be increased as more new cars are sold, creating jobs throughout the economy.

Similar programs have shown proven results abroad. In Germany, sales were boosted roughly 40 percent. Many other nations have acted to strengthen their economies with policies designed to sell more automobiles, and the U.S. should not be left behind.

We must pass the CARS Act today to create a recovery, not just for our auto industry, but for the entire economy.

U.S. JOURNALISTS ARE POLITICAL PRISONERS IN NORTH KOREA

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, two American journalists, Laura Ling and Euna Lee, are reporters for Current TV. They were in China near the North Korean border making a film about the horrible sex trafficking between North Korea and China. The North Koreans claim they crossed the border illegally, so the Communist court sentenced them to 12 years at hard labor. That's some border enforcement policy.

The conditions in these prison camps are harsh. Some reports say a quarter of the inmates die of starvation every year. The prisoners do backbreaking work in factories, coal mines and rice paddies. They're also used in experiments involving biological weapons. I guess the Communists didn't get the memo on human rights.

Now we hear that the journalists may have actually been kidnapped and forcibly taken to North Korea. Anyway, they are being used as political prisoners to try to force this administration to give more concessions and American money to North Korea.

North Korea is starving. The Communist regime is bankrupt. But they want to be able to sell nuclear technology to terrorist nations, so they're holding these journalists ransom until they get their way.

Mr. Speaker, the journalists should go free, and the North Korean outlaws should take their place in that prison. And that's just the way it is.

RECOGNIZING THE NAVAJO CODE TALKERS

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

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, over the Memorial Day recess, our Nation lost two individuals that I consider to be national treasures. Two marines that were known as "Navajo Code Talkers" passed away: John Brown, Jr., of Crystal, New Mexico, and his compatriot, Thomas Claw. Both were 87.

During World War II, the Marines recruited members of the Navajo Nation for the specific purpose of devising a code that was based on the Navajo language. The Japanese were never able to break the code, and the Code Talkers were credited with helping save lives and contributing to the military success in the Pacific theater.

The Code Talkers' contributions were invaluable, and we should always be grateful for their service. They did so much, and their contribution can be summarized best by what John Brown said when he was presented with the Congressional Gold Medal: "We have seen much in our lives. We have seen war and peace, and we know the value of the freedom and democracy that this great Nation embodies. But our experience also reminds us how fragile these things can be and how vigilant we must be in protecting them."

FISCAL RESTRAINT

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

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand the voting card of the United States Congress. Now, this is the ultimate credit card. There's no limit and there's no penalties. And it's wrong.

Every time I hear a solution from the Democrats, it's about spending more. We have got to stop running this country on a credit card. The problems that we face in this Nation, the challenges that we face are not solved by charging things on the credit card.

The American Dream is not about overspending and being in debt. It's about hard work and perseverance and liberty. Every time we add dollars to this card, we take away that liberty.

I urge my colleagues, come up with solutions that don't include an increase in spending. Cap-and-trade is one of the largest tax increases in the history of the United States of America.

Please, let's stop running this government on a credit card. Institute fiscal restraint, and remember that it's the people's money. It's not the Congress' money.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, our current health care system is unsustainable. Working people go every day without care or struggle to pay increasingly higher premiums and deductibles. In my home State of Maryland, 76.7 percent of the uninsured are from working families.

Now, if a single-payer plan is not adopted by this Congress, which I support strongly, then we must have a robust public plan option like Medicare to be enacted to reduce costs for small businesses and individuals, provide true competition, and give patients the choice they deserve. A public plan option has to be available to all without exclusions. It must retain patient choice and implement reforms that promote quality care, prevention, primary care, and chronic health care management. And importantly, a public plan option must address health care disparities in underrepresented communities.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress and President will be judged by our ability to construct a health care system that covers all Americans, lowers costs for everyone, and provides real and competitive choice for health care. The time for reform is now, and we can't delay.

THE CRISIS IN HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it's time we address the crisis in health care. We can ensure every American can get the care they need, protect individuals from costs that can bankrupt them, and make health insurance portable so they can move or change jobs without losing health insurance coverage. We can also stop insurance companies from avoiding sick patients by reforming the system to pay when people become healthier.

Enacting a public plan will not bring about this type of change. If you think you won't be affected by a public plan, consider this: a recent analysis by the respected independent firm The Lewin Group estimated that 70 percent of individuals who have health care coverage through their employer would lose those benefits in favor of a public option. This plan could very easily be a Medicaid-like plan. In fact, Senator KENNEDY is proposing expanding Medicaid to families making up to \$110,000 a year in legislation he dropped yesterday.

When supporters of a public plan say they want a public plan to compete with private plans, the facts show that what they're really saying is they want a Washington bureaucrat to take over health care decisionmaking. Buyer beware.

H. RES. 505, CONDEMNING THE MURDER OF DR. GEORGE R. TILLER

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

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, later today the House will consider H. Res. 505, a bill that condemns the tragic murder of Dr. George Tiller, and offers our condolences to his wife, four children and 10 grandchildren.

He was known as a doctor of last resort and a friend to women when they were in desperate need of support and care. His murder in his church in Wichita, where he served as an usher and where his wife sang in the choir, was a violent, lawless and senseless act.

At his memorial service this past Saturday, Dr. Tiller was remembered for his generosity of spirit and his sense of humor. Let us also remember him for his courage.

Mahalo nui loa (thank you very much).

IMPRISONMENT OF AMERICAN JOURNALISTS IN NORTH KOREA

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, news came yesterday that Laura Ling and Euna Lee, two American journalists held in North Korea, and held there since March, have been found guilty of illegally entering North Korea. They've been sentenced to 12 years of hard labor. These court proceedings were a cruel joke, nothing more than a kangaroo court. I know of no justice system in North Korea. The two should be immediately released.

As if there were any doubts, the North Korean regime has shown its true colors, a hostile regime bent on destroying the lives of its own citizens and others.

Let's be clear. These two wouldn't have been near North Korea were it not for the barbaric cruelty of its regime. Ling and Lee were convicted of so-called "grave crimes." It is the North Korean regime that commits real grave crimes against millions of North Koreans every day.

President Obama, himself, must make it clear that this action cannot stand. Now is the time for urgent action.

OUR HEALTH CARE SYSTEM

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

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, it has become amply clear to all Americans, North, South, Republican, Democrat, rich, poor, that our health care system is not just a moral embarrassment to the greatest country on Earth, but a severe economic liability.

Our auto companies and our corporations stagger under cost increases. Our small businesses choose between covering their employees or taking a step towards insolvency. And of course, health care costs are the leading cause of bankruptcy for American families.

We cannot fix this economy without reforming our health care system. We cannot be fiscally responsible without addressing the stunning economic liabilities that we have associated with Medicare and other promises we have made.

The reforms that we are offering will offer a real choice of plans to small businesses in America. It will provide tax credits to small businesses, and it will end the practice of insurance companies denying coverage to Americans who need it. Most importantly, it will emphasize prevention, wellness, and patient-centered care.

The bottom line, reforming health care to contain rising costs is the most effective action we can take to return our Nation's budget to balance and make our workers the most competitive in the world.

PATIENT-CENTERED SOLUTIONS

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today I draw attention to a vision for a new era of American health care, a clear path to provide access to affordable, quality care for all Americans.

There's no doubt that our health care system is failing some of America's patients. Now, some in this body believe that the solution is giving greater control over health care decisions to Washington, a government takeover of personal health insurance.

Now, as a physician, I know that government interference only harms patient access to health care. Real positive reform will only be achieved by empowering patients, not government and not bureaucrats. Positive reform starts with giving ownership of health coverage back to the patient, not the government. Allowing individuals full control over their coverage will make insurers truly accountable to patients, leading to greater choice, innovation, and responsiveness.

Secondly, we must provide the proper financial incentives so that there's no reason to be uninsured. With tax reform, not government mandates, we can achieve universal access to care for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans have a positive, patient-centered prescription for America that doesn't result in a government takeover.

□ 1230

HONORING THE LIFE OF AMBASSADOR JACK HENNING

(Ms. SPEIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, we lost a lion of the labor movement and a true son of San Francisco with the passing of Ambassador Jack Henning. Jack spent the vast majority of his 93 years fighting for men and women in the fields, factories, and loading docks of America. The only thing he loved more than telling labor stories to anyone who would hear them was telling them to those who didn't.

For 26 years, Jack was the driving force behind the California Labor Federation, but he served our country in many ways. He was the director of the California Department of Industrial Relations under Governor Pat Brown, Under Secretary of Labor for President Kennedy, and U.S. Ambassador to New Zealand for President Lyndon Johnson.

Mr. Speaker, my thoughts are with Jack's family and the millions of Americans—most of whom never knew him—who earn a liveable wage, work under safer conditions, and are able to take their child to a doctor because of the tireless passion of Ambassador Jack Henning.

A REAL WAY TO PEACE

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, as President Obama begins to wade into the Israel-Palestinian conflict, he must remember who our friends are. Israel is America's most reliable and only democratic ally in the Middle East. Yet in his speech last week in Cairo and in statements by his administration, President Obama seems only to want to pressure Israel, while not requiring similar concessions from the Palestinians and other Arab states.

Starting with the British Partition Plan in 1937—when they were offered the western part of Palestine—then again to the U.N. Partition Plan in 1947, to the Camp David talks in 2000, and most recently in December of 2008, the Palestinians have rejected every plan to divide the land into independent states. Each time their answer was “no.”

No outside party, President Obama included, can arbitrarily impose a peace agreement, nor can peace be achieved by setting conditions on just one party, Israel, which has been willing to take the necessary and difficult steps towards peace and consider compromise.

THE RECOVERY BILL

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

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, it is undeniable that we have seen many positive signs in our economy since January. The unemployment rate, while still far

too high, is improving and money is starting to flow through the economy and into our cities and municipalities to improve our infrastructure and ensure the safety of every American.

The recovery bill has been at the core of this progress and has saved and created jobs and made much-needed investments in my local district. For example, in my hometown of Utica, New York, the recovery bill provided the City of Utica with over \$2 million for lead abatement in homes across the city. This lead abatement program will put people to work and improve the health and quality of life for countless families. Without this recovery bill funding, the City of Utica would have had to have continued to delay this vital program because it is likely that they did not have the funding necessary to proceed with these plans on its own.

I will continue to fight for the recovery bill funding for critical projects in my district, and I know that we will see even more progress in all of our communities as we all continue to work together to lead America out of this economic crisis.

ENERGY

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the importance of building a clean energy economy for America. Americans are fed up with the same tax breaks for oil companies that post record profits while working families are stuck paying exorbitant prices at the pump. Americans want a new energy economy, a green economy, to take us into the future, to take us into a carbon-neutral economy, to take us into jobs, to take us into a future in which we are not dependent upon the automobile for every transportation decision.

The time has come to transform our economy for decades to come. The time has come to create American jobs with new, clean, American-made energy. The clean energy jobs plan is the next step in creating millions of American jobs in clean energy, efficiency, and modernizing a smart electric grid. We can reduce our dependence on costly oil, curb pollution, and create jobs. We can do this. Yes, we can.

FIX THE HEALTH CARE SYSTEM

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call out the siren and the clarion call for fixing America's health care system. We urgently need to fix it, and we realize that if you've got it, you like it, you can keep it.

We need to get a system that will allow those that are underinsured and without insurance to be able to be

cared for in this Nation. We need to reduce the serious health disparities. We need to also ensure that there is a public option, that there is universal access to health care. Make it a good Medicare plan that helps the young, the old, and the working Americans.

In addition, we need to be fair to how we pay for it. We need to realize that physician-owned hospitals are not the enemy. In fact, they help to, in essence, bring down health disparities. Many physician-owned hospitals or investor-owned hospitals with doctors involved are in the urban and rural areas where no other hospitals would go. Let's fix this system in a fair manner that addresses the question of making sure the 47 million-plus who are under-insured and those without insurance can have a good public option, can as well have a fair system of good doctors and have good hospitals and make it work for working Americans and others who are in need.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLUMENAUER). 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.

CONDEMNING THE MURDER OF DR. GEORGE TILLER

Mr. NADLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 505) condemning the murder of Dr. George Tiller, who was shot to death at his church on May 31, 2009.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 505

Whereas Dr. George Tiller was murdered in Wichita, Kansas, on May 31, 2009;

Whereas Dr. Tiller is mourned by his family, friends, congregation, community, and colleagues;

Whereas Dr. Tiller, 67, was killed in his place of worship, a place intended for peace and refuge that in a moment became a place for violence and murder;

Whereas places of worship should be sanctuaries, but have increasingly borne witness to reprehensible acts of violence, with 38 people in the United States killed in their place of worship in the past 10 years and 30 people wounded in those same incidents;

Whereas these acts of violence include the murder of an Illinois pastor at the pulpit in March 2009, the murder of an Ohio minister in November 2008, the murder of an usher and a guest during a children's play in a Tennessee church in July 2008, the murder of four family members in a church in Louisiana in May 2006, and the shooting of a worshipper outside a synagogue in Florida in October 2005; and

Whereas violence is deplorable, and never an acceptable avenue for expressing opposing viewpoints: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) offers its condolences to Dr. Tiller's family; and

(2) commits to the American principle that tolerance must always be superior to intolerance, and that violence is never an appropriate response to a difference in beliefs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. NADLER of New York. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 505, which condemns the murder of Dr. George Tiller, who was shot to death at his church on May 31. The resolution also offers the condolences of the House of Representatives to Dr. Tiller's family. I know that Dr. Tiller and his family are in the thoughts and prayers of every Member of the House today.

I want to commend our colleague, the distinguished chairperson of the Rules Committee, my fellow New Yorker, Ms. SLAUGHTER, for introducing this resolution.

It is imperative that the House of Representatives speak with a united voice in condemning this crime. It is a sad reminder that medical personnel are still at risk from armed extremists who are willing to resort to deadly violence in order to advance their causes even when they cloak their cause in the language of life. There can never be room in a free society for the use of deadly violence to advance a cause. It is against everything this country stands for. I have no doubt there isn't a single Member of this House who would disagree.

This resolution renews our commitment to the American principle that tolerance must always be superior to intolerance and that violence is never an appropriate response to differences and belief.

As deplorable as this murder was, it was all the more reprehensible because the victim was targeted as he was leaving church. In the past 10 years, 38 people have been murdered in their place of worship and 30 more have been wounded.

Dr. Tiller was a controversial figure. He was the target of threats and even a prior shooting because of his dedication to providing needed, if unpopular, services. He was murdered solely because of the work he did. The continued violence directed at abortion pro-

viders, including doctors and the people who staff their clinics, is well-known. Bombings, shootings, vandalism, and harassment all serve to warn women and their health care providers that they may pay a terrible price if they choose to avail themselves of their rights under the Constitution.

This was not the first time a health care provider was similarly targeted. I am sure every Member of this House and every decent American, however they may feel or whatever they may believe on the question of abortion, will insist that this and every other question must be decided by our legal, constitutional, and democratic processes and not by murderous violence. I am sure we all condemn those people or groups who espouse or excuse domestic terrorism.

But while violence has long been directed at the clinics and the people who work there, this time the killer chose, in addition, to invade the sanctity of the Sabbath. Murderous intolerance is never justified; even so, the idea of bringing death and mayhem to a house of worship strikes all people as particularly reprehensible. These acts include the murder of an Illinois pastor in the pulpit in March of this year; the murder of an Ohio minister in November of last year; the murder of an usher and a guest during a children's play in a Tennessee church in July of last year; the murder of four family members in a church in Louisiana in May 2006; and the shooting of a worshipper outside a synagogue in Florida in October 2005; not to mention the attempted bombings of two synagogues in Riverdale in the Bronx just a few weeks ago. Whether these acts of violence target one individual or an entire community of faith, we must all join together and speak out against them.

I urge all of my colleagues to stand up to those who would bring their reign of terror into a house of worship and those who would seek to change American law by violence and unconstitutional means to express their opprobrium of this conduct by supporting this resolution condemning the murder of George Tiller and extending the condolences of this House to the members of Dr. Tiller's family.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COBLE. I rise in support of the House Resolution 505, Mr. Speaker. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I support House Resolution 505 which deplores the murder of Dr. George Tiller who was shot to death at his church, as has already been mentioned, on May 31. I join with the National Right to Life Committee, the Nation's largest pro-life group, in condemning the killing of Dr. Tiller. As that organization correctly said, Anyone who works to increase respect for human life must oppose any unlawful use of violence that is directly contrary to that goal.

Because I believe everyone who is the victim of unlawful violence should be

treated equally under the law, I voted against the so-called hate crimes bill when it was brought up on the House floor earlier this year. The resolution we are now debating and another we will debate today recognize what should be obvious to all, which is that anyone can be the victim of hate-inspired crimes and that the perpetrators of those crimes should be equally condemned and punished.

I urge, Mr. Speaker, all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the chairperson of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, today I want to speak about the senseless killing of a good man as he was volunteering as an usher among family and friends in his place of worship. Dr. George Tiller got shot to death, as most of us know, at his church in Wichita, Kansas, on May 31. A single gunshot fired by a man who apparently has a long history of animosity to a woman's right to choose ended the life of a man who had dedicated his life to helping others and was a stark reminder to all of us of the raw emotion surrounding this issue.

In the days since the arrest of the shooter, we have now heard reports that even more violence may be planned against doctors who believe in choice. And while this kind of violence is deplorable, it seems to me that this act is particularly villainous because it took place in a house of worship.

□ 1245

This church, a place where people come together to seek peace, safety, and protection, was in an instant transformed into a place of shocking, senseless violence.

Our places of worship are meant to be peaceful refuges for those who seek serenity in times of turmoil and safety in times of hostility. The sanctity of these places is honored at all times and without regard to denomination. There should be no exception to this rule that we are taught early and that provides us with a structure for our interaction with other faiths and beliefs. Only the most evil can bring violence into these sacred buildings. To defile houses of worship with bloodshed is nothing less than villainous, and we should not tolerate such actions in a civilized society.

For millennia, into the Middle Ages, our churches, synagogues, mosques, and others have been the center of communities, places of scholarship, proponents of peace and love among humankind. There is more to a place of worship than its physical presence; there is a sense of community and accord and safety where worshippers can share their faith. But when you look at our recent history, what we have seen is a disturbing rise in violence at

churches that we have taken no note of in the House of Representatives. As mentioned, 68 persons have been shot, dead, wounded or assaulted in violence in religious institutions here in the United States. This is more than deplorable.

Deepening the tragedy is the fact that, until now, there has been no expression of outrage decrying violence in a place of worship. It shakes the foundations of our communities, our principles, and our Nation. It is not a Christian issue or a Jewish issue or an Islamic issue or any one faith. It is a test of what we as a society are willing to tolerate and a reminder that some people in this Nation do not respect the sanctity of a house of worship.

The brutal killing of Dr. Tiller was the latest church killing. In March of 2009, Rev. Fred Winters was killed while at the pulpit by gunfire at the First Baptist Church in Illinois. It was only after the gun malfunctioned that members of the congregation subdued the shooter to prevent further fatalities.

Rev. Donald Fairbanks, Sr., was fatally shot at the Ninth Street Baptist Church of Covington, Kentucky, in November of 2008. He was visiting from his Cincinnati, Ohio, church to attend a funeral for a woman with relatives in his congregation. Grief turned to fear as the gunman opened fire in the church.

In July 2008, an usher and a guest were shot and killed during the opening act of a children's play in Knoxville, Tennessee. This time, the gunman walked into the sanctuary carrying a guitar case with a 12-gauge shotgun. He is said to have fired over 40 shots, killing two and injuring seven.

In May 2006, five family members were killed by a gunman who opened fire during a church service at The Ministry of Jesus Christ Church in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. A whole family was wiped out, and the shooter's wife was abducted from the church and killed nearby.

One of the most upsetting church killings in recent memory occurred in 1999 when a lone gunman massacred seven worshippers and wounded seven others at a youth celebration—150 teenagers strong—that was taking place in the sanctuary of the Wedgewood Baptist Church in Fort Worth, Texas. The assault was one of the worst ever, and I know there was a tremendous sense of loss after that awful act.

Why doesn't America care about this? Why have we said absolutely nothing about it? Why are we now allowing concealed weapons to be carried in Federal parks where, frankly, I hope most people will not be able to go in any notion that they might come out of there alive.

Dr. Tiller's family held a memorial service for him over the weekend after his burial on Friday, and he was remembered by all four of his children for his care and devotion as both a phy-

sician and father. It is a senseless tragedy, and so I offer this resolution and hope that all Members of this House will say "no more."

Mr. NADLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 12 additional minutes.

Mr. NADLER of New York. I now yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlelady from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, our society has too often, recently, devolved into violence to address controversy.

The murder of a doctor, who was beloved by his family, trusted by his patients, and respected by his community, is never an acceptable form of expression. While virtually all established groups have condemned this act, some individuals are still threatening violence against the health care providers they disagree with. The message to those people needs to be unequivocal and it needs to be unanimous: We will not condone violence in any form, and those who perpetrate it will be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.

Mr. Speaker, we must have a civil discourse in this society, and this is something we all have to strive for together. I know that we on our side of the aisle and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle all believe this. We need to put it into action.

I will say that Dr. George Tiller is survived by his wife, Jeanne, their four children and their 10 grandchildren. I think the saddest thing about all this and the thing that personalizes it the most is that Jeanne called Dr. Tiller "Buddy." And the reason she called him Buddy was because he was her best friend.

Mr. Speaker, the mark of a civilized society must be civil discourse. We cannot lose one more of someone's best friend because of this lack of civility.

Mr. NADLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the distinguished chairman and the author of this legislation, the distinguished gentlelady from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), chairman of the Rules Committee. And I rise to simply say to this House and to America, enough is enough.

I am delighted that we have heard the majority of pro-life organizations, who are Americans as well, denounce this horrific act. My deepest sympathy to Dr. Tiller's wife and children and grandchildren, but I think it is not enough to offer our sympathy; it is a requirement that we denounce this with every fiber of our body.

In addition, I think it is important, as we go forward, that right-to-life organizations learn to respect the First Amendment, and certainly the sanctity of a house of worship. It is important to note that Dr. Tiller is not and was not a criminal, did not perform criminal acts, but responded to women who

willingly came into his office with the counsel of their family and a religious leader and made a decision addressing the question of their health and the concerns of their family. Many of those women who came to Dr. Tiller wanted to have children, were praying for children, and were able to have children and give birth to a healthy child thereafter.

I am concerned that the alleged perpetrator now incarcerated and held in jail is continuing to make threats against those who are trying to both abide by the law but serve the needs of more than 51 percent of America. Yes, we know there is opposition to abortion. None of us stand here as abortion proponents. What we stand here as is simply individuals who believe in choice, prayerfully believe in choice. Therefore, I am asking for full support for this initiative to denounce the killing of Dr. Tiller, but I am also saying enough is enough.

Mr. NADLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlelady from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 505 honoring the life of Dr. George Tiller and condemning his brutal murder at church. I thank Representative SLAUGHTER for this resolution.

Dr. Tiller was a husband and a father. He studied at the University of Kansas School of Medicine and served his country as a United States Navy flight surgeon intern. Despite attacks and threats against him, he continued to serve as a tireless advocate for women's health and women's rights. On May 31, he was brutally gunned down in broad daylight in his place of worship by an extremist who took the law into his own hands. Enough is enough. It is time for us to condemn this act of violence and state forcefully that we will not condone murder, threats, or intimidation in the future.

In addition to my condolences to Dr. Tiller's family, I extend my gratitude to them for his life, his courage, his unyielding support for women, their health, and freedom to exercise their constitutional rights.

Mr. NADLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlelady from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Resolution 505, with deepest sympathy for the family and loved ones of Dr. George Tiller and in strongest condemnation of his murder.

Murder in any setting is horrific. It is unconscionable but to commit a heinous crime of violence inside a place of worship that teaches a message of tolerance and nonviolence is especially reprehensible. Dr. Tiller was guiding worshippers to their seats and his wife was singing in the choir when he was gunned down. This is so precisely the opposite of where humanity should be in 2009.

Violence, especially murder, should never be a recourse for differences in beliefs. So I ask my colleagues to join me in condemning acts of violence and intolerance. And I ask that we resolve to honor the memory of Dr. George Tiller, a physician and a man of God, by working harder than ever to promote tolerance and to promote nonviolence. I urge all of my colleagues to stand unanimously and vote in favor of this resolution.

Mr. NADLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the resolution before the House sponsored by my very good friend, Representative LOUISE SLAUGHTER, condemning the senseless killing of Dr. George Tiller.

Dr. Tiller, as we have heard, was gunned down while serving as an usher during church services last week. We are blessed in this country to have the freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and freedom to protest. Our country has a rich history of nonviolent protests from the women's rights movement to the civil rights movement to the gay rights movement. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., preached nonviolence, and his great movement heeded this call in the face of unspeakable acts of violence from their opposition.

This shooting is, in the words of the New York State Catholic Conference, a terrible perversion of what it means to be pro-life. While we may have different views of this issue, no side should resort to atrocious acts of violence such as this.

Since 1977, there have been more than 5,800 reported acts of violence against providers like Dr. Tiller. Since 1993, eight people have been murdered, and there have been 17 attempted murders since 1991. Clinics like Dr. Tiller's over a 20-year span have been bombed 41 times and faced 175 arsons and 96 attempted bombings and arsons.

I understand that this is a passionate issue for both sides, but we cannot allow this to continue.

Mr. NADLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlelady from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

(Mrs. MALONEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MALONEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership.

Rochester, New York, has historically given this Nation some of our greatest women leaders: Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Susan B. Anthony, and LOUISE SLAUGHTER. With this bill that she authored, she is one of the strongest links in leading women in this country and protecting our rights. We thank you, LOUISE, for your continued leadership.

The horror that played out inside a Wichita church, the murder of Dr. Tiller, is a wound to the conscience of this

Nation. He had long been a target of violence and hate because he provided legal abortions, he provided medical care to women in need. Any time a doctor has to put his life on the line to provide medical care it has a chilling effect on Americans' ability to get the medical care that they need.

The consequences of Dr. Tiller's murder are a tragedy not only to his family, not only for women in Kansas, but for women everywhere, especially in areas of our country where there are relatively few medical providers. Dr. Tiller is the eighth abortion provider to be murdered since 1977, and he was one of just seven doctors in the entire State of Kansas.

Where will women go for the medical help that they need? We have seen throughout history that hate is not just ugly, it can be deadly. I hope that leaders on both sides of this debate will look at the savage killing of Dr. Tiller and call to account those who would use hate, intolerance, and fear to divide us.

My heart goes out to Dr. Tiller's family and friends, and my prayers are with them.

Mr. NADLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlelady from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

□ 1300

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank my colleague Mr. NADLER for yielding.

I want to close my portion here by reminding people what a terrible thing that has happened in this country to a man who was simply doing what he was allowed to do, what he was trained to do.

I think perhaps I should state for the record, too, that third trimester abortions are less than 1 percent, and even Roe v. Wade says that after the first trimester the State has an interest and that it takes two doctors, as well as it does for the third trimester. These are oftentimes babies that have been desperately wanted and planned, but in order to save the health of the mother or to prevent her from carrying a toxic fetus that has already expired, it is sometimes necessary to do this. It is not a whim. It is not something that women do. I think, if anything, what insults my intelligence and my feeling as a woman and a grandmother is the notion that women will just wake up one morning and say, Well, I've had enough. That just does not happen. Women are, by nature, nurturers, and we are just not like that, and it's a major insult to us.

But as we remember this killing and affirm the need for peace in our places of worship, let's remind ourselves of the need for tolerance and kindness. I offer this resolution and offer the most sincere condolences to the family.

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

Mr. NADLER of New York. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. The resolution affirms that the House of Representatives commits to the American principle that tolerance must always be superior to intolerance.

I urge Members to join me in supporting this to renounce nefarious violence in our places of worship where Americans seek sanctuary. Violence is deplorable and never an acceptable avenue for expressing opposing viewpoints.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my good friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the pro-life movement is absolutely nonviolent and is totally committed to protecting unborn children and their mothers through peaceful, nonviolent means. I have been in the pro-life movement for 37 years, and those peaceful, nonviolent means include legal and constitutional reform as well as tangibly assisting women with crisis pregnancies.

Dr. Tiller's murderer must be brought to swift justice commensurate with the heinous crime that he has committed.

Murder is murder. Murder is never justified and can never be condoned by any society committed to fundamental human rights, justice, and the rule of just law.

Let me, as well, like my other colleagues on the floor today, extend my profound condolences to the Tiller family.

Mr. NADLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CLAY). Without objection, the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) controls the balance of the time of the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE).

There was no objection.

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. NADLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may state his inquiry.

Mr. NADLER of New York. Does that mean the gentleman has declined his right to a closing?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has yielded back his time.

Mr. ISSA. I'm declining on this bill. I will pick up on the next one. Thank you.

Mr. NADLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution condemns the murder of Dr. Tiller. It condemns the murder of people who are murdered in church and places of worship. It condemns the practice, and it has become a practice, of seeking to change the laws of this country, of seeking to intimidate women from availing themselves of their rights, of their constitutional right to an abor-

tion, of intimidating doctors from availing themselves of their constitutional right to perform medical procedures that are legal and that they believe are moral by threats of murder and mayhem.

I was glad to hear Mr. SMITH say that the pro-life movement is nonviolent, and I'm sure that most of it is. But, unfortunately, it is clear that there are some people, a small minority, who believe themselves part of the pro-life movement who are not nonviolent. And these people have engaged in such conduct and have murdered several providers of abortion simply for doing what they believe to be the right thing, what I believe to be the right thing, and, more importantly, what the law allows them to do, and to intimidate other people from doing this.

This resolution, which I trust every Member of this House will vote for, says that we do not believe in trying to change the law by violence. We do not believe in domestic terrorism, defining "terrorism" as an attempt to change the law through murder and violence and mayhem. We believe in constitutional processes. And if every single one of us does not believe in that, then we have no moral superiority over the terrorists that we condemn around the world.

So I trust everyone will vote for this resolution to express our horror of what was done in this instance, to express our belief that social change, if necessary, will be brought about by peaceful democratic debate and by votes, not by bullets, and that this country stands for the evolution of law by debate and by consideration and by democratic means. I urge everyone to vote for this resolution.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 505.

Like the vast majority of people throughout our nation, I was appalled by the unconscionable act of violence that took the life of Dr. Tiller at his place of worship.

I offer my deepest and most sincere condolences to the family and many friends of Dr. Tiller. My thoughts and prayers are with them as they struggle with this tremendous loss.

Dr. Tiller was a medical pioneer who, for two decades, worked to provide the highest quality of care to his patients.

Despite encountering constant harassment and threats Dr. Tiller remained committed to providing abortion services and other reproductive care to women and their families.

Often times, Dr. Tiller provided these services to women during the most challenging and heart-wrenching of circumstances.

The shooting death of Dr. Tiller is an affront to all physicians who provide abortion and reproductive care to women; it's also an affront to a woman's right to choose.

Moreover his death was an affront to our nation's rich religious and democratic traditions.

No matter which side you may stand on in regards to protecting a woman's right to choose, we can and should all agree that violence has no place in our political discourse.

I thank my colleague Ms. SLAUGHTER for authoring this resolution, and I urge all my colleagues to vote in favor of its passage.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 505, condemning the murder of Dr. George Tiller.

Dr. George Tiller was murdered in Wichita, Kansas, on May 31, 2009. Dr. Tiller was 67 years old, a father, a husband and a friend, and was killed in his place of worship, a place intended for peace and refuge that in a moment became a place for violence and murder.

As stated in H. Res. 505, in the past 10 years, 38 people in the United States have been killed in their place of worship with 30 more sustaining wounds in those same incidents. This violence is deplorable, and never an acceptable avenue for expressing opposing viewpoints.

I join the author of this bill, Congresswoman CAROLYN MALONEY, in offering my condolences to Dr. Tiller's family, and commit to the American principle that tolerance must always be superior to intolerance, and that violence is never an appropriate response to a difference in beliefs.

It's nearly impossible to find comfort after such a senseless and horrific act, and I extend my deepest condolences to the Tiller family and all those families whose lives he touched. Like many others, Dr. Tiller persevered through decades of threats and attacks, and I condemn anyone who takes action or makes statements to incite violence as an acceptable response.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 505, which condemns the tragic murder of Dr. George R. Tiller of Wichita, Kansas. I would like to thank the author of the bill, Congresswoman LOUISE SLAUGHTER and Judiciary Chairman JOHN CONYERS for their expeditious work in bringing this bill to the floor.

We mourn the loss of Dr. Tiller, a husband, father of four, and grandfather of ten. We also mourn the loss of a man who was a friend to women and young girls around the world, who he saw through their most desperate hours of need.

Dr. Tiller, born and raised in Wichita, was the son of a physician. In medical school, Dr. Tiller planned to become a dermatologist. After his father, mother, sister, and brother-in-law died in a 1970 plane crash, he returned to Kansas to close his father's family practice. His father's patients pleaded with him to return and take over the practice. Eventually, his clinic evolved from general family practice to focusing on reproductive services.

Acts of terror and intimidation were an all too common occurrence at his clinic. In 1986, Dr. Tiller's clinic, the Women's Health Care Services, was bombed. In 1991, it was blockaded for six weeks. In 1993, Dr. Tiller was shot in both arms while trying to enter the clinic. In May 2009, vandals cut wires to security cameras and made holes in the clinic roof.

Dr. Tiller was murdered on Sunday, May 31, 2009. He was shot in his place of worship, the Reformation Lutheran Church. Dr. Tiller served as an usher and his wife, Jeanne, sang in the choir.

I would like to insert into the RECORD an article by Judith Warner that was published in her New York Times blog. One of Dr. Tiller's cases mentioned by Ms. Warner, that involving a 9 year-old girl who had been raped by her father, is particularly haunting.

This child was 18 weeks pregnant and her small body just would not be able to physically bear the burden of labor and delivery. There

was no doctor or hospital in her rural, Southern town that would provide her with an abortion. She was referred to Dr. Tiller, the doctor of last resort. Dr. Tiller took her case for free. He kept her under his personal care for three days. The young girl and her sister stated that even in this difficult and heart-wrenching situation, he could not have been more wonderful in his care.

On Saturday, memorial services were held for Dr. Tiller. His family and friends remembered him for his generosity and his sense of humor. Let us also remember him for his courage.

Mahalo nui loa (thank you very much).

[From the New York Times, June 4, 2009]

DR. TILLER'S IMPORTANT JOB

(By Judith Warner)

The 9-year-old girl had been raped by her father. She was 18 weeks pregnant. Carrying the baby to term, going through labor and delivery, would have ripped her small body apart.

There was no doctor in her rural Southern town to provide her with an abortion. No area hospital would even consider taking her case.

Susan Hill, the president of the National Women's Health Foundation, which operates reproductive health clinics in areas where abortion services are scarce or nonexistent, called Dr. George Tiller, the Wichita, Kan., ob-gyn who last Sunday was shot to death by an abortion foe in the entry foyer of his church.

She begged.

"I only asked him for a favor when it was a really desperate story, not a semi-desperate story," she told me this week. Tiller was known to abortion providers—and opponents—as the "doctor of last resort"—the one who took the patients no one else would touch.

"He took her for free," she said. "He kept her three days. He checked her himself every few hours. She and her sister came back to me and said he couldn't have been more wonderful. That's just the way he was."

Other patients of Dr. Tiller's shared their stories this week on a special "Kansas Stories" page hosted by the Web site "A Heart-breaking Choice."

One New York mother wrote of having been referred by an obstetrician to Tiller after learning, in her 27th week of pregnancy, that her soon-to-be son was "so very sick" that, once born, he'd have nothing more than "a brief life of respirators, dialysis, surgeries and pain." In-state doctors refused to perform an abortion.

"The day I drove up to the clinic in Wichita, Kansas, to undergo the procedure that would end the life of my precious son, I also walked into the nightmare of abortion politics. In this world, reality rarely gets through the rhetoric," wrote another mother, from Texas, of the shouts, graphic posters and protesters' video camera that greeted her when she came to see Tiller.

Our understanding of what late abortion is like has been almost entirely shaped in public discourse by the opponents of abortion rights. In recent years, discussions of the issue have been filled with the gory details of so-called partial-birth abortion; the grim miseries that drive some women and girls to end their pregnancies after the first trimester have somehow been elided.

"Late abortion is not a failure of contraception. It's for medical reasons," Eleanor Smeal, the president of the Feminist Majority Foundation, who has worked to defend abortion providers like Tiller against harassment and violence since the mid-1980s, told me this week. "We've made pregnancy a

fairy tale where there are no fetal complications, there's no cancer, no terrible abuse of girls, no cases where to make a girl go all the way through a pregnancy is to destroy her. These are the realities of the story. That's what Dr. Tiller worked with—the realities."

There was a great deal of emotion in the air this week as the reality of Tiller's death set in. Much of it was mournful, some was celebratory, some was cynical and self-serving.

There were the requisite expressions of disapproval and disavowal by politicians from both sides of the abortion divide. And yet it seemed to me that even from pro-choice politicians, the response was muted. In death, as in life, no one wanted to embrace this man who had specialized in helping women who learned late in their pregnancies that their fetuses had gross abnormalities.

It seemed that no one wanted to be too closely associated with the muck and mire of what Tiller had to do in carrying out the risky and emotionally traumatic second- and third-trimester abortions that other doctors and hospitals refused to do. In news reports, there was a tendency to frame the "abortion doctor's" murder almost as a kind of combat death: a natural occupational hazard.

Yet Tiller—who went to work in a bullet-proof vest, lived in a gated community and drove a bulletproof car—was a doctor, not a soldier. And it is precisely this kind of thinking—this viewing of his life and work through the lens of our most gruesome cultural warfare, this slippage and mixing up of medicine and politics—that left him largely unprotected at the time of his death.

Someone resembling Scott Roeder, the man charged in Dr. Tiller's murder, was seen on Saturday trying to pour glue into the lock on the back door of a Kansas City clinic. Before that, abortion providers around the country had been telling local law enforcement and the United States Justice Department that harassment at their clinics was on the rise, and they were scared. The Feminist Majority Foundation had been hearing all spring that the atmosphere outside clinics was heating up in the wake of the new pro-choice president's election. "We all lived through Clinton, the shootings in '93 and '94. We were concerned some of the extremists said they had to take the fight back to the streets," Smeal said.

There are legal protections in place that ought to keep abortion providers like Tiller safe. The Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances (FACE) Act, passed by Congress after the 1993 murder of Dr. David Gunn outside his Pensacola, Fla., women's health clinic and the attempted murder of Tiller that same year, prohibits property damage, acts or threats of force, and interference with and intimidation of anyone entering a reproductive health care facility.

When the federal law is backed by complementary state laws, and when local law enforcement officers apply those laws assiduously, serious violence greatly declines. When the law's not applied strenuously, when vandalism goes uninvestigated, when protesters are allowed to photograph or videotape patients arriving at women's health clinics, when death threats aren't followed up, more serious acts of physical violence follow. In fact, when intimidation occurs at a clinic, the reported rate of violence triples, the Feminist Majority Federation's 2008 National Clinic Violence Survey found.

"We really do need to arrest people who are trespassing. Arrest people who are gluing locks. Committing more minor violations of the law so criminal activity doesn't escalate, so these criminals don't feel emboldened," said Vicki Saporta, the president of the National Abortion Federation. "In places where

the laws are enforced, you don't see violence escalate. Protesters generally go someplace where there's a more hospitable climate," she told me. But, she added, in a lot of communities, law enforcement views clinic violence as a political problem. "They don't view it for what it is: criminal activity outside of a commercial establishment," she said. "Law enforcement can't treat this as a political issue. It's a criminal issue."

We as a nation cannot continue to provide a hospitable environment for the likes of Roeder because the thought of what happens to fetuses in late abortions turns our stomachs. We have to accept that sometimes terrible things happen to young girls. We have to face the fact that sometimes desired pregnancies go tragically wrong. We have to weigh our repugnance for late abortion against the consequences for women and girls of being denied life-saving medical treatment.

Only a tiny handful of doctors in this country will, like Dr. Tiller, provide abortion services for girls or women who are advanced in their pregnancies. These doctors aren't well known to patients or even to other doctors, but they're closely monitored by anti-abortion groups, who know where they work, where they live and where they worship. Roeder may have been a lone gunman, but in the largest possible sense, he did not act alone. The location of Tiller's gated community was prominently featured on an easily-accessed Web site, along with a map of the streets surrounding his house. It was really only a matter of time before someone was unbalanced enough to take the bait.

Most Americans, I'm sure, do not believe that a 9-year-old should be forced to bear a child, or that a woman should have no choice but to risk her life to carry a pregnancy to term.

By averting our eyes from the ugliness and tragedy that accompany some pregnancies, we have allowed anti-abortion activists to define the dilemma of late abortion. We have allowed them to isolate and vilify doctors like Tiller.

We can no longer be complicit—through our muted disapproval or our complacency—in domestic terror.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, as millions of Americans are now aware, Dr. George Tiller was assassinated in his church on Sunday, May 31st, 2009 because of his political beliefs and profession. Dr. Tiller provided legal abortions, and his dedication to his profession, to the health and well-being of the women he cared for, cost him his life. I join President Obama, members of Congress, and millions of Americans in professing horror, shock, and sadness over this blatant act of terror. I hope that all Americans—regardless of their personal stances on the issue of abortion—will join in opposing those who would seek to control the actions of women and doctors through the use of violent intimidation.

Abortion doctors and women's clinics across this country which provide a range of women's health services including abortion face threats and violent acts every day. I sincerely hope that in the wake of this terrible event, the Department of Justice and law enforcement agencies across this country take future threats directed toward women's health providers seriously. Justice and the rule of law demand nothing less.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 505, condemning the murder of Dr. George Tiller.

On May 31, 2009, Dr. Tiller was gunned down while handing out church flyers to the congregation of the Reformation Lutheran

Church in Wichita, Kansas. Dr. Tiller was murdered because he had provided comprehensive legal reproductive healthcare to women and their families.

For 20 years, Dr. Tiller lived under a constant threat of violence. His clinic was bombed in 1986 and he was shot in both arms in 1993. He received constant death threats. Despite feeling the need to wear body armor and travel with a guard dog, he continued to provide reproductive services to women, often in the most difficult and heartbreakng circumstances. Dr. Tiller once said that he provided these services because "Women and families are intellectually, emotionally, spiritually, and ethically competent to struggle with complex health issues—including abortion," he said, "and come to decisions that are appropriate for themselves." I could not agree more. Women must have the right to make their own reproductive choices.

Regardless of one's personal feelings about abortion, we all must stand vigilant against such abhorrent and vile acts of violence. To murder someone because of disagreement with his belief system is morally, ethically, and legally wrong. It is especially disturbing that this murder took place in a church. Assaulting, intimidating, and harassing doctors and clinic employees should not be tolerated.

Dr. Tiller's death is only one act of violence against those that perform abortion services. Pro-life extremists have engaged in more than 5,800 reported acts of violence against abortion providers since 1977, including bombings, arsons, death threats, kidnappings, and assaults, as well as more than 143,000 reported acts of disruption, including bomb threats and harassing calls. Eight abortion providers have been murdered in the United States, and another 17 have been the victims of attempted murder. It is past time that we condemn the violence and intimidation against clinics that provide legal services to women in need.

I hope and pray that the friends and family members of Dr. Tiller find solace and comfort as we deal together with this historic and heartbreakng episode.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 505, which condemns the tragic murder of Dr. George Tiller. The murder of Dr. Tiller is a form of domestic terrorism that we cannot tolerate in our country.

I firmly agree with President Obama that we can maintain our beliefs while agreeing to disagree. Dr. Tiller's medical practice in Kansas was operating legally, and we must abide by the rule of law.

Mr. Speaker, I have personal knowledge of the work of Dr. Tiller. In 2000, my Subcommittee Staff Director, Jason Steinbaum, and his wife, Miriam, were expecting a child. This was their first baby, and they were very excited about becoming new parents.

Through visit after visit to their doctor, they learned the pregnancy was proceeding well and all seemed normal. The sonograms were all as they should have been, until calamity struck. At 28 weeks the doctors discovered a horrible brain deformity. They said the baby would die in utero or shortly after birth.

I recall that Jason and Miriam went from doctor to doctor and hospital to hospital to try to find a way to save their baby boy, but all told them that there was no chance that he would live. At that point, after consulting with their clergy, their doctors, and their families, they decided to terminate the pregnancy to put an end to this tragedy in their lives.

At 28 weeks, however, extremely few physicians in the country would provide the medical care they needed. Dr. Tiller was recommended to them as the best physician to help them.

I recall that I could not believe they had to fly to Wichita, Kansas to get the medical care they required. As a member of Congress from New York, I have become accustomed to receiving the best health care in New York City and could not imagine that they would have to travel half way across the country because no such clinic existed nearby. Nevertheless, when they determined that there was no other place to which they could turn, Jason, Miriam, and their mothers flew to Kansas to Women's Health Care Services of Wichita and Dr. Tiller.

Jason has told me that the care they received at Dr. Tiller's clinic was extraordinary and that the people at the clinic treated them as well as they could imagine. The procedure was safe and humane, and at the end, they held their baby boy for a moment and said goodbye. Today, the baby is buried not far from their home in north Virginia.

So, as the House votes on this solemn resolution, I ask that my colleagues reflect for a moment on the fact that Dr. Tiller helped someone right here in our congressional community and that his murderer took someone who was there for one of us in a time of need. This is a terribly sad day, and I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 505.

Mr. NADLER of New York. 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 New York (Mr. NADLER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 505.

The question was taken.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. 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.

WITNESS SECURITY AND PROTECTION GRANT PROGRAM ACT OF 2009

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1741) to require the Attorney General to make competitive grants to eligible State, tribal, and local prosecutors to establish and maintain certain protection and witness assistance programs, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1741

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Witness Security and Protection Grant Program Act of 2009".

SEC. 2. ESTABLISHMENT OF WITNESS PROTECTION GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall make competitive grants to eligible State, tribal,

and local governments to establish or maintain programs that provide protection or assistance to witnesses in court proceedings involving homicide, or involving a serious violent felony or serious drug offense as defined in section 3559(c)(2) of title 18, United States Code. The Attorney General shall ensure that, to the extent reasonable and practical, such grants are made to achieve an equitable geographical distribution of such programs throughout the United States.

(b) STATE DEFINED.—For purposes of this Act, the term "State" means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

SEC. 3. USE OF GRANTS.

A grant made under section 2 may be used only to pay all or part of the cost of the program for which such grant is made.

SEC. 4. PRIORITY.

In making grants under section 2, the Attorney General shall give priority to applications submitted under section 5 involving programs in States with an average of not less than 100 murders per year during the most recent 5-year period, as calculated using the latest available crime statistics from the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

SEC. 5. APPLICATION.

To be eligible for a grant under section 2, a State, tribal, or local government shall submit to the Office of Justice Programs an application in such form and manner, at such time, and accompanied by such information as the Attorney General specifies.

SEC. 6. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

From amounts made available to carry out this Act, the Attorney General, upon request of a recipient of a grant under section 2, shall provide technical assistance to such recipient to the extent the Attorney General determines such technical assistance is needed to establish or maintain a program described in such section.

SEC. 7. BEST PRACTICES.

(a) REPORT.—Each recipient of a grant under section 2 shall submit to the Attorney General a report, in such form and manner and containing such information as specified by the Attorney General, that evaluates each program established or maintained pursuant to such grant, including policies and procedures under the program.

(b) DEVELOPMENT OF BEST PRACTICES.—Based on the reports submitted under subsection (a), the Attorney General shall develop best practice models to assist States and other relevant entities in addressing—

- (1) witness safety;
- (2) short-term and permanent witness relocation;
- (3) financial and housing assistance; and
- (4) any other services related to witness protection or assistance that are determined by the Attorney General to be necessary.

(c) DISSEMINATION TO STATES.—Not later than 1 year after the development of best practice models under subsection (b), the Attorney General shall disseminate to States and other relevant entities such models.

(d) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that States and other relevant entities should use the best practice models developed and disseminated in accordance with this Act to evaluate, improve, and develop witness protection or witness assistance as appropriate.

(e) CLARIFICATION.—Nothing in this Act requires the dissemination of any information if the Attorney General determines such information is law enforcement sensitive and should only be disclosed within the law enforcement community or that such information poses a threat to national security.

SEC. 8. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

Not later than December 31, 2015, the Attorney General shall submit a report to Congress on the

programs funded by grants awarded under section 2, including on matters specified under section 7(b).

SEC. 9. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act \$30,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2010 through 2014.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Witness Security and Protection Act of 2009 authorizes the Attorney General to award grants to States and local prosecutors for establishing and improving short-term witness protection programs for witnesses that are involved in a State or local trial involving a homicide, a serious violent felony, or a serious drug offense.

Witness intimidation reduces the likelihood that citizens will be willing to perform their civic duty in the criminal justice system, often depriving police and prosecutors of critical evidence. More broadly, it also undermines public confidence that the criminal justice system can adequately protect its citizens.

And there is no better example that demonstrates the need for this legislation than the tragedy that befell the Dawson family in the autumn of 2002 in Baltimore, Maryland.

Angela Dawson had repeatedly contacted the police about drug dealing in her neighborhood. In retaliation, Darrrell Brooks, a neighborhood dealer, firebombed the Dawson home not once but twice before killing Angela; her husband, Carnell; and all five of their children.

This heinous violence perpetrated against the Dawson family was the impetus for this legislation, and I commend Congressman CUMMINGS for his tireless pursuit of this legislation over multiple Congresses. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1741, the Witness Security and Protection Grant Program Act of 2009. Witness testimony is a critical component of our criminal justice system. Even with sophisticated DNA and other fo-

rensic evidence, there is no substitute for an eyewitness testimony.

However, engaging the cooperation of witnesses is frequently a daunting obstacle in many criminal prosecutions. Many witnesses fail to come forward or refuse to testify out of fear of retribution by the defendants or pressure by the community.

It is no surprise that violent criminals will unleash their brutality on witnesses whose testimony could result in years or decades in prison. It is also no surprise that violent gangs and drug organizations are the source of much of this brutality. The Justice Department's National Gang Center reports that "gang members so frequently engage in witness intimidation that it is considered part of normal gang behavioral dynamics." State and local law enforcement officials and prosecutors are in a constant struggle to counteract witness intimidation and to convince witnesses to cooperate. It's vital that we assist in this.

At the Federal level, the U.S. Marshals Service is charged with witness protection and has operated the Witness Security Program since 1970. Under the program, more than 7,500 witnesses and over 9,500 family members have been protected, relocated, or given new identities. Most States and local governments cannot offer that level of protection. Many cannot afford to offer even basic protection services, for instance, during a trial in which the proceedings in a small town might be all too evident to gangs in the area.

H.R. 1741, the Witness Security and Protection Grant Program Act, directs the Attorney General to award grants to State and local governments to establish and maintain witness protection programs.

Mr. Speaker, it is very clear that this not only is a well-worthwhile program whose time has come, but, in fact, it could be a real cost-saving to the taxpayers from the Federal level. Federal prosecution tends to be more expensive. In the case of gang, drug, and other activities, there is almost always a dual nexus: one in which the State or local courts can try the gang members, one in which the Federal Government can find Federal statutes to try under. Unfortunately, without an effective witness protection program, localities may often choose to move a case to Federal court where witness protection is available rather than providing that protection themselves.

So, Mr. Speaker, I rise with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to support strongly that we find those opportunities in which local government can provide this service rather than removing to Federal court. This is a cost-saving, commonsense initiative, and I support it.

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

□ 1315

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, with respect to my great colleague

from the great State of Maryland, Congressman CUMMINGS, I will yield so much time as he may consume.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) for yielding, and I want to certainly thank Chairman CONYERS, Chairman SCOTT, Mr. ISSA, the entire Judiciary Committee, and the House leadership for recognizing the importance of this legislation by bringing it to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, while our soldiers fight in Iraq and Afghanistan, many citizens across our Nation are facing terrorism right here at home, right here in their own neighborhoods. People are being murdered in broad daylight, and their killers are walking free because we do not protect witnesses to crimes from threats against their safety if they cooperate with the police, if they testify in court, or even if they are listed as witnesses to testify in court.

This epidemic of witness intimidation is a menace to our civil society, and it is a plague on our entire justice system. In fact, it was the deaths of Angela and Carnell Dawson and their five children, ages 9 to 14, that first motivated me to address this issue. I can remember very vividly sitting at a funeral with one adult casket and with the caskets of five children. Then, a day later, the husband died, and we went to his funeral.

The entire Dawson family was killed in October 2002 when a gang member firebombed their home in the middle of the night in retaliation for Mrs. Dawson's repeated complaints to the police about the recurring drug trafficking in her east Baltimore neighborhood.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that Mrs. Dawson literally lived within about a 5-minute drive from my house.

Angela Dawson and her family were not affiliated in any way with drugs or gangs. Rather, Mrs. Dawson was just a civic-minded parent, trying to clean up her neighborhood, and trying to make it a safe place for her children and for other families.

While several State and local entities have established witness assistance programs, many of these programs have fallen victim to the tough economic times and have had to be discontinued. Conversely, the U.S. Marshals Service uses \$65 million to operate its Federal Witness Security Program, and it has an excellent track record. In all of its years in existence, they have never been known to have lost a witness, and at the same time, the prosecutors in those cases have had an 89 percent success rate.

It is because of this inequity that I call upon my colleagues to give law enforcement the ability to protect the sanctity of our justice system and pass H.R. 1741, the Witness Security and Protection Grant Program Act.

H.R. 1741 would help local law enforcement officers strengthen witness assistance and protection units, sending a very loud and clear message to

criminals that our citizens and we in the Congress of the United States of America will not be deterred by fear tactics like intimidation.

Speaking of intimidation, throughout the City of Baltimore, we have a group that put out two trailers entitled "Stop Snitching." In one of those trailers I, along with the State's attorney, were threatened because we were standing up for this legislation and because we were standing up for witnesses. I made it very clear to them that I have no fear because, if you can have a situation where a person can literally be standing on a corner and 20 people know the perpetrator and the perpetrator comes up and blows somebody's brains out and nobody testifies, what happens then is that we have given the criminal more power; we have taken power away from regular citizens. The next thing you know, the criminal feels that there are no consequences to his or her actions.

You cannot have a criminal justice system that is effective and efficient unless you have the cooperation of witnesses. It is up to this Congress to make it very, very clear that we will not, under any circumstances, stand for witnesses to be intimidated, harmed, threatened, killed or in any way deterred from carrying out their duties to assist police and law enforcement.

The bill would provide \$150 million in competitive grants over 5 years to enable State and local governments to establish witness assistance programs with priority given to cities or to locales that have had an average of at least 100 homicides per year during the most recent 5-year period. H.R. 1741 would also allow these programs to receive technical assistance from the United States Marshals Service.

By improving the protection for State and local witnesses, we come one step closer to alleviating the fears and the threats of prospective witnesses and to safeguarding our communities from violence.

Again, I want to thank Mr. CONYERS. I want to thank Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. SCOTT, and the ranking member for their support. I urge my colleagues to pass this legislation.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished attorney from the City of New Orleans, the junior Member from Louisiana, Mr. CAO.

Mr. CAO. I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1741, the Witness Security and Protection Grant Program Act.

Crime is the number one concern of my constituents in New Orleans and in Jefferson Parishes in Louisiana. Crime is my top concern, too. My district includes the City of New Orleans, which, as of June 1, has already seen 80 murders. Further, according to the FBI's annual report on crime released last week, New Orleans leads the Nation in

murders. This says nothing about the incidence of other types of crime, from sexual offenses to robberies.

I hold in my hand a photo of Sergeant Manuel Curry. He was a popular and much-loved member of the New Orleans Police Department. At 62 years of service, he was one of America's longest-serving police officers. Tragically, for the NOPD and for New Orleans, he passed away last week, and our thoughts and prayers are with his wife, with his family, and with his NOPD colleagues.

Here is an article from today's newspaper. It reports that, within hours of Sergeant Curry's death, three people broke into his home and stole guns, money, jewelry, and medication. While at the funeral home, arranging her husband's burial, his wife was notified of the burglary.

Our thoughts and prayers also go to the family of this couple, Orlander Cassimere, Sr., and his wife of 55 years. Elder Cassimere was scheduled to have preached the Mother's Day sermon this year at the church in New Orleans' Lower Ninth Ward, where he was pastor; but on that day, relatives found him and his wife fatally shot in their home. It is thought that their murders are connected to a relative's plan to testify in a kidnapping and attempted murder case.

Reading these articles makes me angry and sick because of the actions of these individuals who disgraced the memories of Sergeant Curry and of the Cassimeres. They disgrace all of the people of New Orleans and of Jefferson Parishes. If these stories don't paint a picture of out-of-control crime, I don't know what will.

I continue to meet with law enforcement and with prosecution officials in my district, and I am presently working with them to leverage Federal resources. They must have all of the resources they can get.

The Witness Security and Protection Grant Program will go a long way towards addressing the issue of crime in my district because, without adequate protection and assurances, these witnesses will stop coming forward, and crime will remain out of control.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for this effort with this important bill, and I look forward to working with them on other important legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I will yield 3 minutes to my fellow Judiciary Committee member, Congressman PEDRO PIERLUISI.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1741, and I want to commend Congressman CUMMINGS for his terrific work on this bill.

H.R. 1741 will provide funding to States and to territories so they can create or can improve their witness protection programs. Priority for funding would be given to those jurisdictions with the highest rates of violent crime.

Violent crime continues to plague many of our communities. Many of

those crimes were likely observed by one or more bystanders. Whether these witnesses choose to come forward or choose to remain in the shadows, many of those crimes will depend, in large part, on whether they feel safe cooperating with law enforcement. It is, therefore, critical to the effective functioning of our criminal justice system that government at all levels has the means to provide for witness security.

As Attorney General of Puerto Rico, I have worked with many witnesses who have received threats that they or their loved ones would be harmed if they testified against a defendant. Not unreasonably, some of these witnesses ultimately chose to remain silent. Others elected to plunge ahead despite the risks, motivated by a sense of civic duty. The key point is this:

Choosing between providing information that may deliver a criminal to justice and protecting one's own safety is a choice that no witness should be forced to make.

Since 1970, the Federal government has operated its own successful witness protection program. In light of a 2006 report by the Department of Justice that found that witness intimidation was pervasive and increasing, the need to support similar programs at the State and territorial levels is beyond question. Therefore, I respectfully urge my colleagues in this Chamber to support H.R. 1741.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague from Georgia for bringing forth and for handling this commonsense bill on the floor of the House. I want to thank my colleague from California for yielding me time.

This is an important issue. There are many issues that are remarkably important to the American people, and I want to talk about one of them. It is the national energy tax.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, there is a proposal that is moving through the House committees right now that will have a remarkable effect on the American people. If history holds true, there will be very little time on the floor of this House to debate this issue. As the Speaker has said, she wants to get it done by July 4.

So I would suggest that it is important for all of our colleagues to be paying attention to the national energy tax and to the consequences of it. I would suggest that the American people ought to be paying attention as well. Let me point out a couple of the issues on this national energy tax.

By an outside group, by an objective group, the estimates are that it will destroy millions of jobs—1.1 million jobs on average each year. It will raise electricity rates 90 percent after adjusting for inflation. It will increase gasoline prices by 74 percent. It will increase residential natural gas prices by 55 percent. It will raise the average family's

annual energy bill by \$1,500. That's right, Mr. Speaker, by \$1,500. It will increase inflation-adjusted Federal debt by 26 percent. So let's review.

This national energy tax, supported by the Speaker, is going to decrease jobs, and she is trying to get it through this House by the end of this month. It will decrease jobs; it will increase electricity rates; it will increase gas prices; it will increase natural gas prices; it will increase the family energy bill; and it will increase the Federal debt.

Now, the American people think this is a terrible idea, and they are very frustrated with the fact that the commonsense solutions that have been put on the table are not being given an opportunity to come to the floor.

What are those commonsense solutions?

Well, Mr. Speaker, as you know and as the American people know, there are good bills out there. One of them is one that I have cosponsored, H.R. 2300, coming out of the Republican Study Committee and the Western Caucus. It is called the American Energy Innovation Act.

□ 1330

What it does is provide for increasing production, responsible production of American resources. It provides for increasing conservation so that we decrease the demand side of the energy curve; and it provides for expansion of innovation, incentives for innovation so that we unleash the genius of the American people to solve the challenges that we have in the area of energy. It doesn't tax the American people. It doesn't decrease jobs. It doesn't increase electricity prices, as the Democrat plan would do. It doesn't increase gas prices, as the Democrats would do. It doesn't increase natural gas prices, as the Democrat plan would do. It doesn't increase the family energy bill, and it doesn't increase the Federal debt. No, Mr. Speaker, it solves the problems in the way that the American people want them solved.

The American Energy Innovation Act would increase production in a responsible and environmentally sensitive and sound way. It would increase innovation so that we develop a new energy for this 21st century, and it would increase conservation, decrease that demand side so that we don't continue to support countries overseas that, frankly, aren't necessarily our friend.

I appreciate the opportunity to commend my friend from Georgia for his bill. I appreciate my friend from California for offering this opportunity to speak to my colleagues and to ask the Speaker if she wouldn't allow for full and open debate of appropriate energy bills that American people can support, not ones that increase their taxes and decrease jobs all across this land.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, nothing can be more important than the liberties that we enjoy under our Constitution. This bill that we are considering could not be any more important.

Therefore, in that regard, I wish to yield 5 minutes to my good friend from New Jersey, Congressman PASCRELL.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, this is truly bizarre. We're talking about life-and-death issues—and I know technically you can speak about anything. But we're talking about life-and-death issues. We have seen witnesses disappear, go underground so that law enforcement cannot protect us. Yet the gentleman, my good friend from Georgia, gets up and talks about something which has absolutely nothing to do with what we're talking about. But I guess that's par for the course.

So I thank the ranking member. I thank the chairman. I thank Mr. CUMMINGS for getting this legislation. And Mr. CUMMINGS has done us all a great favor. Nothing is going to help law enforcement more than our trying to help with the protection of the witnesses out there who view these crimes.

Criminal street gangs have been a major concern all across this country and in New Jersey; and truly, law enforcement cannot do its job without this legislation. Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that there is a more significant thing that we can do in reversing the losing battle that we face at this point and attacking street crime and ending modern-day organized crime on the streets. You need viable witnesses who are not left to chance and risk and will not be frightened or intimidated.

In a 2007 survey conducted in New Jersey by the State police, respondents in 4 out of every 10 New Jersey municipalities—that's 43 percent—reported the presence of street gangs in their jurisdiction during the previous 12 months, not only in cities but in suburban communities. As a former mayor, I know how tough it is for our cities and communities to deal with gang problems all across the United States of America. Gang members are involved in violent and drug-related crimes and recruit young folks in our public schools. Catching and punishing the perpetrators of these crimes is often times difficult, if not impossible. Gangs are so pervasive in many communities that the threat of violent reprisal against members of a community or gang members who want to leave severely hinders law enforcement investigations.

H.R. 1741 would provide a crucial missing link that prevents many of these crimes from being solved in the first place. This legislation will allow the Justice Department to begin offering grants to local communities to implement local witness protection programs. What have we come to? When we talk about witness protection programs, we think we're talking about something 20 years ago, 40 years ago. We're talking about now. We're talking about in our own neighborhoods. We're talking about in our own families. That's what we're talking about. Ensuring witness safety, short- and long-term relocation, and financial and

housing assistance are essential to the effective investigation and prosecution of gang-related crimes, Mr. Speaker. The Federal Government must reach out to assist local police departments in keeping our communities and our schools safe. This bill will provide a critical service to many needy communities. I thank those folks who brought it to the floor, particularly Mr. CUMMINGS, my good friend from Maryland. I'm glad we could stay, most of us, on the topic at hand.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, we believe that the precious time on the floor needs to be well spent, and we certainly support that we are well spending it. This is an important piece of legislation. It's important because, in fact, we in the Federal Government need to team with cities and localities around the country to ensure that we not distort where prosecutions are made. I fully support this legislation because, with all due respect to my colleague, it will relieve the cities and the counties from often choosing a Federal venue rather than a local venue if we help with protecting their witnesses, something that the Federal Government and the U.S. Marshals have proven to do very well. So I do support the bill. It's a bipartisan bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would ask how many minutes are left.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There are 6 minutes remaining for the gentleman from Georgia. The gentleman from California has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I now yield 4 minutes to the gentlelady from Houston, Texas, and also a fellow member of the Judiciary Committee, Ms. JACKSON-LEE.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee and chairperson of the subcommittee for yielding.

I rise in support of H.R. 1741, which is long in coming and long overdue. Tragically, we are seeing the increased utilization of gun violence and certainly the increased impact on our teenagers. Whether it is guns used in gang activity or guns used to slaughter innocent persons in various stop-and-go shops or others, we are seeing that kind of senseless violence. Over the last couple of days, I saw in my own community two hardworking shopkeepers murdered and slaughtered in their own shop early in the morning; and the kind of killing it was may have generated witnesses who need to be protected. We have watched the slaughter of children in the Chicago school district, which has gotten to be an epidemic condition. They have been using guns. There have been young people leaving churches who have been shot and killed. So we understand the value

of this legislation. I remember hearing before the Judiciary Committee where the individuals who wanted this kind of protection told us of the fear in which they live.

H.R. 1741, sponsored by my good friend, Representative ELIJAH CUMMINGS, is an important legislative initiative; and I would ask my colleagues to, likewise, support it. It joins right together with H. Res. 454 that will be on this House floor in a few minutes that deals with the 25th anniversary of the National Center For Missing and Exploited Children and has a lot to do with the protection of our Nation's children, those who have been kidnapped and murdered, and those who have been exploited. Again, it ties back to this whole question of protecting witnesses who provide the necessary testimony to convict those of these heinous crimes.

This may not be the underlying necessity for H. Res. 515; but I rise to also add my support for the legislation that condemns the slaughter and murder of Army Private William Long and the wounding of Army Private Quinton Ezeagwula. That was a terrorist act of which we condemn. It may be that the alleged perpetrator is in prison, but we don't know whether there is a widespread conspiracy. We hear so. Again, H.R. 1741 would allow us to protect these witnesses. The act of killing our military personnel on U.S. soil was an act of terror, and I abhor it. I denounce it. It is a resounding disgrace in this country; and therefore, H. Res. 515 should, in fact, be able to pass. All of these tie to the idea of protecting witnesses in criminal activities because we realize how frightening a prospect it is.

I also add my support to H.R. 2675, the extension of the Antitrust Criminal Penalty Enhancement and Reform Act of 2004. I am also a member of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and view this as an important legislative initiative.

Allow me to close by suggesting that as we saw in my remarks earlier today on the floor in H. Res. 505, condemning the death of Dr. George Tiller, we have conditions here that warrant this legislation, H.R. 1741. It is terrible that violent acts are perpetrated here in America, that violent acts come about through the use of firearms and other manners and, therefore, there will be witnesses that will be necessary to bring these people to justice. I cannot imagine allowing these heinous crimes to be perpetrated without being able to prosecute because a witness is frightened for themselves and their family. The legislation that we are now speaking to provides that protection, and I ask my colleagues to support the legislation.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would yield back the balance of my time and support the passage of this important legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. The great Constitution of the United States of America starts off with a preamble, and that preamble goes as follows:

We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

So this bill deals with domestic tranquility; and as you know, Mr. Speaker, the most powerful beast imagined can always be brought down by just a little parasite inside of that particular beast. We too can be subjected to internal parasites, and we can die from that. The question is, are we willing to die to ensure that domestic tranquility is achieved? If we truly care about ourselves, our own safety and the safety of our dear families, neighbors and anyone else, should we not be willing to die to protect our liberties by calling it like it is, street crime? You see something happen—regardless of whether or not you consider that snitching or not, and I would say that it's not. But do you have the courage to be able to do what will really protect your folks? That's the question.

□ 1345

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 Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1741, 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.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. 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.

ANTITRUST CRIMINAL PENALTY ENHANCEMENT AND REFORM ACT OF 2004 EXTENSION ACT

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2675) to amend title II of the Antitrust Criminal Penalty Enhancement and Reform Act of 2004 to extend the operation of such title for a 1-year period ending June 22, 2010.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2675

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Antitrust Criminal Penalty Enhancement and Reform Act of 2004 Extension Act".

SEC. 2. DELAY OF SUNSET.

Section 211(a) of the Antitrust Criminal Penalty Enhancement and Reform Act of 2004 (15 U.S.C. 1 note) is amended by striking "5 years" and inserting "6 years".

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE OF AMENDMENT.

The amendment made by section 2 shall take effect immediately before June 22, 2009.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation extends by 1 year expiring provisions of the Antitrust Criminal Penalty Enhancement and Reform Act of 2004, otherwise known as ACPERA. ACPERA not only increases maximum criminal penalties under the Sherman Act for hardcore antitrust violations but also created whistleblower incentives to spur anti-trust cartel detection.

Portions of the 2004 act are set to expire in 2 weeks on June 22. This 1-year extension preserves the penalties and incentives currently in place, while affording Congress time to explore possible improvements to the 2004 act.

I am pleased to have as cosponsors of this bill the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, JOHN CONYERS, as well as full committee Ranking Member LAMAR SMITH and Courts Subcommittee Ranking Member HOWARD COBLE.

Cartel violations are some of the worst crimes perpetrated on the American consumer; yet they are too often crimes we cannot see, as all of this criminal activity takes place in secret meetings behind closed doors. In the previous bill, we were talking about crime in the streets, and now we are talking about crime in the suites.

Price-fixing cartels can go undetected for years, possibly forever. With hundreds of millions or even billions of dollars worth of unlawful profits at stake, these criminal cartels are very effective at finding ways to keep their actions secret. But 5 years ago, Congress gave the Justice Department's Antitrust Division a new weapon to attack this secrecy head-on. ACPERA promotes the detection and prosecution of illegal cartel behavior by giving participants in a price-fixing cartel powerful incentives to report the cartel to the Justice Department and cooperate in the prosecution of the cartel.

Before ACPERA, the Justice Department could offer leniency to a co-conspirator who exposed a cartel and helped bring it to justice. But the cooperating party remained fully liable to paying treble damages to the cartel's victims and potentially exposed to having to pay the entire amount.

ACPERA addressed this shortcoming in the criminal leniency program by also limiting the cooperating party's exposure to liability with respect to civil litigation. ACPERA empowers the Justice Department to limit civil liability of a cooperating party to single damages, not treble. The remaining co-conspirators, however, remain jointly and severally liable for all damages. In this way, Mr. Speaker, the act strikes a carefully crafted balance, encouraging the cartel members to turn on each other while ensuring full compensation to the victims.

The positive impact of this law cannot be overstated. In the first half of this year, ACPERA has aided the anti-trust division in securing jail sentences in 85 percent of its individual prosecutions and over \$900 million in criminal fines.

As chairman of the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Courts and Competition Policy, I want to ensure that the Justice Department has all the tools it needs to continue its excellent work, which is to protect consumers against price-fixing cartels.

Again, I thank the bipartisan coalition of Members who have joined me as cosponsors in this very important legislation. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to inquire if the gentleman has any further speakers after I conclude?

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. We have no more speakers, and I would be prepared to conclude.

Mr. ISSA. Excellent. I will be brief.

This is noncontroversial. In fact, the Antitrust Criminal Enhancement Reform Act of 2009 is about a program that is working. It is a program that not only do I hope we will unanimously pass and send to the Senate, but that the Senate will act quickly so that after the 2 weeks remaining, this statute will not expire, and we will use this year wisely to review and reauthorize in a longer term basis this act.

ACPERA has in fact worked. It is something that both the majority and minority have agreed on, and I urge its passage.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield back my time on this matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2675.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WEBCASTER SETTLEMENT ACT OF 2009

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2344) to amend section 114 of title 17, United States Code, to provide for agreements for the reproduction and performance of sound recordings by webcasters.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2344

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Webcaster Settlement Act of 2009".

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF AGREEMENTS.

Section 114(f)(5) of title 17, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (D), by striking "2008" and inserting "2008, the Webcaster Settlement Act of 2009";

(2) in subparagraph (E)(iii), by striking "to make eligible nonsubscription transmissions and ephemeral recordings"; and

(3) in subparagraph (F), by striking "February 15, 2009" and inserting "at 11:59 p.m. Eastern time on the 30th day after the date of the enactment of the Webcaster Settlement Act of 2009".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on this bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Webcaster Settlement Act of 2009 allows the recording industry and the providers of Internet radio, also known as Webcasters, to negotiate reasonable royalty rates for the streaming of sound recordings on the Internet.

While a relatively new technology, the audience for Internet radio is growing rapidly. Fifty to 70 million Americans listen to Internet radio each month, in part because of the diverse programming available to cater to many different musical tastes.

In 1995, Congress passed a digital performance right for sound recordings. In 1998, the Digital Millennium Copyright Act expanded the right to Internet radio services by granting them the privilege of using copyrighted music at an industry-negotiated rate, or in the event the industry could not negotiate a rate, at a government-mandated rate determined by the Copyright Royalty Board, or CRB.

At the request of Webcasters, in 2004 Congress enacted the Copyright Royalty and Distribution Reform Act,

which authorized a CRB proceeding to set fair statutory rates for Internet radio. Accordingly, in 2007, the CRB announced new statutory royalty rates for sound recordings to be paid by Webcasters.

The CRB's decision, which sets rates on a minimum fee, per-song, per-listener formula, would require Webcasters to pay significantly higher royalties than they previously paid under a percentage-of-revenue model.

Because of concerns that the higher rates are likely to threaten the future of Internet radio, Congress enacted the Webcaster Settlement Act of 2008. Signed into law last October, it allowed for the implementation of royalty fee agreements reached on or before February 15, 2009, between the recording industry and Webcasters that would serve as an alternative to the payment scheme set forth in the CRB decision.

While some Webcasters were able to reach consensus with the recording industry, others have not yet reached an agreement. Enactment of the Webcasters Settlement Act of 2009 will give more parties an opportunity to reach a consensus by allowing them to negotiate alternative rates. This opportunity to reach consensus will protect the viability of technology enjoyed by millions of Americans every day.

This legislation has the full support of the relevant parties. I commend the Internet radio and recording industries for the substantial progress that has been made in negotiations in recent months, and I encourage them to resolve all outstanding issues promptly so that we may see a thriving Internet radio industry in the near future.

I commend my colleague, Jay Inslee of Washington, for his leadership on this legislation, as well as Intellectual Property Subcommittee Chairman Howard Berman for facilitating discussions between the parties.

I would like to also commend Judiciary ranking member, Mr. LAMAR SMITH, for his leadership in making this a truly bipartisan effort, and I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

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

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as he may consume for our response to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from California yielding.

H.R. 2344, the Webcaster Settlement Act of 2009, grants limited statutory authority to SoundExchange, the government-designated entity that is responsible for disbursing Webcasting royalties to copyright owners.

The bill gives SoundExchange the legal authority to effect an agreement that has already been negotiated with certain "pureplay" Webcasters for the performance of sound recordings over the Internet.

□ 1400

Under the terms, the bill will provide a window of 30 days for other Webcasters to agree to be bound by this new agreement.

For those Webcasters who choose to take advantage, they will be able to substitute the rate and rate calculation methods provided in the agreement for those previously announced by the copyright royalty judges, CRJs, on April 30, 2007.

These new terms will run through the end of 2015, which means that this group of Webcasters and sound recording artists who are due royalties under the Webcasting licensing will benefit from the extended period of certainty in their economic relationship.

Mr. Speaker, I have a strong preference for voluntarily negotiating settlements, which allow each side to compromise, claim a measure of victory, and go home.

This is particularly true when the alternative is for parties to engage in lengthy and expensive adversarial legal and lobbying efforts such as those that have followed the CRJs' determination in the Webcasters proceedings in 2007.

When they issued their 117-page final order, the CRJs established the statutory rates and the terms for the performance of compulsorily licensed Internet streamed music for a 5-year period that is due to expire December 31, 2010.

The law provides this process because we have an obligation to ensure that copyright owners whose works are made available in a government-mandated license are fairly compensated by the private parties who seek to benefit from such use.

Indeed, the Judiciary Committee and the Congress established the CRJ process, in no small part, in response to Webcasters' concerns that the previous Copyright Arbitration Royalty Panel, or CARP, process effectively prohibited many small entities from participating.

Nevertheless, despite their advocacy for this process, some Webcasters have suggested from time to time that the CRJs acted unfairly in reaching their decision. But the record reveals that the decision came at the end of an 18-month proceeding that included 48 days of testimony, 192 exhibits, 475 pleadings, motions and orders, and a transcript that exceeded 13,000 pages.

Notwithstanding these facts, the Congress enacted the Webcasting Settlement Act of 2008 late last year to provide an additional period of time for parties to negotiate private agreements. That period expired February 15, 2009.

Several entities, including the National Association of Broadcasters, are to be commended for reaching an accord during this window, but it appears a number of others were either unable or unwilling to come to terms during the generous period of time that Congress provided.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2344, but in so doing, I

note that it seems a bit like the tail wagging the dog for Congress to legislate and create exceptions to the due process and notice requirements in the existing statutory process each time one party or another calculates they could get a better deal by disregarding the deadline the law provides.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would yield to my colleague from the great State of Washington, the Honorable JAY INSLEE, as much time as he may consume.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to commend the Webcaster Settlement Act of 2009 to my colleagues.

I just want to make two or three points. First, this phenomenon of online radio is just a tremendous service for our constituents; 42 million Americans are enjoying this on at least a semiregular basis. It is growing rapidly. It is a very, very beloved service. And when it goes missing, as it did recently in my City of Seattle, a little station called OCO was sort of providing underground music to my local community and had to shut down as a result of the CRB decision, and it is much missed. We hope to get this and many other things back up when we get this settlement going.

Second, I think there is widespread agreement that the average 47 percent of revenues that the CRB decision would require simply is not sustainable for the industry. And I want to commend all parties to the discussions to try to find an appropriate way to move forward.

The third point I want to make is that keeping online radio going and healthy is not just about entertainment; it's about news, it's about public information, it's about emergency preparedness. We've got to do everything we can to give our constituents multiple sources of information. By allowing this bill to go through—and, hopefully, the parties will reach a final settlement—we're going to allow a democracy to blossom.

So I want to thank Chairman CONYERS and Ranking Member SMITH for their cooperation in facilitating this and commend this bill to my colleagues.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I now yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this legislation and urge its passage, and I do so for a reason that I believe does tie fairly into another piece of legislation. This is a piece of bipartisan legislation with Chairman CONYERS. Another piece tries to deal with a greater inequity than even this one.

While Internet broadcasters or podcasters or Webcasters pay as much as half of their revenues, half of their gross revenues if they play performances of music, and NAB was cited as being a participant, let me make something very clear, Mr. Speaker. The National Association of Broadcasters has chosen to have an absolute "burn the bridge" attitude toward terrestrial broadcasters paying even a cent.

I join with Chairman CONYERS, Mr. BERMAN, myself, and many others, in urging that this pattern of lowering to what we believe is a more fair rate or helping lower to what we believe is a more fair rate, in fact, flies in the face of terrestrial broadcasters continuing to say that the only fair amount to pay in the way of royalties to the music producers, the actual performers, is zero.

The public today, Mr. Speaker, when they hear this, if they hear this, will be shocked to find out that when they listen to terrestrial radio, nothing is paid to the artist.

Well, if they listen to Internet radio, actually more than half in some cases of the gross revenues of these Internet broadcasters is paid to the performers.

As Mr. INSLEE said, I do believe that perhaps it is too much; that there is, in fact, a point at which, when you tax something too much, even if it's taxed to pay the performance, you may get too little of it. To that extent, we need to find an amount that balances fairly compensation for the creative artist who brought us this fine music and those who would seek to make it available to the public.

I hope that this piece of legislation will help for those doing business on the Internet and that H.R. 2344 will be quickly adopted and that it will lead to more affordable rates for the Internet.

But I cannot, in good conscience, fail to mention that these companies trying to start and promote a new industry and a service in many places in which terrestrial broadcasts may be poor or not available at all find themselves hampered while they pay half of their revenues out in royalties, competing against terrestrial broadcasters who insist on continuing to pay not a penny.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will look for this legislation to become law. I look for the other legislation behind it to be brought to the floor, fairly considered, and voted on in order to bring performance fairness.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would join my colleague on the other side of the aisle in support of H.R. 848, which is the bill that you just mentioned, and the reason why is because it's just an issue of fairness. It's fairness to the artist as well as fairness to the platforms upon which we hear these sound recordings, Internet radio being one.

Cable, satellite, they have to pay performance royalties, which is really performers' royalties. They must pay that. But the broadcast industry, AM/FM radio, basically, is protected, if you will, or exempted from having to pay. This is anticompetitive, and it also results in great tragedy where these radio stations are able to play music repetitively that we all enjoy listening to, and then the artist who performs the music doesn't get a dime. And so many of them are forced to work what I call the "Chitlin Circuit" and, you

know, can't even purchase their prescription medication for diabetes, whatever infirmity that they may have. And then some even die indigent and there's no coverage for burial expenses.

And so it's really an issue of fairness. And unfortunately, the broadcast industry has done a despicable thing, and that is to play the race card. And they do it with the deceptive and false statement that H.R. 848 is an attempt to drive black broadcasters, black radio stations off, out of existence, and nothing could be further from the truth.

May I inquire though, Mr. Speaker, as to whether or not there are anymore speakers?

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers at this time and would close quickly when the gentleman is ready.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I will yield back.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia. I, again, reiterate my appreciation for his appropriate and wonderful statements on H.R. 848, a bill that would simply eliminate Congress' prohibition on the Copyright Royalty Board from reaching a fair and equitable royalty for performers.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUMMINGS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2344.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONDEMNING THE MURDER OF PRIVATE WILLIAM LONG

Mr. NADLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 515) condemning the murder of Army Private William Long and the wounding of Army Private Quinton Ezeagwula, who were shot outside the Army Navy Career Center in Little Rock, Arkansas, on June 1, 2009.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 515

Whereas, on June 1, 2009, Private William Long, 23, was murdered outside the Army Navy Career Center in Little Rock, Arkansas;

Whereas, on June 1, 2009, Private Quinton Ezeagwula, 18, was wounded by gunfire outside the Army Navy Career Center in Little Rock, Arkansas;

Whereas there are more than 1,400,000 active component and more than 1,200,000 reserve component members of the Armed Forces protecting America;

Whereas there are more than 8,000 Army and Army Reserve recruiters and more than 7,000 Navy recruiters serving at more than

1,500 military recruiting stations and centers in United States, Guam, Puerto Rico, and Europe;

Whereas the men and women of the Armed Forces risk their lives every day to preserve America's freedom and to defend the liberty, security, and prosperity enjoyed by the American people;

Whereas service in the Armed Forces entails special hazards and demands extraordinary sacrifices from service members;

Whereas members of the Armed Forces are the targets of violence not only abroad but in the United States as well; and

Whereas such violence is despicable and must not be tolerated: Now, therefore, be it Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) offers its condolences to the family of Private William Long;

(2) hopes for a full recovery for Private Quinton Ezeagwula;

(3) urges swift prosecution to the fullest extent of the law of the perpetrator of this senseless shooting; and

(4) urges the American people to join Congress in condemning acts of violence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. NADLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I now yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 515 rightly condemns the murder of Army Private William Long and the wounding of Army Private Quinton Ezeagwula, who were shot outside the Army Navy Career Center in Little Rock, Arkansas, on June 1, 2009.

This dastardly attack on two young Americans who were simply standing outside the Armed Forces Recruiting Center where they worked should shock the conscience of all Americans.

Private Long, who was 23, was murdered. Private Ezeagwula, who is 18, was wounded. They had answered their call to service and were willing to lay down their lives for their country, but the deadly attack came here at home, not on a field of battle halfway across the world.

There are more than 1.4 million Active members of the Armed Forces protecting America, and more than 1.2 million Reserve members. There are more than 8,000 Army and Army Reserve recruiters, and more than 7,000 Navy recruiters, serving at more than 1,500 military recruiting stations and centers in the United States, Puerto Rico, Guam, and Europe. Each one of these men and women are courageous patriots who deserve our support, and this deadly attack is nothing short of dastardly.

This resolution offers the condolences of this House to the family of Private Long, expresses our hopes for a full recovery for Private Ezeagwula, and urges that the perpetrator or perpetrators of this senseless shooting be brought to justice.

□ 1415

I want to commend our colleague, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS), for introducing this resolution. It is an appropriate statement of what I note to be the views of every Member of this House. At a time like this, it is important for all of us to stand together to support our men and women in uniform and to speak with one voice against violence directed against them.

I urge my colleagues to support this important resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, on June 1 of 2009, only about a week ago, Private William Long, only 23 years old, was shot and killed as he worked at the Army Navy Career Center, which is a military recruitment center, in Little Rock, Arkansas. Private Quinton I. Ezeagwula, age 18, was also shot in the attack that day. Thankfully, Private Ezeagwula survived; although our latest information is that he remains still in critical condition.

Mr. Speaker, most persons who are listening today are hearing about Private Long's death for the first time. It's likely that most Americans haven't heard of his killing because Private Long's murder forces the issue that the mainstream media does not want to confront or report on, and that is Islamic terrorism within and coming from within the United States.

The man accused of shooting Private Long and Private Ezeagwula was formally known as Carlos Bledsoe. Bledsoe converted to Islam and changed his name to Abdulhakim Mujahid Muhammad. He later traveled to Yemen where he was there studying under an Islamic scholar. Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have millions of law-abiding Muslims in this country. Acts of terror committed by some members of a religion should never be used to condemn all members of that religion. At the same time, however, we cannot be blind to the jihadist ideology of some Muslims of this country who believe that they have a religious duty to murder the innocent.

The mindset of radical Islamic terrorism which today seems to find fertile ground in the soil of jihad claims that the cause of justice is advanced by killing the innocent and by killing those who seek to protect the innocent. This is the fundamental reality. And when the American media and we, as a people, refuse to call evil by its name, it imperils us all and it dishonors all of those, like these two soldiers who have sacrificed and bled to protect the innocent from that evil.

Mr. Speaker, the American soldier does not fight because he hates what's in front of him. He fights because he loves what is behind him. Private Long's so-called crime was his commitment to defending the innocent against those who would cause them and all of us harm. That commitment is the price required oftentimes to maintain our freedom. That commitment was carried deeply in the heart of Private William Long. He displayed it bravely by wearing the uniform of the United States armed services and dying in it for all of us. That commitment will forever be the legacy of his life on this Earth.

Mr. Speaker, today there are approximately 1.2 million Reserve component members of the Armed Forces protecting America; more than 8,000 Army and Army Reserve recruiters; and more than 7,000 Navy recruiters serving at more than 1,500 military recruiting stations and centers in the United States, Guam, Puerto Rico, and Europe. This attack could have ended the lives of any one of those noble men and women. Each of them risks his or her life every single day to preserve America's freedom and to defend the right of every American to live free, to be free, and pursue their dreams.

So today, Mr. Speaker, I've introduced House Resolution 515 to offer our deepest condolences to the family of Private William Long on behalf of the United States House of Representatives, to offer our hope of a full and complete recovery for Private Quinton Ezeagwula, and to urge the prosecution of the preparator of this senseless shooting to the fullest extent of the law, and finally, to urge the American people to join together in condemning such horrific acts of violence upon the noble men and women of our Armed Forces.

We pray especially that the hearts of all of those that Private Long knew and loved would find comfort and peace in the knowledge that in dying, because he wore the uniform of the United States military, their loved one laid down his life for the sake of human freedom and on behalf of those who could not defend that freedom for themselves. No legacy could be more noble, Mr. Speaker.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I now yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER).

Mr. SNYDER. People in America, Mr. Speaker, mourn the loss of any of our troops in combat or not, here or abroad. Andy Long, private, United States Army, was killed in Little Rock, Arkansas in my district 1 week before he was to leave to be with his unit headed to Korea. We mourn his loss today. So, also, do we hope and pray for the rapid recovery of Private Ezeagwula who was wounded.

I attended the funeral yesterday of Andy Long in Conway, Arkansas, and met both families. The Long family is

a military family: his great-grandfather served; his grandfather served; his father is a retired marine warrant officer; his mother served and is a veteran—and, in fact, she was in the parking lot waiting to give him a ride home when the shooting began. His brother Triston is in the military today and will be headed to Iraq this summer.

A family tradition for this family is that the father prepares a letter to give to the son when he deploys. Yesterday, Andy's father, Retired Marine CWO4 Daris Long, read the following letter to his son. He had these ideas in mind to give to his son and put them down in writing, and the letter was placed in the casket yesterday at the funeral. And this was the letter that Daris Long wrote to his son:

"Dear Andy, let me start by telling you how proud your mother and I are of you in your choice to serve this country. The profession of arms is not an easy job. It is not 9-5. You won't often get a choice in what you want, when you want to do something, or even voice some of your opinions.

"You took an oath, 'I, William Andrew Long, do solemnly swear to support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic, and bear true faith and allegiance to the same.' That means a lot. In my mind, it means that whatever your personal feelings are, you may have to put them aside because you don't get to decide who you are going to protect, you protect the rights of all. Oliver Hazard Perry, a War of 1812 Naval hero, once toasted the country with this, 'My country, right or wrong, but first my country.' That statement was often quoted out of context by my generation in the end years of the Vietnam War by protestors. In light of your oath, its true meaning is revealed. Always remember, your loyalties are to the principles upon which this country was established. Your duty is to the country, not some cause, not some character, not to some party."

Mr. Long continues: "'That I will obey the orders of the President of the United States, the officers and non-commissioned officers appointed over me, acting in accordance with regulations and the Uniform Code of Military Justice. So help me, God.' You are to obey the rightful orders given you. I am sure you were given classes on the laws of warfare, what is right and what is wrong. This part of the oath charges you to do the right thing. This part absolutely absolves you from obeying illegal orders. It reminds you that the old 'I was just following orders' routine doesn't excuse you from misconduct that results from following an illegal order. It does not mean you can refuse to follow orders you may disagree with but only those that are clearly illegal. You have to have a moral compass and rigidly follow it."

"You are now on your way to Korea. What we had talked about, filling your off-duty time with constructive pur-

suits, may have to go on hold with what is going on over there now."

Mr. Long continues: "You need to find someone in your unit who is good at what he does professionally and personally and get into his hip pocket. Learn what he knows. Your leaders are going to be pressed to have everything and everybody ready in case things go south. You may not have time to get your newly acquired skills down to an art. You need to support your leaders and fellow soldiers by being a good follower. Remember, as an infantryman, your life support system is the guy next to you. You need to trust him. He needs to know he can trust you. When you are in the thick of things your focus will narrow to your immediate brothers in arms, other things will fade the mere distractions. You need to have your head on a swivel, be aware of your surroundings. Follow your orders quickly and completely. Please, for your own sanity and to ease the burden of your immediate leaders, don't get bogged down with all the whining and back seat driving you may hear from 'sea lawyers' in your unit—every outfit has them—they are known, some have more, some have less."

Mr. Long continues: "I was once where you are, at the bottom of the food chain. However, after having been promoted up the ladder to Chief Warrant Officer 4, I can tell you that at each level of command, at fire team, squad, platoon, company, and so on, the people in charge are always being pounded on to take care of their people. Your welfare is key to the success of the accomplishment of the mission. There will be times that you will have to be reminded of this and you may think I am full of it, but it is fact."

Mr. Long continues: "This quote has been used many times and I think it was attributed to some anonymous author who wrote on a c-ration box somewhere in the field in Vietnam: 'For those who have fought for it, freedom has a flavor the protected will never know.' I am personally proud of your progression from boy to man. It's been hard, but the end result is my hero. You and your brother serving are a joy to me. You both are foregoing a lot by doing what you are doing especially now when your country is in peril. You both are heroes by having the moral courage to stand up when the country needs you most, when others are not willing to give up their creature comforts. These are times I wish I were still doing what you are. However, the profession of arms is a young man's game. The last recruits I trained are now coming up on 29 years, 3 months in service if any of them are still in."

Mr. Long continues: "My heart is with you. My mind is still ticking through the pre-deployment checklists, what the priorities are, where I am going. I know you are in the Army and I'm sure you are tired of hearing how the Marines do it. Marines march to the sound of the guns. You need to do the same. Don't let others do your job,

your duty. I haven't told your mom in words, but all those times I left on a moment's notice and came back long after others were home, I volunteered. I wasn't going to be left behind to let others do my job or what I considered a job I could do better. I'm telling you this because your job is to stand watch on the wall, separating us, from those who would do us harm. Your day only ends when you've done your duty."

And Mr. Long finishes: "So you have a lot of long days ahead of you. I've told this to Triston, and now it is your turn. I hope you take this letter as it is meant—from a father who loves you, trying to give you some hard-learned life experience. Even though we have had our ups and downs, I have always loved you. You are in both my thoughts and prayers. You are my son. You are my hero. I love you. Semper Fidelis, Dad."

Mr. Long put this letter in the casket, and then he reminded me today that he intends to write a similar letter to his son Triston when he deploys to Iraq this summer.

I want to make a brief comment about the resolution.

I was not involved with the writing of this resolution. I think I would have phrased part of it differently. It says, Resolved, that the House of Representatives, number 3, urges swift prosecution to the fullest extent of the law the perpetrator of this senseless shooting.

My own view is that we do not know all of the facts surrounding this shooting. If it turns out that, in fact, the perpetrator, whoever did this, was trained, supported by some overseas group affiliated with al Qaeda or any of the other terrorist groups, the hell with swift prosecution. We need to take him out.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, just a personal thought on my part.

Sometimes a country oftentimes asks itself the question of what really is the source and fundamental essence of our security. And oftentimes, we think that that is the length and breadth of our military might, and I would only remind us all that thousands of years ago, China built the Great Wall to protect China. This was a wall that would have challenged some of our modern day tanks and they thought that they were completely secure, but in that time China was invaded three different times because the enemy simply bribed the guard who opened the gate and let them in.

□ 1430

I would submit today that the greatest and most important factor for the freedom of a people is the commitment in the heart of its people, and especially those who put on the uniform, to be committed enough to stand in the way of the aggressor and their homeland. And that is exactly what Private Long and Private Ezeagwula tried to do.

There is a verse that says, Greater love hath no man than this; that a man

lays down his life for his friends. It is the most noble of all acts that we can accomplish on this Earth. Sometimes I think we forget how much some people give for the freedom that we have. Privates Long and Ezeagwula are good examples.

Mr. Speaker, I think sometimes we also forget the price that families pay. You know, it is easy for us to focus upon only the fallen, but those who remain and the grief that is laid upon their broken shoulders is often sometimes something we cannot identify with.

I was in the Press Club here a few days ago, and I saw a diamond-shaped picture of a cold, icy, windy day out at Arlington National Cemetery. A woman stood alone with her back to the viewer standing at a tombstone. There was no one else in the cemetery and the wind was blowing and her clothes were out to the side. It was the loneliest thing I had ever seen. And the title was simply, "The Widow." Now, I understand that Private Long was not yet married, but I am sure there was someone out there that loved him, and I know that his parents loved him. And the family has faced a loss that none of us can even imagine. So as we salute Private Long, I also think it is in order to salute his family, who have paid such a high price so we can stand here in this Chamber and talk about freedom.

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

Mr. NADLER of New York. How much time do I have remaining, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 10½ minutes.

Mr. NADLER of New York. Well, I won't take that, but I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, we ask every member of our armed services—2.6 million men and women in the Active and Reserve forces—to be willing to lay down their lives for our country in defense of our freedom, if need be, and they are willing to do that. And every time, whether in Iraq or Afghanistan or anywhere else around the globe, a member of our armed services is killed in action there is a grieved family, a lover, a wife, a husband, a mother, a father, a son, a daughter for all of these who are grieved and whose loss can never be made up. And we sometimes, except on Memorial Day, forget about that. And this happens all the time, too often, and we don't think about it too much. We ought to think about it because our freedoms are dependent on it; our way of life is dependent on it. And none of us would be here enjoying our freedoms if it weren't for the willingness of our sons and daughters to do what they have to do to keep us safe and free.

This resolution does not address all of that; it simply addresses two members of our armed services, one of whom was killed and one of whom was severely wounded. But the difference is

that they weren't in a combat zone; they were murdered and wounded here at home, supposedly in a safe place. And it illustrates that even here at home not everyone is safe.

So this resolution mourns the death of Private Long and the wounding of Private Ezeagwula, and it extends our condolences to the family of Private Long and our wishes for the best recovery to Private Ezeagwula. It is little enough that we can do, but it is really all we can do at this point. It says we are grateful. It reminds us of the sacrifices that are made.

I appreciate Mr. FRANKS' introduction of this resolution. I urge everyone to support it. And as with the resolution I spoke of earlier today, I cannot believe anyone will not support it. So I urge its adoption.

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

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the motion.

CONDEMNING THE MURDER OF PRIVATE WILLIAM LONG

Mr. NADLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 515) condemning the murder of Army Private William Long and the wounding of Army Private Quinton Ezeagwula, who were shot outside the Army Navy Career Center in Little Rock, Arkansas on June 1, 2009, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 515

Whereas on June 1, 2009, Private William Long, 23, was murdered outside the Army Navy Career Center in Little Rock, Arkansas;

Whereas on June 1, 2009, Private Quinton Ezeagwula, 18, was wounded by gunfire outside the Army Navy Career Center in Little Rock, Arkansas;

Whereas there are more than 1,400,000 active component and more than 1,200,000 reserve component members of the Armed Forces protecting America;

Whereas there are more than 8,000 Army and Army Reserve recruiters and more than 7,000 Navy recruiters serving at more than 1,500 military recruiting stations and centers in United States, Guam, Puerto Rico, and Europe;

Whereas the men and women of the Armed Forces risk their lives every day to preserve America's freedom and to defend the liberty, security, and prosperity enjoyed by the American people;

Whereas service in the Armed Forces entails special hazards and demands extraordinary sacrifices from service members;

Whereas members of the Armed Forces are the targets of violence not only abroad but in the United States as well; and

Whereas such violence is despicable and must not be tolerated: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representa-

tives—
(1) offers its condolences to the family of Private William Long;

(2) hopes for a full recovery for Private Quinton Ezeagwula; and

(3) urges that the perpetrator or perpetrators of this senseless shooting be brought to justice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. NADLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman from Arizona if he is prepared to yield back at this time.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I am.

Mr. NADLER of New York. 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 New York (Mr. NADLER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 515, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND SPORT WEEK

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 503) recognizing National Physical Education and Sport Week, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 503

Whereas, May 1 through May 7, 2009, is observed as National Physical Education and Sport Week;

Whereas childhood obesity has reached epidemic proportions in the United States;

Whereas the Department of Health and Human Services estimates that, by 2010, 20 percent of children in the United States will be obese;

Whereas a decline in physical activity has contributed to the unprecedented epidemic of childhood obesity;

Whereas regular physical activity is necessary to support normal and healthy growth in children;

Whereas overweight adolescents have a 70 to 80 percent chance of becoming overweight adults, increasing their risk for chronic disease, disability, and death;

Whereas type 2 diabetes can no longer be referred to as "late in life" or "adult onset" diabetes because it occurs in children as young as 10 years old;

Whereas the Physical Activity Guidelines for Americans recommend that children engage in at least 60 minutes of physical activity on most, and preferably all, days of the week;

Whereas children spend many of their waking hours at school and therefore need to be active during the school day to meet the recommendations of the Physical Activity Guidelines for Americans;

Whereas teaching children about physical education and sports not only ensures that they are physically active during the school day, but also educates them on how to be physically active and its importance;

Whereas according to a 2006 survey by the Department of Health and Human Services, 3.8 percent of elementary schools, 7.9 percent of middle schools, and 2.1 percent of high schools provide daily physical education or its equivalent for the entire school year, and 22 percent of schools do not require students to take any physical education at all;

Whereas according to the survey, 13.7% of elementary schools, 15.2% of middle schools, and 3.0% of high schools provided physical education at least three days per week, or the equivalent thereof, for the entire school year for students in all grades in the school;

Whereas research shows that fit and active children are more likely to thrive academically;

Whereas participation in sports and physical activity improves self-esteem and body image in children and adults;

Whereas the social and environmental factors affecting children are in the control of the adults and the communities in which they live, and therefore this Nation shares a collective responsibility in reversing the childhood obesity trend; and

Whereas Congress strongly supports efforts to increase physical activity and participation of youth in sports: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes National Physical Education and Sport Week and the central role of physical education and sports in creating a healthy lifestyle for all children and youth;

(2) calls on school districts to implement local wellness policies as defined by the Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 2004 that include ambitious goals for physical education, physical activity, and other activities addressing the childhood obesity epidemic and promoting child wellness; and

(3) encourages schools to offer physical education classes to students and work with community partners to provide opportunities and safe spaces for physical activities before and after school and during the summer months for all children and youth.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PLATTS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend and insert extraneous material on House Resolution 503 into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 503, which supports efforts to increase physical activity and participation of youth in sports.

Physical education is necessary in the face of our Nation's growing child-

hood obesity crisis. The Department of Health and Human Services estimates that by 2010, 20 percent of children in the United States will be obese. Without physical education and youth sports, this epidemic would surely be worse than its current situation.

Childhood obesity places a significant burden on our health care system. Overweight adolescents have a 70 to 80 percent chance of becoming overweight adults, a key predictor of chronic disease and disability. The rise in childhood obesity has also been accompanied in the rise of prevalence of type 2 diabetes among children and adolescents.

Teaching children about physical education and sports provides not only physical activity during the typically sedentary school day but also instills in children the importance of physical activity as a way to stay healthy. It is important that we recognize and encourage physical education in our Nation's schools as a necessary component of a holistic education.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to recognize the value of physical education and youth sports. A 2006 survey by the Department of Health and Human Services found that only 3.8 percent of elementary schools, 7.9 percent of middle schools, and 2.1 percent of high schools provide daily physical education or its equivalent for the entire school. Twenty-two percent of schools do not require students to take any physical education. This exists despite research that shows a positive correlation between physical activity and academic performance. In addition, physical activity provides our children with self-esteem and improves their emotional health.

We recognize that our Nation shares a collective responsibility in reversing the trend of childhood obesity. National Physical Education and Sports Week reaffirms the central role that these activities play in encouraging healthy practices for children.

The future of our children's health is an issue that deserves our Nation's utmost attention. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend and colleague, Congressman ALTMIRE, for introducing this resolution, and I urge our colleagues to support it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 503 to recognize National Physical Education and Sports Week, which took place this year from May 1 through May 7.

The health and wellness of America's children is undoubtedly a subject of great concern at this time in history. Over 33 percent of America's elementary school children are overweight or obese, and over 13 percent of America's high school children are obese.

Overweight and obese children are developing diseases and vascular conditions that were once thought of as conditions affecting only the middle-aged.

□ 1445

Obese children have been shown to be at an increased risk of coronary heart disease, diabetes, respiratory problems, and numerous other debilitating diseases. In addition, they often suffer from low self-esteem and feelings of isolation and other psychological side effects.

Physical activity is an important aspect of health in preventing obesity and obesity-related illnesses in both children and adults. Regular physical activity substantially reduces the risk of a number of preventable diseases, such as coronary heart disease, the Nation's leading cause of death, and decreases the risk for stroke, colon cancer, diabetes, and high blood pressure. It also helps to control weight, contributes to healthy bones, muscles, and joints, reduces falls for older adults, and is associated with fewer hospitalizations.

Physical activity need not be strenuous to be beneficial, but in the age of innumerable video games, computer activities, and television channels, it often takes a back seat in the lives of America's youth.

Physical education and sports encourage children to participate in physical activity on a regular basis in a group setting that can foster teamwork, competition, and a sense of accomplishment. In addition, a correlation has been seen between children that participate in sports and higher academic achievement in the classroom.

Participation of children in organized sports has grown in recent decades. However, the percentage of children participating in daily physical education programs has declined in recent times; although the importance of physical activity has become increasingly apparent.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention recommends that children engage in 60 minutes of physical activity 5 or more days a week. Only 35 percent of children regularly meet this recommendation, however. Physical education programs and sports create an opportunity for children to build lifelong healthy habits in a fun and engaging environment. As such, they should be supported and encouraged.

I ask my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize an outstanding colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ALTMIRE), for 2 minutes.

Mr. ALTMIRE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my resolution to celebrate National Physical Education and Sports Week. This resolution simply recognizes the role that physical activity and sports play in creating a healthy lifestyle for children and adults and encourages schools and communities to promote physical education and activities.

Today, there are more than 9 million overweight children in the United

States. And as a result, children are now being diagnosed with high blood pressure, high cholesterol, and type 2 diabetes, all afflictions once thought to be age-related. And these children are at an increased risk also for chronic diseases like heart disease and cancer.

The benefits of physical activity have been well-documented. Research shows daily physical activity reduces the risk of heart disease, high blood pressure, and diabetes, and also increases self-esteem and performance in the classroom. It is for these reasons and many more, Mr. Speaker, that I introduced this resolution, and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague's offer to yield time on this bill as this bill discusses the need to create healthy lifestyles for children. I think that something we should also be discussing here is the need to create economic opportunities for children, to make sure that our children not only are having a lifestyle that's healthy in school, teaching physical fitness, but also making sure that we are dealing with policies up here in Washington that allow them to have real opportunities when they get out of school.

There is one bill that is moving through this body right now, the cap-and-trade energy tax, that would severely jeopardize our children's opportunities to have a better life, to have the opportunities that we had in our life. And so as we are talking about legislation right now to create healthy lifestyles, I think we should also be looking at the policies that come out of this body that could actually create big impediments, impediments that would deny them opportunities when they graduate from school.

Let's talk about that cap-and-trade energy tax that is moving through. We just got a new, updated report by the Congressional Budget Office. The cap-and-trade energy tax that has been proposed imposes \$846 billion in new taxes, taxes on energy that would affect every American, denying people the ability to buy healthy food for their children because they would be spending, according to the President's own budget director, \$1,300 a year more in higher utility prices, not to mention how much more money they would be spending in higher gas prices at the pump, creating a greater dependence on Middle Eastern oil at a time when we need to be creating a national energy policy that is comprehensive, that uses our natural resources to create good jobs here in America, to fund and bridge us into those alternative sources of energy, like wind, like solar, like nuclear power, so that we can truly reduce our dependence on Middle Eastern oil and give those young children an opportunity to have good jobs here in America, using American natural resources to propel them.

We have got an alternative bill called the American Energy Innovation Act, a bill that takes an all-of-the-above approach, that actually utilizes American natural resources, our oil, our natural gas. There are estimates that we have got almost 100 years of natural gas reserves here in this country. In fact, in Louisiana, the largest natural gas find in the history of our country occurred just 3 years ago. I know one of my colleagues will be talking about that. But we have got the ability here in our country to secure our energy independence. We've got legislation we have filed that would help us secure that energy independence, and they won't allow us a hearing on this bill because they are promoting this cap-and-trade energy tax, a tax on energy. Again, as we're talking about our young children, encouraging them to lead healthy lifestyles, we need to also be creating policies here that give them those opportunities so that they don't get out of school and have to go straight to the unemployment line.

Their bill, this cap-and-trade energy tax, and I have got a copy of it right here. There are 55 pages, 55 pages in their bill dedicated to job losses, to American jobs that will be lost due to a cap-and-trade energy tax. In fact, the National Association of Manufacturers has estimated the cap-and-trade energy tax would run 3 to 4 million jobs out of America to countries like China and India, who are just chomping at the bit to take our jobs.

So you would wonder why at a time when we are here discussing legislation to encourage our children to lead healthy lifestyles, as we should, there's also legislation moving through this Congress, pushed by the leadership in this Congress, that's trying to tax energy and run millions of jobs overseas to countries like China and India at a time when we are seeing record-level unemployment, over 9 percent. We broke the mark of 9 percent just in this last report, 9 percent unemployment in this country, at a time when so many people are cutting back because times are tough. And the answer that the leadership in Congress has is to promote a tax on energy, an \$840 billion tax on energy that would run millions of jobs overseas.

The real irony, when they talk about the goal of reducing carbon emissions, the real irony is the countries that will be getting our jobs, China, to produce the same steel that's produced here in America today, will actually emit more carbon to produce the same steel because they don't have the current environmental regulations that we have here in America. So the real irony is that they would be running jobs overseas to countries that will actually emit more carbon.

Spain just did a study on cap-and-trade because they experimented with it for years. Spain, after finally realizing it was a bad idea, looked back and noticed that for every new job they

created in a “green” industry, they lost 2.2 regular jobs, and of those new jobs they created, 9 out of 10 of them were temporary jobs. So, in essence, they lost 20 jobs for every full-time job they created.

So we need to promote good policies, but we need to defeat this cap-and-trade energy tax.

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

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING).

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend from Pennsylvania for yielding me this time.

I think this is an important bill. I do rise in support of it. I'm a family physician who has treated diabetes even in and among teenagers, which is a sad situation when you consider the future of someone who develops diabetes so young. And certainly the physical future is very important.

But I am also very concerned about the fiscal future of our youth. I'm very troubled today. A constituent came to me today from the oil and gas industry and was discussing with me the problems that already are emerging with the loss of tax incentives to invest in exploration that is going on in my district and districts around. So, Mr. Speaker, I think that looking down the line here at the fact that we have not yet developed an energy policy, I know my side of the aisle, we Republicans, attempted to get to the floor a no-cost stimulus bill which would have, I think, been very innovative and certainly revolutionary in getting our energy costs down. But having said that, as gas prices now are approaching \$3 a gallon and we are still in a severe recession, just think that even \$4 a gallon pretty soon is probably going to be bypassed very quickly.

With that, I just want to reiterate what my friend also from Louisiana, Mr. SCALISE, has discussed as we move into the cap-and-trade debate, the cap-and-tax debate, if you will, where every analyst that we have been able to read sees this as a pure form of taxation, that the real underlying purpose of it is to raise more money for, I guess, social spending or perhaps single-payer, nationalized, health care spending. I'm not sure. But the net effect of that is just what we have seen with the incubator that we call Spain, and that is cap-and-tax has been in play there for 10 years, and what has been the net result?

Well, today the unemployment rate in Spain is 17.5 percent. As Mr. SCALISE mentioned, for every job that's been gained, a so-called “green” job—and again, I will get to that in a moment as to what a green job, I think, is supposed to be—there has been a loss of 2.2 real jobs. And I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that in the State of Louisiana and surrounding States that the jobs that we have today that come from the oil and gas industry are very significant jobs. They carry benefits. They

carry pay easily in the \$50,000 to \$100,000 range in many cases. And the so-called “green” jobs that are discussed, if you look at Spain and their experience, what they found was that 90 percent of the green jobs were implementation jobs, that is, construction. And, of course, once the construction or implementation period is over, that job goes away; so there is only left a remaining 10 percent of the total green jobs that even become permanent jobs.

But then if you look further underlying that, Mr. Speaker, what you find is that the green jobs are really a pass-through of taxpayer money into the system and then as payroll for these so-called “green” jobs. They are not a direct result of an exponential growth of a healthy economy or a healthy oil and gas industry.

So, as we move into this debate—and I understand it's being pushed pretty hard right now—we've got to decide are we going to continue to put more taxes on our citizens in the way of higher utility bills, which will impact the poor and those on fixed income to the tune of over \$3,000 a year of added electrical bills, or are we going to see our manufacturing have to leave this country and go overseas because it can no longer compete with the higher energy costs? What is really the question here? How are we going to have more revenue into our Treasury by killing off jobs?

So I don't think this is any longer a theoretical discussion. I think we are talking about real people and real jobs. And all we have to do is to look at Spain and other countries who have attempted this.

But just in summary, Mr. Speaker, I think that we need to be very careful about what government is taking over and what it's controlling. If you look to Western Europe, where socialism has been rampant for years, you actually see a retraction, a move away from that. Even Pravda made a statement recently that we are going headlong into Marxism when, in fact, the rest of the world is pulling back.

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

Mr. FLEMING. With that, I thank you for your time in the discussion.

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

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in this steady march and drum towards cap-and-trade or cap-and-tax, it strikes me that certainly the health of our Nation is really what's at risk here in terms of what cap-and-trade will do to our Nation, what it does to our businesses, our industries, what it does to our families, what it does to the individual citizens in terms of the costs that will be placed upon them, the burden that

they have to bear, and it's a burden that affects all segments of the society. Those that I worry most about actually are those who live paycheck to paycheck and those who just barely get by in their household budgets and what this significant increase of costs will be, specific to turning a light switch on in Pennsylvania with energy costs going up 30 percent, with filling up your gas. I represent a very rural district, and in rural America we drive. We drive to work. We drive to pick up our groceries. We drive sometimes to pick up our mail. And the cost of gas is estimated to increase by 76 percent. Those are costs that our families and individuals cannot bear.

But I think there is something out there, as opposed to this big government proposal of cap-and-trade, that we should be looking at, and that is using our natural resources like natural gas. Natural gas currently accounts for roughly 23 percent of our overall energy consumption, and natural gas is the cleanest fossil fuel. Natural gas is used for many energy sources, but it's also vital as a feedstock ingredient in many products we consume every day. Anything from plastics to pharmaceuticals use natural gas as an ingredient.

Now, as a member of the House Agriculture Committee, I must point out how important natural gas is to our farmers and our agricultural sector. We can't grow our food without fertilizer, and natural gas is an important ingredient in fertilizer. We only have to go back as far as last summer when we saw the price of energy skyrocket in our country, and that's what we are looking at now under cap-and-trade, to see what the impact of that was on our farmers and on food prices. Many farmers in the past few years have been hurting because of high energy costs.

The United States has an abundant supply of natural gas, and the vast majority of what we consume is produced right here at home. Let me repeat that. The vast majority of natural gas we produce, that's a homegrown product, and that's good for this country.

Oil, for instance, is a world price. That means that we pay \$69 a barrel, today's price, but so does Germany, Japan, and Canada. However, natural gas is not a world price, meaning that the price of natural gas varies from country to country, and it's simply supply and demand. When we produce more natural gas, its costs will come down.

Now, having said that, I believe that we should expand upon our natural gas production, which could act as a bridge to get us into a future where renewables really will be the major energy source. Renewables such as wind, solar, and the like are all energy sources that we would like to utilize. But it's also important to bear in mind that these sources make up only about 1 percent of what we consume, and the major reason for that is because they are not as inexpensive as coal, oil, and natural

gas. However, the majority party in Washington would like to make renewables more viable by increasing the costs of fossil fuels through the proposed cap-and-trade bill.

Now, last fall the House Republicans had an important and major victory in Congress. They led the way in removing a longstanding moratorium on the Outer Continental Shelf. I would like to see us move forward in producing in the OCS, which estimates the project has a net royalty worth of \$1.7 trillion.

□ 1500

Another area that shows great promise is my home State of Pennsylvania. Eighty percent of Pennsylvania rests upon the Marcellus Shale, which is likely the third largest natural gas field in the world. That's literally hundreds of trillions of cubic feet of clean-burning natural gas that could power our country for decades, bringing jobs and all of the economic benefits with it.

Just today, in The Wall Street Journal, there was an article on the marketplace page entitled, "KKR Invests in Gas Explorer." Within cap-and-trade, we talk a lot about these renewables that only exist because of the subsidy that we're putting into them. This is a great article because this is what America is all about in terms of real science. It talks about the company KKR that has invested in gas exploration. It didn't take stimulus money. It didn't take subsidy money from the Federal government or from any other level of government. It was free market enterprise money for investing in natural gas because they recognized the value of it.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Pennsylvania have any further speakers?

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Speaker, I do not have any additional speakers. I urge a "yes" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, routinely, this Chamber is visited by many young people, by many groups of young people, reminding us that we are in need of promoting and of advancing sound and principled ideas and policies that will be inherited by them, by their generation. They will inherit the good and the bad works that we do, and they will count on us for finding sound and reasonable solutions.

That being said, I believe it's very important for us to advance the opportunity for them to have a sounder environment. They have the right to breathe cleaner air. We have within our grasp the opportunity to reduce that carbon footprint. We have the opportunity to go forward and to cut this pattern of advancing \$475 billion annually to foreign economies for fossil-based fuels. We can do better with green solutions, and we can advance House Resolution 503, which allows for us to promote physical education and sports, which will advance the general health and well-being of our students

and which will give them stronger academic performance.

I strongly urge our colleagues to support House Resolution 503. I encourage them to vote "yes" on Representative ALTMIRE's resolution.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 503—Recognizing National Physical Education and Sport Week.

This measure will signal to school districts across the country that they must begin to place health and wellness among their top priorities when planning curriculums for the upcoming school year. The rates of childhood obesity, heart disease, and diabetes in this country are unacceptable, and it is incumbent upon local school systems to provide programs and education that will teach students fundamental healthy lifestyle habits.

Therefore, I firmly support this resolution and I commend my colleague Rep. JASON ALTMIRE for bringing this measure before the floor.

Physical education that takes place within schools and incorporates nutritional guidelines, physical activity, and a holistic approach to fitness will not only reverse the alarming increase in childhood obesity, but it will also result in a general decline in obesity and heart disease among the general U.S. population. As studies have shown, obese children have a 70 to 80 percent chance of becoming overweight adults, further increasing their risk for chronic disease.

Our nation's minority communities are at particular risk, as poverty, lack of education, and diets high in fat and calories are all contributing factors increasing the likelihood of childhood obesity. During my visits to schools and conversations with children and their parents, I always emphasize the importance of not only academic success, but also a healthy lifestyle including physical fitness.

Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that we begin to rethink our old paradigms about health. In addition to treating the effects of unhealthy lifestyle habits—heart disease, diabetes, and chronic illness—we must enhance our efforts to promote prevention of disease and encourage healthy living.

Redirecting our attention toward youth health today will help children grow up to be healthy and productive adults. This will also reduce future healthcare costs. Therefore, I am pleased to add my voice of support for H. Res. 503. Moreover, I will be working with my colleagues to make sure we continue to take the necessary steps to educate our nation's children and adults about the importance of healthy lifestyle habits.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 503.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING AMERICORPS

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the reso-

lution (H. Res. 453) recognizing the significant accomplishments of the AmeriCorps and encouraging all citizens to join in a national effort to salute AmeriCorps members and alumni, and raise awareness about the importance of national and community service.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 453

Whereas the AmeriCorps national service program, since its inception in 1994, has proven to be a highly effective way to engage Americans in meeting a wide range of local needs, national response directives, and promote the ethic of service and volunteering;

Whereas, each year, AmeriCorps provides opportunities for 75,000 citizens across the Nation to give back in an intensive way to their communities, States, and to the Nation;

Whereas those same individuals have improved the lives of the Nation's most vulnerable citizens, protect the environment, contribute to public safety, respond to disasters, and strengthen the educational system;

Whereas AmeriCorps members, after their terms of service end, remain engaged in their communities as volunteers, teachers, and nonprofit professionals in disproportionately high levels;

Whereas AmeriCorps members serve thousands of nonprofit organizations, schools, and faith-based and community organizations each year;

Whereas, on April 21, 2009, President Barack Obama signed the Edward M. Kennedy Serve America Act, passed by bipartisan majorities in both the House and the Senate, which reauthorizes and expands AmeriCorps programs to incorporate 250,000 volunteers each year;

Whereas national service programs have engaged millions of Americans in results-driven service in the Nation's most vulnerable communities, providing hope and help to people facing economic and social needs;

Whereas, this year, as the economic downturn puts millions of Americans at risk, national service and volunteering are more important than ever; and

Whereas 2009's AmeriCorps Week, observed May 9 through May 16, provides the perfect opportunity for AmeriCorps members, alums, grantees, program partners, and friends to shine a spotlight on the work done by members—and to motivate more Americans to serve their communities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) encourages all citizens to join in a national effort to salute AmeriCorps members and alumni, and raise awareness about the importance of national and community service;

(2) acknowledges the significant accomplishments of the AmeriCorps members, alumni, and community partners;

(3) recognizes the important contributions to the lives of our citizens by AmeriCorps members; and

(4) encourages citizens of all ages and backgrounds and from each state to consider serving in AmeriCorps.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PLATTS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend and insert extraneous materials on House Resolution 453 into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the substantial contributions that AmeriCorps has made towards national and community service.

AmeriCorps began in 1994 as an effort to engage Americans in the ethic of service and volunteerism. The organization launched following the establishment of the Corporation for National and Community Service under the National and Community Service Trust Act. The initial class of 20,000 volunteers established an immediate tradition of assisting communities across the country. This tradition involves improving the lives of the Nation's most vulnerable citizens, protecting the environment, contributing to public safety, responding to disasters, and strengthening our educational system.

We recognize the real impact that AmeriCorps has and continues to have on our Nation's communities. Since 1994, more than 570,000 individuals have served with the organization. These individuals have tackled some of the Nation's toughest issues, including illiteracy, gang violence, homelessness, and drug abuse. They have worked with thousands of organizations ranging from Habitat for Humanity to the Red Cross. After their terms of service, these members remain engaged in their communities as volunteers, as teachers, and as nonprofit professionals at disproportionately high levels.

In my district, in the capital region of New York State, we have a large AmeriCorps program with the Self Advocacy Association of New York. The AmeriCorps members, all with developmental disabilities, travel around the State, giving presentations—promoting the importance of self-advocacy for people with disabilities, the general awareness of disability-related issues and the importance of full community inclusion of people with disabilities.

This is important work, and I am so pleased we have these volunteers back home in my congressional district. We realize that, as this current economic downturn puts millions of Americans at risk, the need for volunteers and national service will be more important than ever.

The recently signed Edward M. Kennedy Serve America Act expands the AmeriCorps program to incorporate some 250,000 volunteers each year. It is important to recognize the commitment of these volunteers so that future generations will continue to support the ideal of national service. The strength of our Nation depends upon

individuals who take action towards building better communities.

We observed AmeriCorps Week May 9 through May 16. AmeriCorps Week provides current volunteers, alums, grantees, program partners, and friends with the opportunity to highlight the important work done by this great organization. It is a chance for us to thank those individuals whose service to society cannot be fully measured.

It is also a wonderful opportunity for us to motivate future individuals to pursue the ethic of service, whether in organizations such as AmeriCorps or in the various other service opportunities that exist in our Nation. The ethic of service is a manifestation of the greater ideal of democracy. The AmeriCorps pledge begins: "I will get things done for America to make our people safer, smarter, and healthier." It is important that we recognize that service is a civic duty. Not only do we express gratitude for service, but we express gratitude through service. When we acknowledge the significant accomplishments of AmeriCorps as an organization, we affirm the importance of service as a necessary component of any democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage everyone to take a moment to appreciate the contributions made by AmeriCorps. These volunteers are the muscle of America, and they deserve this recognition.

I want to thank Representative MATSUI for bringing this resolution to the floor, and I urge my colleagues to pass this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 453, a resolution recognizing AmeriCorps Week observed last month on May 9 through May 16.

AmeriCorps recognizes the individuals who have chosen to participate in the AmeriCorps program, and they have dedicated a significant amount of time helping others in local communities.

In 1990, President George Herbert Walker Bush signed the National Service Act, a network of national service programs that engage Americans in intensive service to meet the Nation's vital needs in education, public safety, health, and the environment.

In 1993, President Bill Clinton signed the National Community Service Trust Act, which established the Corporation for National and Community Service, which brought the full range of domestic community service programs under the umbrella of one central organization.

Finally, just a few months ago, President Obama signed the latest reauthorization of the Corporation for National and Community Service, a bill that was developed and passed in a strong bipartisan fashion in both Chambers. This legislation builds on the reforms to the corporation, started by the previous administration, to ensure additional accountability in national serv-

ice programs. This most recent legislation will also help smaller organizations participate in national service, and it will ensure that the unique skills of America's veterans are well-utilized.

AmeriCorps offers 75,000 opportunities for adults of all ages and backgrounds to address a myriad of needs in communities all across America, such as tutoring and mentoring disadvantaged youth, fighting illiteracy, building affordable housing, and assisting communities in times of natural disaster. For example, in the last 3 years, more than 4 million service hours have been spent helping gulf coast communities recover and rebuild after Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. That's 4 million hours of service made possible by the organizations and by the individuals who chose to participate in the AmeriCorps programs.

This resolution recognizes one week where we salute current and former AmeriCorps members for their important work. It also allows us to thank all community partners who make it possible for AmeriCorps members to serve.

I want to take this opportunity to thank my fellow cochairs on the National Service Caucus, Representatives MATSUI, EHLERS and PRICE, for introducing this resolution. I ask my colleagues to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN).

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I thank my colleague of Pennsylvania for yielding me some time.

Mr. Speaker, this bill encourages Americans to support AmeriCorps. There are some around the country who would agree with that. There are others who would not because there are problems with AmeriCorps, such as moneys that have been expended on ACORN. Other funds and efforts by AmeriCorps volunteers have been utilized in campaigns, which I don't think is quite appropriate, particularly when we're trying to promote volunteerism.

Whether people would support AmeriCorps or not, I think that there is another issue that, if the American people were to fully comprehend and understand, the vast majority of this country would not support. It's what the liberals in this Congress are calling cap-and-trade legislation. I call it tax-and-cap legislation because that's what it's all about. It's about taxes. In fact, the President recently said, if this bill were not passed, he would not have the money to fund his socialized medicine program for which he is actually pushing very hard and for which he wants passed by the end of this year.

Now, socialized medicine is going to take people's choices away. It's going to take their choices of doctors away, their choices of hospitals, their choices

of what medications they can utilize, whether they can even have a procedure or have surgery that is so desperately needed. It's going to be a program that's going to literally kill people because it's going to deny them care that's desperately needed.

So this tax-and-cap legislation—"cap-and-trade" as it's called—is about money. It's not about the environment. It's about money. It's about more funds being brought into the Federal government to foster what I call a "steamroll of socialism" that's being shoved down the throats of the American people. It's going to slay the American economy. It's going to cost jobs.

The President has talked about using Spain as the icon for what we should look at. Well, in Spain, the icon that the President looks to, we have already seen that for every single green job that it has produced another 2.2 jobs, which were real jobs, permanent jobs, were destroyed.

In my congressional district in northeast Georgia, right now, today, in many counties, we have an unemployment rate of nearly 14 percent. The national average is over 9 percent. In northeast Georgia, it's higher, much higher. I have manufacturing entities within my district that tell me, if this cap-and-trade/tax-and-cap legislation is passed, they're going to lock the doors, and the unemployment rate in northeast Georgia is going to go up markedly from what it is today, which is roughly 14 percent. I think we're going to see 18 percent, 20 percent, maybe 25 percent unemployment in northeast Georgia because of one bill, because of one bill that is being pushed down the throats of the American people: this cap-and-tax—"tax-and-cap" as I call it—cap-and-trade legislation, the Waxman-Markey bill.

□ 1515

It's going to be disastrous for the American economy, it's going to be disastrous for American workers, and it's going to be disastrous for the poor and those who are on limited incomes.

Why do I say that? Well, I say that because every single person in this country utilizes energy. Every single person, when they flip on their light switch, their electric bill is going up. Every single person in this country is dependent upon gasoline or diesel fuel. Why? Even if they don't have a car, even if they use public transportation, it is gasoline and diesel fuel that motivates America. But it's more than that. Groceries don't grow in the grocery store. Grocery prices are going to go up markedly because of this tax-and-cap legislation. Every single good and service in this country is going to go up because of this tax-and-cap legislation.

Now I'm a conservationist. I fought in the conservation movement for a long period of time. We have to be good stewards of our environment. There's no question. I want clean air and clean water just as much as the most ardent,

rabid environmental activist in this country. I'm a physician, and I know what dirty air does to my patients who have chronic obstructive pulmonary disease or chronic asthma and lung diseases. We must have clean air. We can do that, but we can do that without destroying our economy. We can do that without costing American jobs.

All we're going to do is run jobs overseas instead of having them here in America. We ought to have public policy that grows our economic base, not kills it. Tax-and-cap legislation would kill it. We ought to have public policy that stimulates the economy instead of kills it. Tax-and-cap will kill it.

We are in a bad economic situation today. People are hurting all over this country. We are borrowing too much. We're spending too much. We're taxing too much. We see the policy from this administration and the liberal leadership of Congress in both the House and the Senate that is going to not only extend this current recession, but I believe it's going to deepen it. I believe it will even take us into a severe recession to the point of a frank, outright depression. Tax-and-cap legislation is going to be the locomotive that takes us down those tracks, and it's going to be a high-speed train taking us toward economic ruin. That high-speed train is going to run off a cliff, and it's going to take the American economy and the American people with it. It's going to kill small business. It's going to kill big business. It's going to kill jobs. It's going to hurt poor people. It's going to hurt the elderly, those on limited incomes. It's going to raise the cost of medicine, raise the cost of health care.

And why are we doing this? It is so, as the President himself has said, that he can have the funds to create a bigger socialized medicine program and other socialized programs, bigger government, bigger spending, more economic doom and gloom that's going to be foisted upon the American people. We've got to stop it. And if the American people realized what was happening, they'd stand up and say no to cap-and-tax, cap-and-trade, what I call tax-and-cap legislation, as well as the socialized medicine program, the two big things that this administration and the liberal leadership in this Congress are pushing. Both of them are going to be disastrous. Both of them are going to kill jobs. Both of them are going to take away choices. Both of them are going to destroy our economy. Both of them are going to put our children and grandchildren in severe economic peril. And believe me, I believe it's immoral. I think it's totally immoral because we are robbing our children and our grandchildren of their economic futures. They will live at a standard that's much below ours today.

We have a clear picture of where the leadership in this Congress is taking us and the way the administration is taking us. All we have to do is look in Venezuela. This administration and the liberal leadership in this Congress is

going down the same road that Hugo Chavez has taken the Venezuelans. Venezuela nationalized their energy systems. That's exactly what we're trying to do here with cap-and-trade. In Venezuela, Hugo Chavez nationalized the financial institutions. We've already done that. We've nationalized Chrysler and GM, and they're trying to force Ford into the same trap. We've nationalized the insurance industry. We're nationalizing everything of major consequence in this country economically. And now the leadership wants to nationalize, federalize, socialize the health care system in America.

Now where is that train going to take us? We've got a clear picture of that, too. All we have to do is look in Cuba, look in the Soviet-controlled Soviet Union prior to them making their reforms and turning toward a more capitalistic system. But we can look at Cuba. Cuba, prior to Fidel Castro taking over that government, was very prosperous. Certainly they had problems, but not the problems that they have today. In Cuba we have a very rich elite, headed by a Marxist, Fidel Castro. The vast majority of the people in that country are struggling, very poor, with no choices. That's exactly where we're heading in America today if we continue down this road, this steamroller of socialism, this high-speed train that's going to drive us off the economic cliff. We've got to stop it.

Republicans have offered alternative after alternative. We had alternatives to the housing crisis. The liberals on the other side were obstructionists. They wouldn't let our alternatives be heard. We had alternatives to the stimulus bill. I call it the nonstimulus bill because it has not and will not stimulate the economy. We had alternatives. The other side were obstructionists. They would not allow our ideas to be heard or brought to this floor for debate.

We've offered alternatives to the banking crisis. But what have we done? We've bailed out Wall Street. Republicans have offered many alternatives to bail out Main Street, but they are not heard on this floor. Over and over again, the other side has been obstructionist. They've blocked every effort that we have brought on our side, from the Republican side, to bring forth commonsense, market-based free enterprise solutions that would not have put our children and grandchildren's futures at peril. But the other side have been obstructionists. They have not allowed those things to be heard. They have been buried in committee. We introduced the bills. We had press conferences. The Main Street media around this country are very compliant with the leadership on the liberal side because they bury it and don't even report the alternatives.

We hear on the other side that the Republicans are the Party of No. Well actually we are the Party of Know, but it's K-N-O-W. We know how to solve these problems in America. We know

how to solve the banking problems. We know how to solve the stimulus/economic problems. We know how to solve the environmental problems, the energy problems, the health care problems that America faces. But are our ideas heard? The other side is the side of no, N-O, because they say no to every proposal that we've made on our side.

The press also is the party of no, N-O, because they've not reported on any of the proposals that we've offered, and it's not right. It's actually going to be disastrous to the American people, and the American people need to stand up and say no to this steamroller of socialism. Stop this high-speed train running off the cliff of economic doom that's going to take our children and grandchildren down into the chasm of a poor economy, struggling to try to pay off the debt for this totally inappropriate outright steamroller of socialism that's being forced down the throats of the American people.

We've got to stop it. And we can stop it if the American people rise up and say no to the steamroller, put a stop to this high-speed train that NANCY PELOSI's driving and HARRY REID's driving that is going to hurt our children, it's going to hurt our grandchildren, it's going to hurt America, and I'm not sure that we can recover in the next 10 decades, century. It may take that long to put us back on the right track, if we can ever get back on the right track.

We've seen over and over throughout history societies destroyed because of people doing things in a self-centered manner, and that's exactly what's happening in this country today. We are self-centered as a people. We need to look at serving other people, particularly our children and grandchildren, put this country back on the right track, and we can do that.

Former U.S. Senator Everett Dirksen one time said, when he feels the heat, he sees the light. The American people need to put the heat on Members of Congress in the House and the Senate and say no to cap-and-tax, cap-and-trade legislation, to the Waxman-Markey bill. They need to say no to the socialized medicine program that the liberal leadership on the Democratic side is trying to force upon us which will take our choices away. They need to say no to the steamroller of socialism, no to big government, and yes to free enterprise, yes to personal responsibility and accountability, yes to small business. We cannot borrow and spend our way to prosperity. We have to stimulate the economy by stimulating small business. We have to have money in the hands of small businessmen and -women around this country to create jobs. We have to have money in the hands of the taxpayers so that they can have money for a college education for their children, buy clothes, buy food.

The bill just before this one was about encouraging physical education for our children. I'm a medical doctor,

and I have seen over and over again how fat and out of shape the kids in this country are. But our economy is going to be skinny and poor because of a fat, bloated Federal Government that the liberal leadership in this House and this Senate are trying to force upon the American people.

So the American people need to stand up and say no to all these steamroller of socialism programs, to the cap-and-trade, to socialized medicine; and say yes to the Republican alternatives that will look to the free marketplace and will stimulate the economy, get us back on the right track and help us have a strong economic future not only for us today but for our children and our grandchildren for the next decades to come.

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Speaker, I do not have any additional speakers, and I would yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, if there is a common thread woven through the fabric of volunteers across this great country of ours, it's a sense of positive, a positive spirit, a positive attitude, positive energy going forward and building stronger communities, enhancing the quality of life of American citizens. Their deeds speak to our needs.

So to focus effectively and most positively on the subject at hand, bringing us to House Resolution 453, I will close with my comments focused in great respect for the volunteers of this country, the spirit of this House resolution. I would suggest that they are that muscle of America. They make a total difference. They enhance the quality of life of each and every American, and the recognition of our volunteers through AmeriCorps, the spirit of House Resolution 453, should be recognized and responded to by our colleagues. I would encourage a "yes" vote on the resolution.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 453, which recognizes the significant accomplishments of the AmeriCorps programs, encourages all citizens to join in a national effort to salute AmeriCorps members and alumni, and helps raise awareness about the importance of national and community service to our country.

AmeriCorps Week is celebrated each year to honor the important work that AmeriCorps volunteers provide to our communities.

This year, we celebrated National AmeriCorps Week with a renewed sense of purpose after the passage of the Senator Edward M. Kennedy Serve America Act. Already we have seen a rise in AmeriCorps applications and a tremendous interest in national and community service as a direct result of this legislation.

The Serve America Act restores the promise of our national service programs by expanding the AmeriCorps programs' volunteer capacity from 75,000 to 250,000 volunteers across the country, and reauthorizes the Corporation for National and Community Service for the first time in 15 years.

In my district of Sacramento, AmeriCorps National Civilian Community Corps, or as we

say NCCC, volunteers provide immense benefits to our community and our region. Trained in CPR, first aid, disaster response and fire-fighting, NCCC teams have responded to every national disaster since the program was established.

As a Co-Chair of the National Service Caucus, it is a pleasure to call attention to the tremendous work of those involved at every level and in every AmeriCorps program.

As a result of the great work of these volunteers, extraordinary things are happening all around America. The service programs and new initiatives help address some of our nation's toughest problems, from poverty and unmet education needs, to natural disasters.

I urge my colleagues to continue to support AmeriCorps volunteers and take this opportunity to thank them for their dedication to our country and to their communities.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. I rise in support of House Resolution 453 which recognizes the significant accomplishments of the AmeriCorps and encourages all citizens to join in a national effort to salute AmeriCorps members and alumni, and raise awareness about the importance of national and community service.

I want to commend my good friend from the 5th district of California, Ms. DORIS MATSUI, for introducing this important resolution. I also want to recognize the cosponsors for their strong support of House Resolution 453.

Ever since its creation in 1993 by President Clinton, AmeriCorps has honorably served our nation's communities. I am also encouraged by the recent decision by the Obama Administration to increase the total number of volunteers in AmeriCorps to 250,000 by the year 2012, which further demonstrates that AmeriCorps is fulfilling its mission and honorably serving its purpose.

Today, this legislation honors the thousands of volunteers who have selflessly served communities in areas such as education, public safety, health, and the environment. As a result of all their hard work and service, communities across the nation have benefitted tremendously. For example, AmeriCorps has provided mentoring programs to children of incarcerated parents. The program recruits and provides knowledgeable and caring mentors for these children with parents in prison. In 2007, statistics show the program provided mentoring to 93,400 children of incarcerated parents, more than double its target goal of 36,000 children. In addition, AmeriCorps has also been endorsed by a growing number of higher education institutions. In the 2007 fiscal year, 76 institutions matched the AmeriCorps Education Award, an award that provides up to 5,000 dollars a year to volunteers who demonstrate outstanding service in the AmeriCorps programs. This goes to show the support the AmeriCorps is getting from higher-education institutions around the country.

Back in 2003, I co-sponsored House Resolution 2125, introduced by my friend, Ms. ROSA DELAURO of Connecticut, the Rite of Passage Community Service Act, which created a national network of service programs that allowed for young people who were part of community-based, after-school, and summer service corps programs to work with older AmeriCorps members who could organize service projects and act as mentors to new AmeriCorps members. In the midst of this economic downturn millions of Americans are

without jobs and AmeriCorps can provide opportunities for many to become involved in their communities and benefit our nation.

I recognize that there are still some areas that need improvements, but the overall purpose of AmeriCorps programs has been a success. The program has become the number one catalyst for service and voluntary work, in the country.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to announce my support for AmeriCorps and to salute all AmeriCorps members nationwide. Since AmeriCorps was created in 1994, Texas has benefited from over 22,000 young people serving a year or more in our communities. Through programs such as the National Civilian Community Corps, City Year and Teach For America, AmeriCorps volunteers address critical Texas needs in education, public safety, disaster response and recovery, and environment preservation. These programs serve an important role as they provide an outlet for people to serve their country in a manner that had previously not been afforded.

In the last 14 years more than 500,000 individuals have served through AmeriCorps and have earned education awards worth more than \$1.5 billion, making the dream of higher education more attainable. This national service program has provided opportunities for growing numbers of Americans to serve our nation.

AmeriCorps members serve thousands of nonprofit organizations, schools, and faith-based and community organizations each year. With the enactment of the Edward M. Kennedy Serve America Act, which President Obama signed on April 21, 2009, three times as many Americans will now have the opportunity to serve. This program has engaged millions of Americans in results-driven service in the Nation's most vulnerable communities, providing hope and help to people facing economic and social needs. With the current economic downturn putting millions of Americans at risk, national service and volunteering are more important than ever.

Mr. Speaker, the AmeriCorps program has done great things for Texas and the country as a whole. I am indeed honored to support the significant accomplishments of this wonderful program which represents the very best of the United States of America.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 453.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. 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.

□ 1530

SUPPORTING INTERMEDIATE SPACE CHALLENGE

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 411) supporting the goals and ideals of the Intermediate Space Challenge in Mojave, California.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 411

Whereas the Intermediate Space Challenge in Mojave, California, is a program designed to capture the imagination of youths regarding outer space;

Whereas the aspiration of the Intermediate Space Challenge is to introduce, instill, and energize youths' interest in the engineering, mathematics, and science career fields;

Whereas the Intermediate Space Challenge focuses on 4th, 5th, and 6th grade students during their formative years;

Whereas the Intermediate Space Challenge provides students the opportunity to visit the Mojave Air and Space Port, a 3,300 acre flight research center;

Whereas aviation legends and private space pioneers such as Burt Rutan, Dick Rutan, Brian Binnie, and Mike Melvill have worked with and spoken to students participating in the program;

Whereas the Intermediate Space Challenge enables students to work together in a team environment to choose a team name, create team banners, craft an essay, and develop and use their math and science skills to construct and launch a small rocket under appropriate supervision; and

Whereas the program judges student rocket teams on banner designs, essays, and rocket construction and performance: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of the Intermediate Space Challenge;

(2) commends the volunteers who run the Intermediate Space Challenge and the Mojave Air and Space Port for opening its facility to the young leaders of the future in the science and engineering fields; and

(3) encourages teachers and school administrators across the country to implement similar programs to stimulate students and infuse them with a love of engineering, mathematics, and science.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PLATTS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend and insert extraneous material on House Resolution 411 into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the goals and ideals of the Intermediate Space Challenge in Mojave, California. The Intermediate Space Challenge Program captures children's imaginations as it relates to science, math, space, and experimental learning.

The competition began in response to the Ansari X Prize manned spaceflight contest in 2004, won by Mojave's own SpaceShipOne in 2004. In twin flights from the Mojave Air and Space Port, the spacecraft designed by Burt Rutan took pilots Mike Melvill and Brian Binnie to space and back, claiming a \$10 million prize.

Marie Walker originally founded the Intermediate Space Challenge. She coordinated with Stu Witt, Mojave Airport's general manager, and they planned the first challenge in 2004. It has been a great success in the Mojave community. Now in its fifth year, students look forward to the annual competition, with younger students anticipating the time when they are old enough to participate.

The Intermediate Space Challenge hosts a student rocket launch competition, where fourth, fifth, and sixth-grade students compete to build a model rocket that reaches the highest point during launches. Points are awarded on rocket altitude, color, marketing strategy, and spirit. In some cases, the handmade rockets reach up to 600 before parachuting downward.

Individual awards are given in each category, with the overall winner announced at the end of the event. The challenge allows students to work in teams, create a team banner, craft an essay, and develop their small rocket. During the events, many of the students get a chance to view professional rockets and hear how they operate.

The Intermediate Space Challenge fosters great interest in science, in technology, in engineering, and in math among these students and certainly is expected to serve to develop the next great aerospace adventurer of our time.

Mr. Speaker, once again, I express my support for this resolution, and I want to thank Representative McCARTHY for bringing this resolution forward. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution, especially in light of our critical need for additional scientists, mathematicians, engineers and related professions. This program that we are recognizing through this resolution is so important to encouraging young people to pursue study in these fields.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 411, a resolution supporting

the goals and ideals of the Intermediate Space Challenge that takes place every year in Mojave, California.

Each May 4th, 5th and 6th graders from school districts around the Mojave Air and Spaceport gather at the Spaceport to show off their homemade rockets and compete to see how far the rockets can actually fly. Points get awarded based on altitude, color, marketing strategy, and spirit of the final product. The Challenge was designed to spark interest in the science and engineering career fields early in a student's educational career. The hands-on nature of the event allows students to see how the concepts they learn about in the classroom can be applied to actually make a rocket soar.

We have all heard about the critical need for American scientists, mathematicians, engineers and other professionals in the Science, Technology, Engineering or Math—STEM—fields for short. For that reason, we passed the America COMPETES Act last Congress. We have also continued to think about the importance of STEM throughout the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act and I expect it to be a big topic of conversation when we start on the reauthorization of No Child Left Behind. with several leaders in the area of STEM education on our Committee, such as Representatives EHLERS, McMORRIS-RODGERS and HOLT, we have ensured that programs such as the Adjunct Teacher Corps got incorporated into our education laws. Through the Adjunct Teacher Corps, we allow professionals in STEM fields to come into the classroom to teach or to provide ongoing professional development to classroom teachers who do not have that subject matter expertise. Programs like this and the others included in both the Higher Education Act and the America COMPETES Act demonstrate the federal government's commitment to trying to help fill the shortfall that currently exists in the STEM pipeline.

Programs such as the Intermediate Space Challenge show what local communities are doing to try and light that spark at an early age for students to become interested in STEM subjects. We should recognize these efforts and encourage other communities to utilize their own resources to develop hands-on projects. These types of projects show students how their classroom knowledge can be translated into real life applications. I support the goals and ideals put forward by the Intermediate Space Challenge and I encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the prime sponsor of this legislation, the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. McCARTHY).

Mr. McCARTHY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 411, a resolution I introduced that honors the goals and ideals of the Intermediate Space Challenge at the Mojave Air and Space Port located in my district in Mojave, California.

Mojave Air and Space Port has a long history of firsts, from Burt and Dick Rutan's collaboration on the Voyager around-the-world flight in 1986 to 2004's flight of SpaceShipOne, the first privately funded manned spacecraft.

Nearby are Edwards Air Force Base and China Lake Naval Weapons Center,

which are cutting-edge research and testing facilities that are continuing to push the envelope. In fact, when I visit the National Air and Space Museum here in Washington, D.C., I feel at home. There are so many aircraft from my district, like SpaceShipOne, Voyager, Chuck Yeager's Glamorous Glennis that broke the sound barrier, and the X-15, which, incidentally, we celebrated the 50th anniversary of the X-15's first flight yesterday.

The Intermediate Space Challenge started in 2005 under the direction of Marie Walker. Marie is the CEO of Fiberset, a Mojave company that manufactures composite products and components. She saw an opportunity in and around Mojave to bring together fourth, fifth and sixth-grade students with aerospace leaders to educate them and inspire them to become the next generation of aerospace pioneers. I am proud to recognize their hard work on this fifth anniversary year of the program, and I appreciate being able to participate.

Marie Walker and all those who have been instrumental in organizing and executing the Intermediate Space Challenge recognized the opportunities to grab the attention of our students through the Intermediate Space Challenge and get them interested in science and engineering.

Students work in teams to write an essay, create a banner, and then build and design a rocket. They get assistance from high school students as mentors, so the program engages students from multiple age groups. The teams of fourth, fifth and sixth-graders then compete both on rocket performance and on a team spirit. Paralleling the X-Prize's requirement for a privately funded manned spacecraft to go up into space twice in two weeks, students' rockets make two flights.

During the course of the events, the students hear from special guest speakers. Students have heard from aviation pioneers Burt and Dick Rutan and the SpaceShipOne astronauts in past years. Through the words and actions of these real, live aerospace heroes, students can see that the opportunities are limitless.

I appreciate the support of Chairman MILLER and Ranking Member MCKEON, who are also original cosponsors, and my colleague JIM COSTA, who has always been supportive of the activities at the Mojave Air and Space Port.

Congratulations to all the students who have participated in this event. I look forward to many more years of successful student rocket launches, and with that, I am proud to support and bring this resolution to the floor.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Pennsylvania have any further speakers?

Mr. PLATTS. I do have additional speakers, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. TONKO. I reserve my time.

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and I do rise to support the Intermediate Space Challenge.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, many of the young people that are growing up and participating in this are going to find they are going to grow up in a very different America than we have grown up in because of the increase in taxes that are taking place every single day and the way this crowds out opportunity for young people.

Indeed, my colleagues across the aisle have become the party of punishment, and that is what I am hearing from my constituents as I traveled across the Seventh Congressional District this past week, and they are very, very concerned.

What they are telling me is they know that clean air and clean water and clean energy are important, and, Mr. Speaker, I think we as politicians would say we are even for clean mud. We are just not for taxing people out of their house and home to pay for clean energy. And that is exactly what this cap-and-trade bill, or cap-and-tax, as we call it, cap our growth, tax our people, trade our jobs, and that is what it is going to do, as the Democrats put a price on the very air that we breathe.

The cap-and-trade bill that came out of the Energy and Commerce Committee last week, the Federal building standards that are in that bill are of concern to our Realtors, to our commercial property holders, knowing that there will be these standards that are going to be very, very difficult for them to comply with, knowing that there are going to be energy audits put on their houses, knowing that they are going to have to buy carbon credits if they don't have solar panels on their roof or a windmill in the yard, knowing that they literally are going to see the air that they breathe taxed.

As my colleague from Georgia had previously said, you know, groceries don't grow in a grocery store. They don't grow in a grocery store, Mr. Speaker; they grow out in the fields. They require this carbon dioxide in order to grow and be green and be healthy and provide the food and the forestation that we need here in the United States and certainly around the globe.

The cap-and-trade bill is something that is going to limit opportunity. It is something that we are going to see affect jobs and future jobs. We know that it is expected to cost us over 1 million jobs lost and that we are going to see our unemployment numbers rise substantially, and we are going to see our electricity rates go up by 90 percent.

When we were in committee, we offered an amendment that would have ended cap-and-trade if gas went over \$5 a gallon. Mr. Speaker, our colleagues across the aisle sought to defeat that.

We said, let's end it if unemployment goes past 15 percent, and our colleagues across the aisle said no, they were not going to end it if employment went past 15 percent.

We said, let's tell everybody what this costs, how much is it increasing the cost of your electric power, how much is it increasing the cost of the gas you buy, how much is it increasing the cost of the food you eat. And our colleagues across the aisle said no, they were not going to disclose that and vote for and support that amendment.

We even offered an amendment that would protect the innovators of tomorrow who are going to solve the energy issues that we have before us, and they sought not to provide that intellectual property protection for all these young boys and girls, many who are going through the Intermediate Space Challenge now, many who will be the innovators of tomorrow, who will solve the energy issues for future decades, who will create the electric cars.

Indeed, when you look at the electric cars and the lithium ion batteries, the three States that hold the most patents for furthering this invention are California, Ohio, and my great State of Tennessee. Intellectual property protection should have been provided for those. Many of those innovators of tomorrow are in this program that we are celebrating. It is very sad that the party of punishment doesn't provide the protection that those young men and women need to be the innovators of tomorrow.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Pennsylvania have any further speakers?

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Speaker, I have one additional speaker.

Mr. TONKO. I reserve my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I also rise in support today of what this would mean to our young people in this country. In my old State Senate district I represented an area in Erie County near Plum Brook Station, which is a large NASA testing facility. Just to the east of there, we had NASA Glenn, which is in Cuyahoga County.

The things that we can do and achieve in this country through the space program are limitless. However, if we stand by what we are seeing happening across Congress today with this cap-and-tax legislation, we are in trouble.

One of the things I am proud of is the fact that in my Fifth Congressional District I represent an area where we manufacture solar panels with First Solar. We have another company coming on line this fall that will also be in solar manufacturing. We also in my district have wind turbines, ethanol, hydrogen, biomass, and we are doing all these things in the alternative.

Also though it is very, very important in this country that we have that base load capacity that we have to have to be able to manufacture, that we have to have if we want to continue

to be able to be independent in this country, especially when we are talking about manufacturing in the new age of space. We have to make sure that we have these homegrown companies here today. It is going to be very, very difficult to do that if we don't have the manufacturing capacity and if we also don't have that base load capacity.

One of the things we have found, of course, is that we don't have that base load capacity in certain areas, and we also don't have the ability of being able to go out there on the nuclear facilities. I think 1977 was the last time that we had a nuclear facility permitted in this country. And the problem that we have today is if we want to have more nuclear, to be able to produce more power, to be able to keep our manufacturing capacity, it is going to be very tough to do, because a lot of these parts are no longer made in this country.

□ 1545

We have to go overseas to buy these if we can get them today. And some of the very large components are made in Japan. And there's a long waiting list because so many countries are out there wanting to build nuclear facilities and keep up that base load capacity. Why is it important?

Well, again, if we don't utilize that all-of-the-above policy of not only having the alternatives because we all want to make sure in this country that we have a clean environment, but we also want to make sure that we have nuclear, clean coal, oil, natural gas and geothermal.

We've all seen the headlines in the paper of course where, you know, CBO score saying that we're looking at \$846 billion on this new cap-and-tax, which would be a massive energy tax on the American people. But at the same time, as the gentlelady from Tennessee was just talking about, is the tremendous cost on individuals.

One of the analyses from the Heritage Foundation shows that they're looking at around a \$4,300 per year tax on an average family. And how do they get to that number? It says, our \$1,500 number is just the direct impact of household energy bills. Your energy bill, your natural gas bill, your home heating bill, and of course the amount of gas you put in your tank, and that would be around \$1,500.

But also, there is that ripple effect that goes through the economy that takes it up to \$4,300. And in the year 2035 alone, the cost is \$8,276, and the cost per family for the whole energy tax aggregated from 2012 to 2030 is \$116,680.

And compare it if we did not have a cap-and-tax, the real GDP losses increase an additional \$2 trillion, from \$7.4 trillion under the original draft to \$9.6 trillion under the new draft.

Compared to no cap-and-trade, the average economic or unemployment increases an additional 261,000 jobs, from

844,000 lost jobs under the original draft to 1.1 million jobs under the new draft.

Also, interesting enough in the paper today in the Washington Times is an article, "GDP hit found with cap, trade." This is from the Brookings Institution. "The Brookings Institution on Monday said cap-and-trade legislation to reduce carbon dioxide emissions would lower the Nation's gross domestic product in 2050 by 2.5 percent, compared with levels it would reach if the legislation is not implemented."

It also says that, "About 35 percent of crude-oil-related jobs and 40 percent of coal-related jobs would be lost in 2025."

It goes on to say: "It assumes that the majority of workers would find new jobs, but the net job loss would be 0.5 percent over the first 10 years that the legislation is in effect."

I don't think that this country can afford it because, again, to go on, you know, when you're looking at reducing the aggregate gross GDP by \$9.6 trillion, destroying 1.1 million jobs, raising electric rates, as the gentlelady from Tennessee just mentioned, by 90 percent after adjusting for inflation, seeing gasoline prices up to 74 percent, raising residential natural gas prices by 55—

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

Mr. PLATTS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. LATTA. I appreciate the gentleman for yielding.

—raising natural gas prices by 55 percent, raising an average family's annual energy bill by \$1,500, and again, increase the inflation-adjusted Federal debt by 26 percent, or \$29,150 additional Federal debt per person after adjusting for inflation.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Pennsylvania have any further speakers?

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, decades ago, a global space race inspired all sorts of ingenuity and innovation. It enabled this country to stretch its thinking, provide for lofty opportunities, and emerge with a higher level of status in the global community because it had won that space race.

Providing many, many opportunities, it is indeed the inspiration for today's House Resolution 411, as witnessed through the Intermediate Space Challenge in Mojave, California. Today, we have that same opportunity to stretch our thinking, to provide that loftiness, to be able to emerge with an innovation economy driven by another sort of global race, one called an energy race, which will find the winner to be the exporter of energy innovation, energy thinking, energy ideas, and energy intellect.

And so I think the moves forward by this House can perhaps inspire another

saga of intermediate space challenge. But today we recognize and support the goals and ideals of that great Intermediate Space Challenge through House Resolution 411.

I would encourage our colleagues to support this resolution. It is most meritorious.

I yield back my time, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 411.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSUMER ASSISTANCE TO RECYCLE AND SAVE ACT

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2751) to accelerate motor fuel savings nationwide and provide incentives to registered owners of high polluting automobiles to replace such automobiles with new fuel efficient and less polluting automobiles.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2751

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Consumer Assistance to Recycle and Save Act".

SEC. 2. TEMPORARY VEHICLE TRADE-IN PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration a voluntary program to be known as the "Consumer Assistance to Recycle and Save Program" through which the Secretary of Transportation (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Secretary"), in accordance with this Act and the regulations promulgated under subsection (d), shall—

(1) authorize the issuance of an electronic voucher, subject to the specifications set forth in subsection (c), to offset the purchase price or lease price for a qualifying lease of a new fuel efficient automobile upon the surrender of an eligible trade-in vehicle to a dealer participating in the Program;

(2) register dealers for participation in the Program and require all registered dealers—

(A) to accept vouchers as provided in this section as partial payment or down payment for the purchase or qualifying lease of any new fuel efficient automobile offered for sale or lease by that dealer; and

(B) in accordance with subsection (c)(2), to transfer each eligible trade-in vehicle surrendered to the dealer under the Program to an entity for disposal;

(3) in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, make electronic payments to dealers for eligible transactions accepted by such dealers, in accordance with the regulations issued under subsection (d); and

(4) in consultation with the Secretary of Treasury and the Inspector General of the Department of Transportation, establish and provide for the enforcement of measures to prevent and penalize fraud under the Program.

(b) QUALIFICATIONS FOR AND VALUE OF VOUCHERS.—A voucher issued under the Program shall have a value that may be applied to offset the purchase price or lease price for a qualifying lease of a new fuel efficient automobile as follows:

(1) \$3,500 VALUE.—The voucher may be used to offset the purchase price or lease price of the new fuel efficient automobile by \$3,500 if—

(A) the new fuel efficient automobile is a passenger automobile and the combined fuel economy value of such automobile is at least 4 miles per gallon higher than the combined fuel economy value of the eligible trade-in vehicle;

(B) the new fuel efficient automobile is a category 1 truck and the combined fuel economy value of such truck is at least 2 miles per gallon higher than the combined fuel economy value of the eligible trade-in vehicle;

(C) the new fuel efficient automobile is a category 2 truck that has a combined fuel economy value of at least 15 miles per gallon and—

(i) the eligible trade-in vehicle is a category 2 truck and the combined fuel economy value of the new fuel efficient automobile is at least 1 mile per gallon higher than the combined fuel economy value of the eligible trade-in vehicle; or

(ii) the eligible trade-in vehicle is a category 3 truck of model year 2001 or earlier; or

(D) the new fuel efficient automobile is a category 3 truck and the eligible trade-in vehicle is a category 3 truck of model year of 2001 or earlier and is of similar size or larger than the new fuel efficient automobile as determined in a manner prescribed by the Secretary.

(2) \$4,500 VALUE.—The voucher may be used to offset the purchase price or lease price of the new fuel efficient automobile by \$4,500 if—

(A) the new fuel efficient automobile is a passenger automobile and the combined fuel economy value of such automobile is at least 10 miles per gallon higher than the combined fuel economy value of the eligible trade-in vehicle;

(B) the new fuel efficient automobile is a category 1 truck and the combined fuel economy value of such truck is at least 5 miles per gallon higher than the combined fuel economy value of the eligible trade-in vehicle; or

(C) the new fuel efficient automobile is a category 2 truck that has a combined fuel economy value of at least 15 miles per gallon and the combined fuel economy value of such truck is at least 2 miles per gallon higher than the combined fuel economy value of the eligible trade-in vehicle and the eligible trade-in vehicle is a category 2 truck.

(c) PROGRAM SPECIFICATIONS.—

(1) LIMITATIONS.—

(A) GENERAL PERIOD OF ELIGIBILITY.—A voucher issued under the Program shall be used only in connection with the purchase or qualifying lease of new fuel efficient automobiles that occur between—

(i) the date of enactment of this Act; and
(ii) the date that is 1 year after the date on which the regulations promulgated under subsection (d) are implemented.

(B) NUMBER OF VOUCHERS PER PERSON AND PER TRADE-IN VEHICLE.—Not more than 1 voucher may be issued for a single person and not more than 1 voucher may be issued for the joint registered owners of a single eligible trade-in vehicle.

(C) NO COMBINATION OF VOUCHERS.—Only 1 voucher issued under the Program may be applied toward the purchase or qualifying lease of a single new fuel efficient automobile.

(D) CAP ON FUNDS FOR CATEGORY 3 TRUCKS.—Not more than 7.5 percent of the total funds made available for the Program shall be used for vouchers for the purchase or qualifying lease of category 3 trucks.

(E) COMBINATION WITH OTHER INCENTIVES PERMITTED.—The availability or use of a Federal, State, or local incentive or a State-issued voucher for the purchase or lease of a new fuel efficient automobile shall not limit the value or issuance of a voucher under the Program to any person otherwise eligible to receive such a voucher.

(F) NO ADDITIONAL FEES.—A dealer participating in the program may not charge a person purchasing or leasing a new fuel efficient automobile any additional fees associated with the use of a voucher under the Program.

(G) NUMBER AND AMOUNT.—The total number and value of vouchers issued under the Program may not exceed the amounts appropriated for such purpose.

(2) DISPOSITION OF ELIGIBLE TRADE-IN VEHICLES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—For each eligible trade-in vehicle surrendered to a dealer under the Program, the dealer shall certify to the Secretary, in such manner as the Secretary shall prescribe by rule, that the dealer—

(i) will arrange for the vehicle's title to be transferred to the United States and will accept possession of the vehicle on behalf of the United States;

(ii) has not and will not sell, lease, exchange, or otherwise dispose of the vehicle for use as an automobile in the United States or in any other country; and

(iii) will transfer, on behalf of the United States, the vehicle (including the engine block) and the vehicle's title, in such manner as the Secretary prescribes, to an entity that will ensure that the vehicle—

(I) will be crushed or shredded within such period and in such manner as the Secretary prescribes; and

(II) has not been, and will not be, sold, leased, exchanged, or otherwise disposed of for use as an automobile in the United States or in any other country.

(B) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) may be construed to preclude a person who is responsible for ensuring that the vehicle is crushed or shredded from—

(i) selling any parts of the disposed vehicle other than the engine block and drive train (unless the transmission, drive shaft, or rear end are sold as separate parts); or

(ii) retaining the proceeds from such sale.

(C) COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall coordinate with the Attorney General to ensure that the National Motor Vehicle Title Information System and other publicly accessible systems are appropriately updated on a timely basis to reflect the crushing or shredding of vehicles under this Act and appropriate re-classification of the vehicles' titles. The commercial market shall also have electronic and commercial access to the vehicle identification numbers of vehicles that have been disposed of on a timely basis.

(d) REGULATIONS.—Notwithstanding the requirements of section 553 of title 5, United States Code, the Secretary shall promulgate final regulations to implement the Program not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act. Such regulations shall—

(1) provide for a means of registering dealers for participation in the program;

(2) establish procedures for the reimbursement of dealers participating in the Program to be made through electronic transfer of funds for the amount of the vouchers as soon as practicable but no longer than 10 days after the submission of information supporting the eligible transaction, as determined appropriate by the Secretary;

(3) require the dealer to use the voucher in addition to any other rebate or discount advertised by the dealer or offered by the manufacturer for the new fuel efficient automobile and prohibit the dealer from using the voucher to offset any such other rebate or discount;

(4) require dealers to disclose to the person trading in an eligible trade in vehicle the best estimate of the scrappage value of such vehicle;

(5) require dealers to accept on behalf of the United States, and Transfer to the Secretary of the Treasury, the amount paid for scrappage of the vehicle up to \$60;

(6) permit the dealer to retain any amounts paid to the dealer for scrappage of the automobile in excess of the \$60 amount referred to in paragraph (5) and designate \$50 of such excess as payment for any administrative costs to the dealer associated with participation in the Program;

(7) clarify that dealers will not be reimbursed for any storage fees or other costs associated with their custodial handling of the eligible trade-in vehicle;

(8) consistent with subsection (c)(2), establish requirements and procedures for the disposal of eligible trade-in vehicles and provide such information as may be necessary to entities engaged in such disposal to ensure that such vehicles are disposed of in accordance with such requirements and procedures, including—

(A) requirements for the removal and appropriate disposition of refrigerants, anti-freeze, lead products, mercury switches, and such other toxic or hazardous vehicle components prior to the crushing or shredding of an eligible trade-in vehicle, in accordance with rules established by the Secretary in consultation with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, and in accordance with other applicable Federal or State requirements;

(B) a mechanism for dealers to certify to the Secretary that each eligible trade-in vehicle will be transferred by the dealer on behalf of the United States to an entity that will ensure that the vehicle is disposed of, in accordance with such requirements and procedures, and to submit the vehicle identification numbers of the vehicles disposed of and the new fuel efficient automobile purchased with each voucher;

(C) a mechanism for obtaining such other certifications as determined necessary by the Secretary from entities engaged in vehicle disposal; and

(D) a list of entities to which dealers may transfer eligible trade-in vehicles for disposal; and

(9) provide for the enforcement of the penalties described in subsection (e).

(e) ANTI-FRAUD PROVISIONS.—

(1) VIOLATION.—It shall be unlawful for any person to violate any provision under this Act or any regulations issued pursuant to subsection (d) (other than by making a clerical error).

(2) PENALTIES.—Any person who commits a violation described in paragraph (1) shall be liable to the United States Government for a civil penalty of not more than \$15,000 for each violation. The Secretary shall have the authority to assess and compromise such penalties, and shall have the authority to require from any entity the records and inspections necessary to enforce this program. In determining the amount of the civil penalty, the severity of the violation and the intent of the person committing the violation shall be taken into account.

(f) INFORMATION TO CONSUMERS AND DEALERS.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and promptly upon the update of any relevant information, the Secretary, in consultation with the Adminis-

trator of the Environmental Protection Agency, shall make available on an Internet website and through other means determined by the Secretary information about the Program, including—

(1) how to determine if a vehicle is an eligible trade-in vehicle;

(2) how to participate in the Program, including how to determine participating dealers; and

(3) a comprehensive list, by make and model, of new fuel efficient automobiles meeting the requirements of the Program. Once such information is available, the Secretary shall conduct a public awareness campaign to inform consumers about the Program and where to obtain additional information.

(g) RECORD KEEPING AND REPORT.—

(1) DATABASE.—The Secretary shall maintain a database of the vehicle identification numbers of all new fuel efficient vehicles purchased or leased and all eligible trade-in vehicles disposed of under the Program.

(2) REPORT ON THE EFFICACY OF THE PROGRAM.—Not later than 60 days after the termination date described in subsection (c)(1)(A)(ii), the Secretary shall submit a report to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate describing the efficacy of the Program, including—

(A) a description of program results, including—

(i) the total number and amount of vouchers issued for purchase or lease of new fuel efficient automobiles by manufacturer (including aggregate information concerning the make, model, model year) and category of automobile;

(ii) aggregate information regarding the make, model, model year, and manufacturing location of vehicles traded in under the Program; and

(iii) the location of sale or lease;

(B) an estimate of the overall increase in fuel efficiency in terms of miles per gallon, total annual oil savings, and total annual greenhouse gas reductions, as a result of the Program; and

(C) an estimate of the overall economic and employment effects of the Program.

(h) TREATMENT OF PAYMENT.—

(1) FOR FEDERAL AND STATE PROGRAMS.—A voucher under this Act or any payment made for such a voucher pursuant to subsection (a)(3) shall not be considered income and shall not be considered as a resource for the month of receipt and the following 12 months, for purposes of determining the eligibility of the recipient (or the recipient's spouse or other family or household members) for benefits or assistance, or the amount or extent of benefits or assistance, under any Federal or State program.

(2) FOR PURPOSES OF TAXATION.—A voucher under this Act, or any payment made for such a voucher pursuant to subsection (a)(3), shall not be considered as gross income of the purchaser of a vehicle under this Act for purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(i) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this Act—

(1) the term “passenger automobile” means a passenger automobile, as defined in section 32901(a)(18) of title 49, United States Code, that has a combined fuel economy value of at least 22 miles per gallon;

(2) the term “category 1 truck” means a non-passenger automobile, as defined in section 32901(a)(17) of title 49, United States Code, that has a combined fuel economy value of at least 18 miles per gallon, except that such term does not include a category 2 truck;

(3) the term “category 2 truck” means a large van or a large pickup, as categorized by

the Secretary using the method used by the Environmental Protection Agency and described in the report entitled “Light-Duty Automotive Technology and Fuel Economy Trends: 1975 through 2008”;

(4) the term “category 3 truck” means a work truck, as defined in section 32901(a)(19) of title 49, United States Code;

(5) the term “combined fuel economy value” means—

(A) with respect to a new fuel efficient automobile, the number, expressed in miles per gallon, centered below the words “Combined Fuel Economy” on the label required to be affixed or caused to be affixed on a new automobile pursuant to subpart D of part 600 of title 40 Code of Federal Regulations;

(B) with respect to an eligible trade-in vehicle, the equivalent of the number described in subparagraph (A), and posted under the words “Estimated New EPA MPG” and above the word “Combined” for vehicles of model year 1985 through 2007, or posted under the words “New EPA MPG” and above the word “Combined” for vehicles of model year 2008 or later on the fueleconomy.gov website of the Environmental Protection Agency for the make, model, and year of such vehicle; or

(C) with respect to an eligible trade-in vehicle manufactured between model years 1978 through 1984, the equivalent of the number described in subparagraph (A) as determined by the Secretary (and posted on the website of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration) using data maintained by the Environmental Protection Agency for the make, model, and year of such vehicle;

(6) the term “dealer” means a person licensed by a State who engages in the sale of new automobiles to ultimate purchasers;

(7) the term “eligible trade-in vehicle” means an automobile or a work truck (as such terms are defined in section 32901(a) of title 49, United States Code) that, at the time it is presented for trade-in under this Act—

(A) is in drivable condition;

(B) has been continuously insured consistent with the applicable State law and registered to the same owner for a period of not less than 1 year immediately prior to such trade-in;

(C) was manufactured in model year 1984 or later; and

(D) in the case of an automobile, has a combined fuel economy value of 18 miles per gallon or less;

(8) the term “new fuel efficient automobile” means an automobile described in paragraph (1), (2), (3), or (4)—

(A) the equitable or legal title of which has not been transferred to any person other than the ultimate purchaser;

(B) that carries a manufacturer's suggested retail price of \$45,000 or less;

(C) that—

(i) in the case of passenger automobiles, category 1 trucks, or category 2 trucks, is certified to applicable standards under section 86.1811-04 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations; or

(ii) in the case of category 3 trucks, is certified to the applicable vehicle or engine standards under section 86.1816-08, 86-007-11, or 86.008-10 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations; and

(D) that has the combined fuel economy value of at least—

(i) 22 miles per gallon for a passenger automobile;

(ii) 18 miles per gallon for a category 1 truck; or

(iii) 15 miles per gallon for a category 2 truck;

(9) the term “Program” means the Consumer Assistance to Recycle and Save Program established by this Act;

(10) the term “qualifying lease” means a lease of an automobile for a period of not less than 5 years;

(11) the term “scrapage value” means the amount received by the dealer for a vehicle upon transferring title of such vehicle to the person responsible for ensuring the dismantling and destroying the vehicle;

(12) the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Transportation acting through the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration;

(13) the term “ultimate purchaser” means, with respect to any new automobile, the first person who in good faith purchases such automobile for purposes other than resale;

(14) the term “voucher” means an electronic transfer of funds to a dealer based on an eligible transaction under this program; and

(15) the term “vehicle identification number” means the 17-character number used by the automobile industry to identify individual automobiles.

(j) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Transportation \$4,000,000,000 to carry out this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. SUTTON) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of over 2,000 men and women who work in the Ohio assembly plant in my district and approximately 50,000 Ohioans whose jobs are associated with that plant. I rise for the 159,000 Ohioans with auto-related jobs and the 3 to 5 million Americans who rely on the auto industry to provide for their families.

I rise today on behalf of the environment, as we turn the corner to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, improve fuel economy, and to help reduce our reliance on foreign oil.

I rise today on behalf of the consumers throughout our great country who continue to struggle during this global recession. And I rise today as the proud sponsor of the Consumer Assistance to Recycle and Save Act, also known as the CARS Act.

And I want to thank President Obama for his support of this legislation. And I want to thank Speaker PELOSI for supporting this effort and thank Majority Leader HOYER for all of the help that he has provided as we worked to deliver the benefits of this bill to the American people.

And I want to thank Chairman WAXMAN, Chairman MARKEY, Chairman Emeritus DINGELL, and Representatives ISRAEL, INSLEE, STUPAK and UPTON for their collaboration and sup-

port on this bill. And thank you to my colleagues, Representative CANDICE MILLER and Representative BRUCE BRALEY, who started this process with me back in March.

Mr. Speaker, the bipartisan CARS Act will shore up millions of jobs and stimulate local economies. It will improve our environment and reduce our dependence on foreign oil. It will provide much-needed financial assistance to consumers to trade in less fuel-efficient vehicles for vehicles which achieve a measured increased fuel-efficient.

What the CARS Act will not do is allow someone to trade in a vehicle and receive a voucher to purchase a vehicle that is less fuel efficient.

We have ensured environmental integrity in this bill, and this bill demonstrates that we do not have to bind ourselves to the arguments of the past. We no longer have to give in to the temptation of either/or thinking. The CARS Act demonstrates that we can free ourselves from the false argument of either you are for the environment or you are for jobs. We can do both. We must do both, and that's exactly what the CARS Act does.

2009 auto sales are down nearly 42 percent below the 2005 peak. We have not seen such a decline since 1955, and this decline jeopardizes our country's largest manufacturing industry.

These are not ordinary times. These times call for bold action. Three to 5 million jobs are at risk. Auto-related jobs number in the thousands in every State in our Nation, and though it's called the CARS Act, this bill is far more than about just cars. It's about people. It's about the millions of families in this great Nation who depend on the strength of our auto and related industries for their livelihood. It's about our friends and our neighbors, and it's about our communities that depend on auto-related jobs for their tax base to support their schools, their police, fire and other city services.

By passing the CARS Act, we can shore up these jobs, get customers back into the showrooms, help our dealers move cars, and improve the environment.

Nations across the world have instituted incentive programs. In May, while our auto sales in this country fell 34 percent, sales in Germany increased 40 percent after they instituted a program.

On May 19, the Committee on Energy and Commerce passed an amendment of the CARS Act to the American Clean Energy and Security Act by a bipartisan vote of 50-4.

Under the CARS Act, consumers will trade in less fuel-efficient vehicles and receive an electronic voucher for \$3,500 to \$4,500 at the point of sale toward the lease or purchase of a vehicle with increased fuel efficiency. Light-duty trucks, both small and large, also qualify under the program, and work trucks, often used by small businesses, will be eligible for replacement as well.

And though our fleet modernization program is open to vehicles, regardless of where they are made, I encourage everyone who participates in this program to think about the families who depend upon cars made in the United States and ask you to purchase a fuel-efficient vehicle assembled right here at home to help shore up jobs and help our environment.

Some refer to this bill as the “Cash for Clunkers” bill. Others use a gentler term, “fleet modernization.” But by any name, by any title, the CARS Act offers significant multiple benefits.

This bill has earned broad-based support. It has the support of Ford and GM and Chrysler, the United Auto Workers, the Business Round Table, the Automotive Trade Policy Council, the Ohio Automobile Dealers Association, Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company, PPG Industries, National Paint and Coatings Association, the Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers, Motor & Equipment Manufacturers Association, Specialty Equipment Market Association, the Association of International Automobile Manufacturers, the American Iron and Steel Institute, Automotive Recyclers Association, the United Steel Workers, the National Automobile Dealers Association, the American International Automobile Dealers, the National Association of Manufacturers, the AFL-CIO, and the United States Chamber of Commerce. These groups have provided letters of support for this bill, and Mr. Speaker, I would like to include them in the RECORD.

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 9, 2009.

Hon. BETTY SUTTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SUTTON: Ford Motor Company strongly supports the adoption of the Consumer Assistance to Recycle and Save Act of 2009 (CARS Act) introduced by Rep. Betty Sutton. This “cash-for-clunkers” proposal would provide an incentive to consumers to trade-in an older, less-efficient vehicle for a new, higher fuel-economy one.

During the recession, foreign and domestic automakers have experienced a steep decline in auto sales not seen in over fifty years. Last week, in fact, automakers reported that U.S. auto sales for May 2009 were down 33 percent from the same month a year ago. Action by Congress is urgently needed to jumpstart vehicle sales and the automotive sector of the U.S. economy.

The CARS Act would help consumers, support jobs and also improve the environment. Consumers will benefit from a robust incentive to purchase a new, more efficient vehicle and the cost savings from buying less fuel.

While the vouchers provide direct help to consumers, it also helps support jobs across the industry. Automakers, autoworkers, suppliers and dealers all benefit from increased sales and that's why the proposal has been endorsed by both labor and business, including the UAW and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

For the environment, the plan would help reduce fuel consumption and decrease emissions by taking old vehicles off the road and replacing them with new, cleaner ones. Plus, the program would have the added benefit of

generating as much as \$2 billion in needed sales tax revenue for the states. Thirteen governors have written Congressional leaders in support of rapid action on a cash-for-clunkers program.

The CARS Act is timely, temporary, and targeted and is urgently needed. We request that Members of Congress work to quickly enact this important legislation by voting “yes” on the CARS Act. Thank you for consideration of our views.

Sincerely,

PETER LAWSON,
Vice President, Government Relations.

JUNE 9, 2009.

HON. BETTY SUTTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN SUTTON: Chrysler LLC strongly supports the Consumers Assistance to Recycle and Save Act, H.R. 2751, that you have introduced. Your bill will establish a fleet modernization program that will encourage consumers to turn in older vehicles to be scrapped and receive in return a voucher to be used towards the purchase of cars and trucks with better fuel economy. The Act is designed to provide consumers with a wide variety of vehicles to purchase. Similar programs in other countries have helped to counter the effects of this global recession, while improving fleet-wide fuel economy. As such, the Act will greatly benefit consumers, dealers, automakers, and suppliers, while moving this country towards energy independence and environmental sustainability.

Your bill deserves broad bipartisan support, and we urge all members of the House to vote in favor of the Consumers Assistance to Recycle and Save Act.

Sincerely,

JOHN BOZZELLA,
Senior Vice President, Chrysler.

GENERAL MOTORS,
Washington, DC, June 8, 2009.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SUTTON: The House of Representatives will soon consider the Consumer Assistance to Recycle and Save (CARS) Act by Representatives Sutton, Dingell and Upton. I urge you to support this legislation which creates a carefully balanced fleet modernization program to stimulate U.S. auto sales and jump start the economic recovery.

This bill is supported by the Automotive Alliance, Automotive Trade Policy Council and all of their member companies (see attached letters). It includes input from the domestic and foreign brand auto companies and auto dealers.

Nearly every major industrial country around the world now has an emergency auto ‘scrapage’ program in place and the results have been immediate and impressive. In Europe and Latin America, these programs have been instantly successfully, with countries such as Germany seeing dealerships flooded with consumers and up to 400% increase in sales. In contrast, here in the U.S. auto sales have shown consistent declines of 30-40% from last year, month after month.

We believe this is an enormous win for consumers, for the American economy, and for our combined national commitment to environmental progress and stewardship. We urge you to support the Sutton, Dingell, Upton CARS bill.

Sincerely,

KEN W. COLE,
*Vice President, Global Public Policy
and Government Relations.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: This Tuesday the House is scheduled to take up fleet mod-

ernization (so-called “cash-for-clunkers”) legislation sponsored by Representative Betty Sutton. The UAW strongly urges you to vote for this important legislation.

The Sutton fleet modernization bill incorporates the compromise provisions that were agreed to by the Obama administration, House leaders, including Chairmen Waxman, Markey and Dingell, and Representatives Upton, Candice Miller, Stupak, Israel and Inslee. The provisions of this compromise were previously approved by the House Energy & Commerce Committee by an overwhelming, bipartisan vote.

By providing incentives for consumers to scrap older, less fuel efficient vehicles and to purchase new, higher mpg vehicles, this measure would result in significant reductions in oil consumption and greenhouse gas emissions. At the same time, it would provide an immediate boost to auto sales, thereby helping auto dealers and automotive production and jobs in this country. Significantly, the structure of this program is carefully crafted so it would apply to all auto companies in a balanced, competitively neutral manner.

Due to the financial and economic crises that have engulfed our nation, the auto industry has experienced a sharp drop in auto sales from over 16 million vehicles per year to less than 10 million. This has resulted in unprecedented difficulties for automakers, suppliers, dealers, workers and retirees. One immediate action that Congress can take to respond to this dire situation is to act promptly to pass the Sutton fleet modernization legislation. Accordingly, the UAW strongly urges you to vote for this measure when it is taken up by the House this Tuesday.

Sincerely,

ALAN REUTHER,
Legislative Director.

HON. BETTY SUTTON,
House of Representatives, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SUTTON: Mazda North American Operations urges the House to pass a fleet modernization, or “cash for clunkers,” bill that will benefit American consumers and increase vehicle sales, especially now when demand is extremely depressed. Additionally, older, less fuel-efficient models will be replaced by newer ones that are cleaner for the environment, more fuel-efficient, and include many new safety technologies. To that end, President Obama last week repeated his call to Congress to enact such legislation. We understand that Representative Sutton’s fleet modernization bill, which enjoys broad bipartisan support, will be considered on the suspension calendar as soon as tonight.

The bipartisan framework created by Representative Sutton’s bill, will achieve significant economic stimulus and environmental benefits. We would have preferred a simpler program that allowed broader participation with regard to the types of vehicles turned in and the replacement vehicles. In particular, we would have liked all vehicle leases to be included. Despite our concerns over the details of the current proposal, on balance, we believe Representative Sutton’s bill will result in incremental sales volume at a time when the industry is badly in need of assistance.

Around the world, consumers are already benefitting from similar programs, and the resulting economic stimulus has been significant. In January, Germany implemented a fleet modernization program. At the end of the first month of the program, sales in Germany were up 21% over 2008. Corresponding sales in the U.S. were down 41% for the same period. To date, 15 countries have enacted

automotive fleet modernization programs and many more are considering enactment.

A fleet modernization program can deliver real benefits to consumers, the environment and the economy. The U.S. is already well behind other major economies in adopting a fleet modernization program, and many buyers are now delaying purchase decisions until the Congress acts.

We urge you to vote for Representative Sutton’s fleet modernization bill.

Sincerely,

TIM O’SULLIVAN.

JUNE 5, 2009.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN SUTTON: On behalf of the automobile dealers in northeast Ohio, I want to offer our support of the “Consumer Assistance to Recycle and Save Act” (CARS Act). It is our understanding that this bill will be considered early next week and we urge its passage.

As you know, the current economic environment of automotive retailing has now reached historic lows in both sales and consumer confidence. This bill, also known as “Cash for Clunkers”, could well provide the needed incentive for consumers to trade in older vehicles and purchase more fuel efficient and safe automobiles.

Providing an incentive to stimulate sales is a critical step in the recovery of the automobile industry and congressional passage of the CARS Act represents an opportunity to benefit both the economy and the environment.

We very much appreciate your assistance and support of franchised new automobile dealers and urge Congress to act swiftly to stimulate the economy with this program.

Sincerely,

TERRY METCALF,
Executive Vice President.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: This Tuesday the House is scheduled to take up the Consumer Assistance to Recycle and Save (CARS Act) fleet modernization bill sponsored by Representative BETTY SUTTON. The United Steelworkers (USW) urges your support for this legislation.

The USW is the largest industrial union in North America and we represent more workers in the auto sector than any other union. Hundreds of thousands of our members work in jobs supplying the auto industry. From the glass, to the tires, to the plastic, to the hundreds of pounds of metal that comprise every vehicle; Steelworkers manufacture these products in locations all across the country. Even paper, the catalogs and brochures that the automakers use to market their vehicles, are often the product of the work of Steelworkers. But, countless other citizens—union and non-union—such as auto dealers, accountants, restaurant and shop owners, have their jobs tied to the auto industry.

The auto industry has experienced a sharp drop in auto sales from over 16 million vehicles per year to less than 10 million, resulting in extraordinary challenges for automakers, suppliers, dealers, workers, retirees and entire communities. Our members in the supply chain have suffered significant layoffs as a result of the financial and economic crises that brought auto buying to a halt. Those layoffs may only be the top of iceberg as the effects of the Chrysler and GM bankruptcies are to yet to be felt.

One immediate action Congress can take to respond to this dire situation is to vote to pass the Sutton fleet modernization bill which incorporates the compromise provisions that were agreed to by the Obama administration, House leaders, including Chairmen Waxman, Markey and Dingell, and Representatives Upton, Candice Miller, Stupak, Israel, and Inslee.

Providing incentives for consumers to scrap older, less fuel efficient vehicles and to purchase new, higher mpg vehicles, from all auto companies, will result in reductions in oil consumption and greenhouse gas emissions while providing an immediate boost to auto sales, thereby helping auto suppliers, dealers and automotive production and jobs in this country.

Sincerely,

HOLLY R. HART,
Legislative Director.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN SUTTON: This week, the House is likely to take up the Consumer Assistance to Recycle and Save (CARS) Act introduced by Representative Betty Sutton and a number of other colleagues. This bill will create a carefully balanced program to stimulate U.S. auto sales and jumpstart the economy. The Automotive Trade Policy Council and its member companies—Chrysler LLC, Ford Motor Company and General Motors Corporation—strongly support this bill and we urge you to vote for it.

Nearly every major industrial country around the world now has an emergency auto ‘scrapage’ program in place and the results have been immediate and impressive. In Europe and Latin America, these programs have been instantly successfully, with countries such as Germany seeing dealerships flooded with consumers and a 28% increase in sales. In contrast, here in the U.S. auto sales have shown consistent declines of 30-40% from last year, month after month.

The Sutton CARS bill will establish a well-crafted and balanced fleet modernization program. The CARS bill is a compromise measure resulting from months of work between the Administration, domestic and foreign brand auto companies, environmental organizations and auto dealers. The measure offers a solid program that will give consumers with older vehicles an immediate cash incentive from the U.S. government to purchase new more fuel efficient cars and trucks. In addition, the bill was structured to be environmentally progressive i.e., the incentives to consumers are higher for vehicles that achieve fuel economy ratings above current government CAFE standards.

The CARS legislation will both accelerate national economic recovery by creating an estimated one million new sales of fuel efficient vehicles and provide clear incentives to move toward our environmental goals more quickly.

This is a winner for consumers, for the American economy, and for our combined national commitment to environmental progress and stewardship. We thank you and urge you to vote for the Sutton CARS legislation.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN J. COLLINS,
President.

JUNE 8, 2009.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN SUTTON: On behalf of PPG Industries' 15,000 U.S. employees, and the 299 at our Barberton and Strongsville facilities in your district, I deeply appreciate your sponsorship of H.R. 1550, the Consumer Assistance to Recycle and Save Act, also known as the CARS Act, designed to help get the American automobile industry back on its feet by offering incentives for Americans to trade in their old cars for new, more fuel-efficient automobiles.

About 4 percent of the U.S. gross domestic product (GDP) is in the auto industry, making it the nation's largest manufacturing sector. PPG's automotive coatings and fiber glass are an important part of the auto supply chain. Last year, the U.S. auto industry provided hundreds of millions in sales and more than 1,260 manufacturing and research and development jobs to PPG.

As a global supplier of paints, coatings, chemicals, optical products, specialty materials, glass and fiber glass, our vision is to become the world's leading coatings and specialty products and services company. We operate on the leading edge of new technologies and solutions and are a streamlined, efficient manufacturer.

Members of the coatings and related industries have been particularly hit hard by the dramatic decrease in sales of new automobiles in America. While the auto manufacturers themselves have received almost all of the focus of attention—and deservedly so—there are countless suppliers to the industry who are hurting as well. The answer is to increase demand, which the CARS Act achieves with incentives for fuel efficient vehicles.

Again, thank you for your continued leadership on this issue. I look forward to continuing to work with you on policy matters important to the success of PPG, our employees and our retirees and their families.

Sincerely,

CHARLES E. BUNCH,
Chairman & Chief Executive Officer,
PPG Industries.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the AFL-CIO, I am writing to urge you to support legislation introduced by Rep. SUTTON to establish a fleet modernization program, which we expect the House to consider this week on the suspension calendar.

The Sutton bill would establish a program to provide incentives for consumers to scrap older, less fuel-efficient vehicles and purchase new, higher mile-per-gallon vehicles, resulting in significant reductions in oil consumption and greenhouse gas emissions. This “cash for clunkers” program would provide an immediate boost to auto sales, helping to preserve domestic auto production and American jobs.

The program is carefully crafted so it applies to all auto companies in a balanced, competitively neutral manner. The legislation in corporate compromise provisions agreed to by the Obama administration, House leaders (including Chairmen Waxman, Markey and Dingell), and Reps. Candice Miller, Stupak, Upton, Israel and Inslee. The House Energy & Commerce Committee recently approved the provisions of this compromise by an overwhelming, bipartisan vote.

Due to the financial and economic crises that have engulfed our nation, the auto industry has experienced a sharp drop in auto sales resulting in unprecedented difficulties for automakers, suppliers, dealers, workers and retirees. Congress can take immediate action to help the auto industry by promptly passing the “cash for clunkers” legislation. The AFL-CIO urges you to support Rep. Sutton’s fleet modernization bill.

WILLIAM SAMUEL,
Director, Government Affairs Department.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: The U.S. Chamber of Commerce strongly supports the “Consumer Assistance to Recycle and Save Act,” which is expected to be voted on tomorrow. This important legislation is urgently needed to help jumpstart U.S. auto sales, generate economic growth, and help protect jobs.

This bill would provide incentives to Americans to purchase new vehicles that meet a set of criteria to ensure that the new vehicles will be more fuel efficient than the vehicles they would replace. Not only would this “cash for clunkers” proposal provide an important environmental benefit, but the legislation would help an industry in crisis. The recession has affected industries across the United States, but the auto sector has

been particularly hard hit as industry sales have declined rapidly. U.S. light vehicle sales were more than 16 million units as recently as 2007. Last week, J.D. Power & Associates estimated that sales will not exceed 10 million units for all of 2009, an approximately 40 percent drop in just two years.

The auto industry is one of the most important sectors of the U.S. economy, representing four percent of the U.S. gross domestic product and accounting for one in 10 American jobs. The steep drop in vehicle sales is not only affecting foreign and domestic automakers and workers, but also their network of dealers, suppliers, vendors, and other businesses that provide goods and services to them.

The Chamber, the world’s largest business federation representing more than three million businesses and organizations of every size, sector, and region, urges you to support the Consumer Assistance to Recycle and Save Act. The Chamber may consider votes on, or in relation to, this issue in our annual How They Voted scorecard.

Sincerely,

R. BRUCE JOSTEN.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI: The Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers (Alliance) writes to urge the House to pass a fleet modernization, or “cash for clunkers,” bill to benefit American consumers as soon as possible. A well crafted fleet modernization program will provide two beneficial effects: helping to stimulate auto sales during the current economic/credit crisis and replacing older, less fuel-efficient vehicles with cleaner, safer, more fuel-efficient ones. To that end, President Obama last week repeated his call to Congress to enact such legislation, and we understand that Representative Sutton’s fleet modernization bill, which enjoys broad bipartisan support, will be considered on tomorrow’s suspension calendar.

While Alliance members would have preferred a program open to all new vehicles that meet the mileage targets, the bipartisan framework created by Representative Sutton’s bill, will achieve significant economic stimulus and environmental benefits, because it provides a broad array of eligible vehicles and will appeal to a large segment of consumers. Ultimately, oil savings and emissions reductions will happen only if buyers can use vouchers to buy vehicles that meet their needs.

Around the world, consumers are already benefitting from similar programs, and the resulting economic stimulus has been significant. In January, Germany implemented a fleet modernization program. At the end of the first month of the program, sales in Germany were up 21% over 2008. Corresponding sales in the U.S. were down 41% for the same period. As of this writing, fleet modernization programs have been adopted in China, Japan, UK, Brazil, Spain, Austria, France, Italy, Portugal, Romania and Slovakia, and are under consideration in several others.

A fleet modernization program can deliver real benefits to consumers, the environment and the economy. The U.S. is already well behind other major economies in adopting a fleet modernization program, and many buyers are now delaying purchase decisions until the Congress acts. We strongly urge the Congress to send a message to American car buyers by sending a bill to the President’s desk without delay.

We urge Representative Sutton to vote for Representative Sutton’s fleet modernization bill.

Sincerely,

DAVE McCURDY,
*President and CEO, Alliance of
Automobile Manufacturers.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SUTTON: On behalf of the Specialty Equipment Market Association (SEMA), we wish to extend our sincere appreciation to you for including a provision within the CARS Act to exclude vehicles of model year 1983 and earlier from the scope of the program. This provision serves to safeguard vehicles that may possess unique historic or aesthetic value qualities, and are irreplaceable to motor vehicle hobbyists and related businesses as a source of restoration parts.

SEMA also takes this opportunity to thank you and your staff for being available during the cash for clunker debate to discuss the challenges facing the entire scope of the automotive industry. We look forward to working with you on other auto industry issues in the future.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN B. McDONALD,
Vice President, Government Affairs.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SUTTON: The Association of International Automobile Manufacturers (AIAM) is pleased to support your "Cash for Clunkers" legislation. AIAM represents 13 international motor vehicle manufacturers who account for 35 percent of all light duty motor vehicles produced in the United States. AIAM members have invested over \$40 billion in U.S.-based production facilities, have over 6,500 locally owned dealerships, directly employ over 90,000 Americans, and indirectly generate almost 600,000 thousand U.S. jobs in dealerships and suppliers nationwide.

The automobile industry is experiencing one of the worst slumps in its history. Passage of a broad, stimulative, fleet modernization measure, as the President has requested, would help consumers purchase new more fuel efficient vehicles, reduce dealer inventories and provide a much needed boost to the industry and the economy. Ideally, this legislation should be administratively simple and cover as many new cars and light trucks as possible, whether purchased or leased. This type of approach has been implemented in numerous other countries with impressive results.

Again, we applaud you for your leadership on this issue and urge immediate passage of this much needed legislation.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL J. STANTON,
President & CEO.

JUNE 9, 2009.

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: On behalf of Business Roundtable, I am writing to support the fleet modernization bill proposed by Congresswoman Sutton that is expected to be considered by the House of Representatives today. This bill provides a financial incentive for consumers to purchase new and more energy efficient vehicles resulting in the removal of less energy efficient vehicles from the nation's highways. It will also increase needed jobs to spur the economy, reduce greenhouse gas emissions and increase national energy security. We believe that this legislation will give a boost to the economy at a time of great economic uncertainty. We also note that the legislation will be financed by the already allocated money in the stimulus package and will not require financing through additional deficit spending. Thank you for your leadership on this important subject.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL G. MORRIS,
Chairman, President and CEO,
American Electric Power Company, Inc.,
Chairman, Sustainable Growth Initiative,
Business Roundtable.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SUTTON: On behalf of the Automotive Recyclers Association (ARA), an international trade association representing over 4,500 automotive recycling facilities through memberships in the United States and fourteen other countries around the world, we are pleased to support the "Consumer Assistance to Recycle and Save Act" (CARS). This legislation seeks to address the distress of anemic motor vehicle sales that have generated negative economic issues throughout our country.

The CARS Act allows for the reuse of nearly all parts from the vehicles retired under the program. The recovery, recycling, and resale of automotive parts are important because it maximizes the availability of replacement parts. Consumers and businesses rely on parts from recycled vehicles because of their substantial savings in reduced repair costs and lower insurance premiums.

ARA looks forward to working with staff from your office and others as the regulatory phase of this program moves forward. We believe there are important issues regarding the adequate handling of these vehicles under the National Motor Vehicle Title Information System (NMVTIS) and steps to ensure that these vehicles are properly handled environmentally that need particular attention during the rulemaking process.

On behalf of its members, ARA thanks you for your consideration of the concerns of America's automobile recyclers, and we look forward to working with you on this legislation.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL E. WILSON,
Executive Vice President.

JUNE 9, 2009.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The National Association of Manufacturers (NAM)—the nation's largest industrial trade association—supports the Consumer Assistance to Recycle and Save Act (H.R. 2751), which is scheduled to be voted on today. This legislation would provide incentives for the purchase of new, fuel efficient motor vehicles. The auto industry represents the country's largest manufacturing base and we believe H.R. 2751 will help jump start the industry and save well paying jobs by stimulating the production and sales of new cars and trucks.

As you well know, the auto industry currently faces challenges of historic proportions. Over the past 16 months, retail sales of motor vehicles have fallen 26 percent, vehicle production has fallen 41 percent and the sector has lost 281,000 jobs. Nearly a fifth (17%) of the 1.6 million manufacturing jobs lost during this recession has come from the auto sector.

At the same time, the industry is critical to our nation's economic recovery and future growth. Almost four percent of U.S. gross domestic product is auto-related. One out of every 10 U.S. jobs, or about 13 million, is auto-related, and auto workers receive \$335 billion annually in compensation. In 2006, the motor vehicle sector spent \$16.6 billion in R&D alone.

By providing temporary incentives for the purchase of new more fuel efficient vehicles, this fleet modernization amendment will provide a much-needed boost to the struggling auto industry, including manufacturers, dealers, suppliers and other related industries.

NAM members believe strongly that a vibrant manufacturing sector is key to our nation's economic recovery and future growth. Similarly, a revitalized auto industry is key to a strong manufacturing sector. This legislation, which provides timely targeted tax

incentives to jump start the auto industry, will help get our nation's economy back on track and ensure job creation and sustainable economic growth. Thank you in advance for supporting this important bill.

Sincerely,

DOROTHY COLEMAN,
Vice President, Tax &
Domestic Economic Policy.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN SUTTON: On behalf of the more than 17,000 members of the National Automobile Dealers Association (NADA), I want to offer our support for your bill establishing a temporary vehicle fleet modernization (also known as "Cash for Clunkers") program. It is our understanding that this bill will be considered in the U.S. House of Representatives sometime today.

As you may know, the current state of all automotive retailing is dire and consumer confidence is near historic lows. When measured on a per capita basis, annual sales of new vehicles have reached levels not seen since World War II. A successful fleet modernization program could well encourage hundreds of thousands of consumers to trade in older vehicles in return for an incentive to purchase more fuel-efficient, safer vehicles. This program is modeled after several successful programs in other states and in other countries.

We very much appreciate the time and attention you have devoted to bringing together a broad coalition of stakeholders into the legislative process and to developing a workable program. As the bill moves forward, NADA is committed to working with you to ensure legislation is passed by Congress and signed into law. We will also need the same sense of urgency that you brought to the legislative process as this important initiative moves through the regulatory process within the Department of Transportation.

Thank you again for your help and support of America's franchised new automobile dealers.

Sincerely,

DAVID W. REGAN,
Vice President, Legislative Affairs,
National Automobile Dealers Association.

THE GOODYEAR TIRE AND
RUBBER COMPANY,
Akron, OH.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SUTTON: I am writing to thank you for your personal help in sponsoring the Consumer Assistance to Recycle and Save Act (CARS) Act and respectfully ask that Congress take swift action to pass this important legislation.

Passage of this measure will provide immediate assistance to the automobile industry by providing direct support incentives to consumers to purchase new fuel efficient vehicles. With estimates that the CARS Act will provide incentives for Americans to purchase approximately one million new cars and light trucks, this action by Congress will provide an immediate and timely boost to the automobile industry.

Similar legislation offered by you in the House Energy and Commerce Committee was passed by a 50-4 bipartisan vote, showing widespread support for this program.

On behalf of Goodyear and our associates across the United States, thank you for your continued support and assistance. I look forward to continuing to work with you on this and other issues of importance to Goodyear.

Sincerely,

ISABEL H. JASINOWSKI.

THE OHIO AUTOMOBILE DEALERS
ASSOCIATION,

June 5, 2009.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN SUTTON: On behalf of our members in your district as well as those throughout Ohio, I am writing to voice our strong support for your "Consumer Assistance to Recycle & Save" proposal, which we understand may receive full House consideration in the near future.

It's no secret Ohio's auto sales are weak, which impacts both our industry as well as Ohio's state and local governments. Your proposal encourages the removal of older vehicles from the road in favor of more fuel-efficient and safe vehicles, which benefits consumers, our industry and the environment.

Thanks again for your strong leadership on this proposal and your support of Ohio's automobile retail industry.

Sincerely,

TIM DORAN,
President.

JUNE 9, 2009.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Support H.R. 2751, the Consumer Assistance to Recycle and Save Act—Automobile dealerships across the country again watched sales decline in May—for the first time in 2009 no single brand saw an improvement over 2008 sales. U.S. sales dropped by an average of 33.7 percent this month, setting the seasonally adjusted annual sales rate (SAAR) at 9.9 million vehicles. Annual sales for 2008 was 13.8 and 2007 was 16.4 million units. I start off reporting these numbers so you can better understand the urgency of my request—we need a "cash for clunkers" program now.

The American International Automobile Dealers Association (AIADA), representing 11,000 international nameplate automobile franchises and their more than 500,000 employees, write today urging you to vote to support the cash for clunkers legislation introduced by Congresswoman Betty Sutton, the Consumer Assistance to Recycle and Save Act, H.R. 2751. The entire auto industry needs to focus fully on recovery. The first element of that recovery is incentivizing customers to buy. Today, we look to the House of Representatives to do just that by passing a cash for clunkers plan that will quickly and effectively stimulate sales.

Done with the right balance, cash for clunkers is an opportunity to benefit both the economy and the environment. AIADA, and its dealer members, support H.R. 2751, the Consumer Assistance to Recycle and Save Act, and again urge you and your colleagues to act swiftly to stimulate the economy with this program and pass this legislation.

Sincerely,

CODY L. LUSK,
President.

UAW LOCAL 2000.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN SUTTON: I, on behalf of the working men and women of Ohio Assembly Plant and the approximate 50,000 Ohioans whose jobs are associated with the Ohio Assembly Plant, write to express all of our gratitude to you for your work on and for support of the Consumer Assistance to Recycle and Save Act (CARS Act).

Passage of this important legislation will not only help the consumer and public by putting cars on the road that run cleaner and maintain better fuel efficiency, but it will provide assistance by boosting car sales to the struggling auto industry in America. This will also help to create a safer driving atmosphere as the older and potentially dangerous vehicles on our roads are replaced with new ones.

The authors of this legislation should be highly commended for their efforts in pro-

viding equal support for ALL the auto companies in a competitively neutral manner. The members of Local 2000 wish to extend our thanks to you for your continual efforts where the security of our jobs at Ohio Assembly Plant and the safety and well being of the citizens of the 13th District and the entire country are concerned.

If the members of UAW Local 2000 or I can assist you in these efforts in any way in the future, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Very truly yours,

JIM DONOVAN,
President.

Mr. Speaker, we must pass the bipartisan CARS Act today for our workers, for our environment, for consumers, for our economy, for our country.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate my colleague from Ohio and my colleague from Michigan, Mrs. MILLER. This is not the perfect bill, but this is it. There is no plan B. This is not the original bill that Ms. SUTTON and Mrs. MILLER introduced, but this is the bill that passed our committee 50-4.

One in 10 jobs in America are auto-related. In the last couple of years now, particularly through this tough recession, we have lost one in five manufacturing jobs, and certainly the Midwest has been critically hurt.

The auto sector, we've seen auto sales plummet from 17 million car sales just 2 or 3 years ago to probably what will be less than 10 million, not only this year, but next year as well. Not only the Big 3 supports this, but Toyota, Honda, the Chamber, a whole number of different groups, the UAW, the Auto Manufacturers, the National Association of Manufacturers, the auto dealers as well. You know what this bill is? It's a jobs bill.

□ 1600

But more important than that, it's an American jobs bill, and it's time to stop the dominos from falling the wrong way and beginning to turn the switch from "red" to "green" for auto jobs and get something in the hands of consumers that will boost their confidence.

Now, who else has done this bill? Well, 16. And guess what? The sales are up. Germany, sales have increased by 40 percent; France, sales are up March through May; the UK, Japan, China, Korea, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Malaysia, Austria, Romania, Luxembourg, The Netherlands. Even Slovakia, auto sales have increased by some 18 percent.

Madam Speaker, this is a very good bill. It's one that has bipartisan support. It's time to put American jobs first and begin to move this process forward. We know we have a majority in this House for this bill. The question is do we have two-thirds. I would like to think we do. This is it. We're not going to have another bill. It's not going back to Rules. We need to pass this.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SUTTON. At this time, it's my honor to yield 1 minute to the gentleman, my colleague from Ohio (Mr. BOCCIERI).

Mr. BOCCIERI. Madam Speaker, this bill is about putting America first. We heard this all throughout the last campaign about how we need to invest in America and we need to protect American jobs. And Congresswoman BETTY SUTTON has stood up for American jobs, and she is putting new meaning to "putting old Betty back in the garage and putting new cars on our streets." That's why it's imperative that the auto industry, especially in Ohio, be preserved under this bill. Twenty-five percent of Ohio's economy is based on how well or how poorly the automotive industry performs. There were 560,000 new vehicle registrations alone last year in Ohio. That averages to more than \$24 million per dealership in Ohio.

This bill is about putting America first and putting Americans back in American-built cars. I will be proud to support this bill today on the House floor.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Speaker, I would yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Republican whip, Mr. CANTOR from Virginia.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Madam Speaker, I rise in reluctant opposition to this bill. It was my sincere hope that this bill would have come to the floor under a process that would have allowed Members to offer amendments. Had we been permitted to do so, I would have offered an amendment to allow individuals to use the credit for the purchase of a fuel-efficient, previously owned vehicle. Even after a generous credit, for many American families, a new car is financially out of reach. Yet with gas prices rising again, these families deserve the same opportunity to upgrade their current vehicle to a more fuel-efficient model. For these families, the credit that can be used towards the purchase of a fuel-efficient, pre-owned car could make all of the difference.

Indeed, there is already a substantial inventory of previously owned, fuel-efficient vehicles on dealer lots available for purchase. As a result, these purchases will promote the goals of the program by increasing the number of fuel-efficient vehicles on the road. It is also important to remember that the livelihood of tens of thousands of Americans depend on the used car market.

Used car sales outnumber new car sales 3-1 in the U.S., and there are more than twice as many used car dealers as new car dealers in this country. Treating cars that meet the same fuel-efficiency standards differently, based on whether they are new or previously owned, effectively picks winners and losers among these dealers. Given the difficult economic situation faced by all Americans, I do not believe that it is wise or necessary to reward some Americans while punishing others.

If we were to expand this bill to include the purchase of previously owned vehicles, it would truly be a win-win. As it helps the environment by encouraging more fuel-efficient vehicles, it would also help ease our dependence on foreign oil, and it would provide another incentive to help jump-start the economy.

Madam Speaker, I'm saddened I was not permitted to offer my amendment, but I'm hopeful as this bill works its way through the process we can work to address the concerns of those who make their living selling previously owned vehicles.

Ms. SUTTON. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time we have.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. BALDWIN). The gentlewoman from Ohio controls 13 minutes, and the gentleman from Michigan controls 16 minutes.

Ms. SUTTON. It's my honor, Madam Speaker, to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, Chairman WAXMAN.

Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you very much for yielding time for me to speak in favor of H.R. 2751, the CARS Act.

I worked closely with Representative SUTTON and other members of our committee to negotiate this legislation, and I believe it hits the trifecta: it's good for the economy, good for consumers, and good for the environment.

For the auto industry, it means a big leap in sales right when the industry needs it most. CBO estimates that this program will help sell 600,000 cars, many of them made right here in America. It's no wonder that the Big Three, the UAW, and the auto industry support the bill. For consumers, it means a chance to get rid of the old gas guzzling clunker and receive a voucher worth up to \$4,500 to get a new, more fuel-efficient car. The better gas mileage, the higher the subsidy. And for the environment, it means a win. With every new sale, every car or truck sold under this program will be more fuel efficient or cleaner than the car or truck it replaces.

I appreciate the work of Representative SUTTON and my other colleagues on the committee for this legislation. I want to acknowledge their efforts on behalf of the American auto industry and American autoworkers. This legislation was an amendment added to the ACES energy bill passed by our committee by a strong bipartisan 50–4 vote.

I ask my colleagues to vote “yes”: “yes” for the economic benefits of the bill, “yes” for the benefits of consumers, and “yes” for the improvement in environmental quality.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Speaker, at this point, I would like to yield to 2 minutes to one of the cofounders of the Manufacturing Caucus and certainly a member of the Automotive Caucus, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO).

Mr. MANZULLO. Madam Speaker, this bill will spur auto sales and revitalize our manufacturing sector. With-

out a strong manufacturing sector, we will not have an economic recovery. While I would have preferred a simple \$5,000 voucher for any new car purchase, Congresswoman BETTY SUTTON moved this bipartisan bill so it really stimulates the economy because it sets the chain of supply into motion. It gets people back to work in our factories. If the first-time home buyer tax credit for \$8,000 is working to spur the housing market, just think what this will do for the auto industry.

Stimulating sales is the only way to get the auto industry back on its feet—not further top-down infusions of money from the top. The bill gets the American people involved because it's bottom-up. It sets the fire of manufacturing. It gets us going again. And even if somebody does not want to buy an automobile, this person will still indirectly benefit from the positive ripple effect.

Look what happens when 1 million automobiles are sold in America today. The Caliber—proudly built in the 16th Congressional District of Illinois, along with the two smaller Jeeps—the sale of 1 million automobiles in this country means 60,000 people go back to work, \$1.4 billion is returned in sales tax to the State and local governments, \$750 million in Federal taxes is paid by the workers and savings of unemployment, COBRA, food stamps and job training of almost \$3 billion. This bill almost pays for itself.

But the beauty of it is the fact that it returns the supply chain. It gets people working again. It gets the economy moving again. Instead of communities having to come to Washington looking for money, the money gets restocked simply because of the payment of the taxes.

Vote for H.R. 2751. This is a real stimulus.

Ms. SUTTON. Madam Speaker, at this time it's my honor to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) 2 minutes.

Mr. KILDEE. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2751, the Consumer Assistance to Recycle and Save Act. This bill will provide incentives for the purchase of new, more efficient vehicles helping to revitalize our auto industry, preserve jobs, and clean up our environment. The need for this bill could not be greater. As we all know too well, our domestic industry has been suffering a prolonged downturn, and our families are feeling the effects. The recent bankruptcy filings by Chrysler and General Motors further underscore the critical need for action.

H.R. 2751 will provide consumers with up to \$4,500 in vouchers for trading in their old vehicles and purchasing new, more fuel-efficient models. Not only will this provide a much-needed boost to the auto industry, including manufacturers, dealers, and suppliers, but it will help preserve jobs in our communities.

Additionally, we are cleaning up the environment by reducing our demand on foreign oil. I have always said that what America drives drives America. And I am committed to a strong and vibrant automobile industry. This legislation will help us get through this difficult time and get our automakers on the path to being the economic engine that has driven the American economy.

I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on this important legislation.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Speaker, at this point I would yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from the great State of Michigan, who was an original author with Ms. SUTTON of the first bill, Mrs. MILLER, for 2 minutes.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in very strong support of this bill that will help support American jobs. We all understand the challenges facing our auto industry. This industry, which is so vital to our national economy, has been hit literally by an economic hurricane which has caused hardships not only for the automakers, but also the suppliers, the dealers, and everyone who has a stake in this industry and its success.

This legislation is a very strong bipartisan approach that will help get the assembly lines moving, keep traffic in the showrooms, protect jobs, and give our economy a desperately needed jolt. And how do we know that it will work? Because it has already been implemented in nations across the globe. Because in every nation that has implemented a similar program, auto sales have risen, and in every nation that has not—like us—the sales continue to fall. That's why this legislation has the strong support of groups like the UAW, the National Auto Dealers, Ford, General Motors, Chrysler, Mazda, the Alliance of Automotive Manufacturers, the Association of International Automobile Manufacturers, the National Paint and Coatings Association, the Motor and Equipment Manufacturer's Association, the Specialty Equipment Manufacturing Association, the American Iron Steel Institute, the AFL, the CIO, the Chamber of Commerce. I could go on and on.

And why do they all support this legislation? Because they understand that the best way to jump-start our economy is to get auto sales moving. The plight of the auto industry is a national problem affecting our entire Nation. And we know this because of the troubles of Chrysler and General Motors dealers across the Nation that are being closed with countless jobs being lost. We know this because suppliers who serve the industry are struggling to stay afloat with countless more jobs being lost and at risk. And we know this because two of our iconic industrial giants—both Chrysler and General Motors—are today in bankruptcy court.

All of these providers are clamoring for action, and they deserve the help of

this Congress. Simply put, we must act. So let us support legislation that will protect American manufacturing jobs. And this legislation will also give our economy the boost that it needs. I certainly do want to thank my colleagues for all of their support. And I urge support of this passage.

Ms. SUTTON. Madam Speaker, at this time it is my honor to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished chairman emeritus and a leader in this effort as well, the gentleman from Michigan, Congressman John DINGELL.

(Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this fine, bipartisan bill, the Consumer Assistance to Recycle and Save Act, authored by my friend and colleague, Ms. SUTTON of Ohio. I commend her and her bipartisan cosponsors for their work on behalf of this.

The bill has the support of the Obama administration, the UAW, domestic and foreign automobile manufacturers, suppliers, and dealers.

□ 1615

It also will result in meaningful reductions in vehicle fleet carbon emissions and fuel consumption while providing much-needed stimulus to our ailing automakers and economy.

I express my deep gratitude to Chairman WAXMAN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. STUPAK, as well as Representatives SUTTON, ISRAEL and INSLEE, for their collaborate, collegial approach during the negotiations on the legislation. And I want to commend my friend, Mr. UPTON, and others of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle as well as the entire Michigan delegation, for their work on behalf of this.

This legislation cannot wait. The longer it is put off, the more auto sales will be depressed. And consumers who are excited about this proposal will continue to wait for Congress to pass this bill before buying that new car that we want them to have.

In view of the unprecedented turmoil faced by the domestic automakers and growing imperatives to address global warming, Ms. SUTTON's fleet modernization bill stands out as a really practical mechanism by which to achieve consumer savings, reduce fuel consumption, lower carbon dioxide and criteria pollutant emissions, as well as increase sales for a critical sector of the national economy. Indeed, in countries such as Germany, fleet modernization programs have been wildly successful in all of these areas.

This is a good bill. It will help us with the environment, and it will help us with employment. It will see to it that the United States moves forward rapidly towards a full and adequate recovery from this terrible recession in which we find ourselves.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I commend its author again.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ala-

bama and a member in good standing of the Auto Caucus, Mr. ROGERS.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. I rise today to offer my reluctant support of the Consumer Assistance to Recycle and Save Act, also known as the Cash for Clunkers program.

All of us have witnessed the devastation felt by our automotive sector. In my home State of Alabama, as in many other States, workers have lost their jobs or had their hours cut. Many hard-working dealers have simply been forced to close their doors.

To help protect our jobs and stimulate the automotive sector, we must work to stimulate consumer credit markets and restore consumer confidence. That is why I recently introduced my bill, the Consumer Auto Relief Act. Unlike the bill we are considering today, my proposal would help all sectors of the automotive industry.

In addition to offering tax credits to working families to help purchase new vehicles, the bill would also help incentivize lenders to finance new vehicles. The bill would also place no limitations on eligibility to participate in the program. Unfortunately, my bill is not what is on the floor today. Nonetheless, despite my reservations about H.R. 2751, I believe that passing it is better than doing nothing, but not by much. I offer my support for the bill and urge its passage.

Ms. SUTTON. Madam Speaker, it is my honor to now yield 1 minute to the distinguished Speaker of the House to speak on this bill, Speaker NANCY PELOSI.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentlelady for yielding. I commend her for her tremendous leadership in putting together this legislation that we have before us. She, Representative ISRAEL and Representative INSLEE all worked very hard to come to a position that we can all support today. Mr. MARKEY is here of the Select Committee, and of course Mr. DINGELL, the Chair Emeritus of the Energy and Commerce Committee. Others, Mr. BRALEY, Mr. STUPAK—well, all of our colleagues have had an important role—Mr. KILDEE and our colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle. Hopefully we will have a good, strong bipartisan vote today on this legislation.

Because you all have given us an opportunity to pass legislation that is a benefit to our economy and a benefit to our environment, we can create and save jobs while addressing the air pollution issue, so important to our children's health. We will do this by allowing Americans to trade in their own gas-guzzling vehicles and receive vouchers worth up to \$4,500 to help pay for the new, more fuel-efficient cars and trucks.

I will go into some specifics—I know we've heard it over and over again, but this CARS bill is quite a remarkable piece of legislation, and the timing is perfect. And when they trade in these cars, they will strengthen America's auto industry, creating jobs and reduc-

ing layoffs, and save more than 250 million gallons of gas. This has been tried and true around the world in recent months with great success. In Germany, for example, it boosted auto sales by 20 percent.

Because this legislation will deliver consumer savings, increase vehicle demand, help save American jobs while cutting greenhouse gas emissions and reducing our dependence on foreign oil, it is supported by a broad coalition. That coalition includes the Big Three automakers, the United Auto Workers, car dealers, business groups such as the National Association of Manufacturers, the Chamber of Commerce, and, in the lead, the Obama administration.

Today, with this legislation, we will ensure a strong American manufacturing base. As much as anything that we can do in terms of addressing the issue of the auto industry in our country, this is a national security issue. The auto industry's success is essential to ensuring that we have a strong manufacturing base. This legislation today will ensure that we have a strong manufacturing base and get more fuel-efficient vehicles on the road, which is essential to our economy, to our national security, and a clean, green future.

I commend my colleagues once again. I commend Congresswoman SUTTON for her determination to accelerate the pace of when we would bring this legislation to the floor and urge strong bipartisan support for the bill, which it certainly deserves.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time is left on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan controls 11 minutes, and the gentlewoman from Ohio controls 7 minutes.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, this bill is a bad idea spawned by a bad idea that was spawned by still yet another bad idea—and it will likely spawn a lot of other bad ideas in the future.

The first bad idea was to bail out the auto industry in the first place. The second bad idea was for the government to essentially take over the auto industries. We all know that government is not very good at manufacturing anything, so it has to manufacture demand. And that's what this bill is about. It is defying the laws of economics and saying we can manufacture enough demand to keep the auto industries afloat without other measures that they need to take to stay afloat. We can't simply manufacture demand any more than we can defy any of the other laws of economics.

A list was given of those who support this legislation. It says it has broad support from Ford, GM, Chrysler, the Automobile Dealers Association, the labor unions, the Chamber of Commerce. Can anybody tell me honestly if

anybody on that list has ever turned down a government subsidy of any type? I would submit I've never heard it, not in the time that I've been here. So it shouldn't surprise anybody that this list of individuals or organizations supports this legislation. That doesn't mean that we should. We have a duty to represent the taxpayers as well here.

I should note that just this morning there was a press conference about PAYGO—pay-as-you-go, don't pay out anymore than you take in. Where is the money going to come from for this? Perhaps that's why it is on the suspension calendar so that what should govern this place—what kind of PAYGO rules that we have—don't actually apply. But you've got to pay the piper at some point, and we simply can't continue to go down this road.

Madam Speaker, this is a bad idea. This is a clunker of a bill that ought to be retired, and we ought to apply the cash toward our unsustainable deficit.

Ms. SUTTON. Madam Speaker, it is my honor to yield 1 minute to the distinguished chairman from Massachusetts, Chairman MARKEY.

Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts. I thank the gentlelady, and I congratulate the gentlelady for her excellent work on this legislation.

To Mr. DINGELL, to Mr. INSLEE, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. ISRAEL, to Mr. BRALEY, to Mr. WAXMAN, this is truly the work of a lot of people coming together. And ultimately, the approach has produced a win-win-win situation: a win for our consumers who get a new, more efficient vehicle; a win for reducing our dependence on imported oil; and a win for an industry struggling to regain its footing. And I will add one more win because it is always a win when Members from the Rust Belt and the two coasts can join together and come up with a compromise that all sides can support.

The price of a gallon of gasoline is rising inexorably, back up to \$4 a gallon. It has gone up \$1 at the pump on a national average since December. The price of a barrel of oil has gone from \$30 to \$69 since December. This is the kind of bill we need to put in place. My congratulations to the gentlelady.

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

Ms. SUTTON. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time the gentleman from Michigan controls.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan controls 9 remaining minutes, and the gentlewoman from Ohio 6 remaining minutes.

Ms. SUTTON. Madam Speaker, at this time, it is my honor to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, Chairman BART STUPAK.

Mr. STUPAK. Madam Speaker, as one of the authors of H.R. 2751, I urge support of the Cash for Clunkers program that will provide cash vouchers of up to \$4,500 at auto dealerships for consumers who trade in aging, less fuel-efficient automobiles and replace them with modern fuel-efficient models.

The Cash for Clunkers program accomplishes a dual task of reducing emissions and stimulating sales in the auto industry. I applaud Congresswoman SUTTON for her leadership on this important issue. And I appreciate the support of Chairman WAXMAN, Chairman Emeritus DINGELL, Chairman MARKEY, Chairman INSLEE, and Majority Leader HOYER in helping to bring this agreement to the House floor.

The Cash for Clunkers program provides an incentive for Americans to do their part to reduce emissions without imposing new regulations on industry or consumers. This bill results in cleaner cars on the road and an increase in sales for the struggling auto industry.

The value of the voucher and the criteria used to determine eligibility vary based on the type of car you are trading in and the type of car you are buying. The agreement we have reached on Cash for Clunkers ensures that a variety of needs of consumers are covered under the program.

The Cash for Clunkers program encourages consumers to buy 1 million new cars and trucks. This program bolsters the automotive industry at its weakest point in years while revitalizing manufacturing and jump-starting our economy.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Speaker, I would just note that I have a list of folks wanting to speak, but they're not here. That is why I am reserving the balance of my time.

Ms. SUTTON. I would just inquire of the gentleman, we have an abundance of speakers and not quite enough time, would you like to yield some time?

Mr. UPTON. I will yield the gentlelady 4 minutes of my time to control.

Ms. SUTTON. I thank the gentleman very much.

At this time, Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 30 seconds to my colleague from Ohio, Congressman TIM RYAN.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentlelady and want to congratulate her.

I would like to make two quick points. One is, the gentleman from Arizona, when he was here, mentioned about manufacturing demand. It was the tax credit for SUVs that actually manufactured the demand that led to a lot of the issues we are dealing with now with the environment. And also, the gentleman was critical of the auto industry. I would like to remind him that it was the auto industry and the tax dollars that the Midwest sent out to build the West. All the water lines and sewer lines in congressional districts that were made out West were made by the taxpayers and the auto industry and the steel industry that sent their money out. So I just wanted to clear the record.

I thank the gentlelady from Ohio. I get nervous anytime I see Ohio and Michigan working together, but in this particular instance, it's a good deal.

Ms. SUTTON. Madam Speaker, at this time, it is my privilege to yield 1

minute to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, Representative PETERS.

Mr. PETERS. Madam Speaker, the CARS Act of 2009 is critical not only to spur growth in America's auto industry but to save and create jobs throughout our country.

History shows that one of the quickest ways to end a recession is to sell more automobiles. New car sales constitute a major percentage of a nation's consumer spending.

Increasing vehicle sales also stimulates demand for raw goods from which automobiles are manufactured. Production of glass, steel, plastics, and other primary materials will be increased as more new cars are sold, creating jobs throughout the country.

□ 1630

Many other nations have acted to strengthen their economies with policies to design and to sell more automobiles, and the U.S. should not be left behind. Many Members of the House have recently expressed their desire to support auto dealers in their States. There is no better way to help car dealers going forward than to pass this important legislation. We must pass the CARS Act today to create a recovery not just for our auto industry but for the entire economy.

Ms. SUTTON. Madam Speaker, at this time it is my privilege to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN. Let me thank Mr. UPTON. I assume I'm using 2 of his minutes.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman another minute.

Mr. LEVIN. No, that's fine. I may yield back, but this is true bipartisanship.

We all know there's a major restructuring of the auto industry going on as we are here today, and there is a very simple truth: If there is not increased demand, that restructuring cannot succeed. And I think only rigid ideologues would say it's impossible to stimulate demand. There has been a historic drop in demand for vehicles in this country. It's about one-half of what it was not so long ago. And it remains true globally. This is not only a national phenomenon; it's a global phenomenon.

Other countries have acted. And I salute Representative SUTTON and all who have worked on this to step up to the plate for the basic manufacturing base of the United States of America.

Ms. SUTTON. Madam Speaker, at this point, it is my privilege to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington, Representative JAY INSLEE.

(Mr. INSLEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. INSLEE. Madam Speaker, I just want to point out something about the benefits of efficiency in this bill. We know it's going to help the important

auto industry, but I want to point out how it will help consumers in efficiency.

Under this bill, Americans who participate will save an average of 133 gallons of gasoline a year by having access to a more efficient car. At the price of \$2.71 a gallon, that's a saving of \$368 a year in gasoline. That is 250 million gallons of gasoline that we otherwise will not be burning.

Now, the reason I point this out is there is a benefit to the environment in our efforts to stop global warming in this bill, and Mr. ISRAEL and I had earlier introduced a piece generally in the same direction, heading with the great leadership of BETTY SUTTON and JOHN DINGELL and BART STUPAK, and we put our bills together, and this is the product.

Some folks have argued that the efficiency provisions of this bill are not aggressive enough. The bill I introduced with Mr. ISRAEL had more aggressive targets.

But I want to point out something that is a singular achievement of this bill, and I want to thank BETTY SUTTON for her leadership on this. If we are going to stop global warming, we indeed are going to have to come together all across the country. Folks in the steel industry are going to need to work with people on the coast. People in the Midwest, in the Rust Belt States in the auto industry are going to need to work with those folks in the San Francisco Bay region.

Congress means coming together, and this bill, I think, represents a perfect example of how our Nation needs to come together to tackle the many challenges we have in dealing with global warming. And when we pass this bill today, it will be one step, one brick in the wall of that effort, for a true clean energy revolution in America that we can all be proud of across the country.

Congratulations.

Ms. SUTTON. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, it is time to get America moving again, and that's exactly what this bill does. The auto sector is so important to our country in virtually every single community. It doesn't have to just be a community that has an assembly line. It's the communities that build parts, whether it be a gas cap or a part for a brake, a side panel, a piece of trim, a window. Auto dealers are in virtually every community across the country, and they average about 50 employees per dealership. So this bill impacts every single community across America.

No one here today has talked about what this bill also does. We will rely less on foreign oil because the average consumer, by taking advantage of this program, will save \$780 in fuel costs because they're going to trade in that old car and they're going to have a more fuel-efficient, better emission vehicle

than they had before; \$780 per household for those that take advantage of it. We have fraud and abuse provisions in here so that they won't be taken advantage of.

And to my good friend Mr. FLAKE, yes, there is a sunset. This program doesn't go on forever. There is a sunset. It's a temporary Band-Aid to fix an economic problem that needs America's attention.

Isn't it better, isn't it better to have people work and have a job and pay taxes than having them laid off and receive benefits? I think most Americans would rather have that job. They want to pay their taxes. This is a bill that helps America, and that's one of the reasons why it passed in our committee 50-4.

I would urge all of my colleagues to support this. And, sadly, because of the procedure, it does have to pass tonight by a two-thirds vote rather than a majority. I would like to think that we can exceed that two-thirds and pass it.

With that, Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SUTTON. Madam Speaker, we have heard overwhelming support for the CARS Act on the floor today and from across the country throughout this process. I want to thank, first of all, the gentleman from Michigan for what a fantastic job he has done in moving this bill on the floor this afternoon and for all of the work that he put into making it a success. I also want to thank all of those, many of whom we have heard from today here on the floor, for all of their help and their support in getting this innovative measure to the floor and on the way to the beneficial effects for the American people. I also want to thank all of the staff who worked on this bill and bringing it together: my staff, Nicole Francis Reynolds and Christine Corcoran, as well as the staff on the Committee on Energy and Commerce and others, Representative DINGELL's staff. It has been a truly collaborative process, and we have a good result.

We have heard about how this bill will improve our environment, serve as an economic stimulus, and shore up the 3 to 5 million jobs in the auto and related industries. Close to home in my district, the Akron Area Auto Dealers Association put it this way: "Providing an incentive to stimulate sales is a critical step in the recovery of the automobile industry, and congressional passage of the CARS Act represents an opportunity to benefit both the economy and the environment."

Local 2000 of the United Auto Workers, which assembles the Ford E-Series line of vehicles in my district in Avon Lake, has stated: "Passage of this important legislation will not only help the consumer and public by putting cars on the road that run cleaner and maintain better fuel efficiency, but it will provide assistance by boosting car sales to the struggling auto industry in America."

And the United Steelworkers, who represent hundreds of thousands of

workers in jobs supplying the auto industry, summed it up like this: "From the glass, to the tires, to the plastic, to the hundreds of pounds of metal that comprise every vehicle, steelworkers manufacture these products in locations all across the country. Even the paper, the catalogues, and brochures that the automakers use to market their vehicles are often the product of the work of steelworkers. But countless other citizens, union and non-union, such as auto dealers, accountants, restaurant and shop owners, have their jobs tied to the auto industry."

Governors from 12 States, including Governor Strickland from Ohio, the Governors of Michigan, Colorado, Delaware, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, New Hampshire, Oklahoma, Vermont, West Virginia, and Wisconsin all support this effort today.

It's time to act, Madam Speaker. It's time to pass the CARS Act, and I urge a "yes" vote on the bill.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I stand today in strong support of H.R. 2751, the Consumer Assistance to Recycle and Save Act.

This bipartisan piece of legislation is desperately needed to reinvigorate our domestic auto industry and replace high-emission vehicles with cleaner, more fuel-efficient cars.

This fleet modernization bill will help stimulate auto sales across the country by replacing approximately one million new cars or trucks on the road.

Specifically, old passenger cars and light duty trucks or SUV's must receive 18 miles per gallon (mpg) or less to participate in the program.

Consumers can receive vouchers—ranging from \$3,500 to \$4,500—to help reduce the cost of a new vehicle if the new vehicles receive greater fuel efficiency.

The greater the increase in fuel efficiency, the greater the value of the voucher.

New passenger cars must receive at least 22 mpg and light trucks or SUV's must receive at least 18 mpg. Large light-duty trucks and work trucks are also eligible for the program.

By replacing aging vehicles with more fuel-efficient ones, this bill will help reduce oil consumption in America, lower overall fuel costs and reduce transportation emissions to help us meet any national climate program.

I want to thank Representative SUTTON, Chairman-Emeritus JOHN DINGELL, and others for their leadership in moving this legislation forward, and I hope this legislation swiftly becomes law.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Madam Speaker, in Texas we implemented a program called Air Check Texas, which was designed to replace older, polluting vehicles with newer ones. The program succeeded in getting vehicles 10 years or older—or those that had failed an emissions test—off of the road. The program in Texas focused mostly on older vehicles because they emit 10 to 30 times as much pollution as newer vehicles. In fact, vehicles that are 13 years old and older account for just 25 percent of miles driven, but 75 percent of all tailpipe emissions.

While I support Representative SUTTON in her Cash for Clunkers and I am a co-sponsor because I believe in both the stimulative and

environmental benefits of getting older vehicles off of the road, I don't believe that the arbitrary 18 mpg combined efficiency requirement for the trade-in vehicle is beneficial. Setting an arbitrary number like 18 mpg leaves a lot of folks with older, polluting vehicles behind the wheel of these cars because they can't afford a new car without the \$3500 or \$4500 this voucher would provide.

As the bill is currently written, a 1986 Peugeot station wagon with a 20 mile per gallon combined efficiency would not qualify for the voucher, but a 2009 Mercedes Benz station wagon would, because it has an EPA combined efficiency rating of 15.5 miles per gallon fuel. Clearly the intent of the bill is not to subsidize the new car purchase of a 2009 Mercedes driver. So let's think a bit more about our 1986 Peugeot driver and helping him or her improve the efficiency and tailpipe emissions of that car.

Expanding this program to model years and failed emissions tests—like the successful program in Texas—will achieve a more far-reaching success than the program as written. I support this legislation, but as the legislation moves forward I believe the combined efficiency requirements for the trade-in vehicle should be dropped and a model-year approach should be explored.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2751, the Consumer Assistance to Recycle and Save Act.

The Consumer Assistance to Recycle and Save Act would strengthen demand for automobiles in the United States and provide much needed relief to struggling car companies and dealerships. More commonly known as the "Cash for Clunkers Act," this legislation would allow car owners to trade in their old inefficient automobiles for new more fuel efficient automobiles. The Cash for Clunkers Act could spur the sales of up to 1 million more fuel efficient cars and trucks. It would help to save jobs and shore up car dealerships, and it would help save more than 250 million gallons of gas a year.

Our national car companies are struggling in the floundering economy. Since last year ago, national car sales have fallen by 34 percent. Car dealerships across the nation are closing their doors, and it is estimated that in my home state of New Jersey 8,000 jobs in the automobile industry could be lost by the end of the year.

This legislation allows consumers to receive a voucher for \$3,500 if they turn in their old car for a new automobile that is 4 miles per gallon more fuel efficient. Those who buy new models that are 10 miles per gallon more fuel efficient would receive a \$4,500 voucher. Owners of sport utility vehicles, pickup trucks or minivans that get 18 miles per gallon or less could receive a voucher for \$3,500 if their new truck or SUV is at least 2 miles per gallon higher than their old vehicle. The voucher would increase to \$4,500 if the mileage of the new truck or SUV is at least 5 miles per gallon higher than the older vehicle.

Programs like the Cash for Clunkers Act have proven effective in increasing car purchases; Germany enacted a similar measure that increased car sales by more than 20 percent. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation that would spur our economy and decrease dangerous greenhouse gas emissions.

Ms. SUTTON. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. SUTTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2751.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. FLAKE. Madam 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, this 15-minute vote on the motion to suspend on H.R. 2751 will be followed by 5-minute votes on motions to suspend on H.R. 1741 and House Resolution 505.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 298, nays 119, answered "present" 2, not voting 15, as follows:

	[Roll No. 314]	YEAS—298	ROTHMAN (NJ)	ROYBAL-ALLARD	NAYS—119	GOMHART	GOODLATTE	MORAN (KS)
Abercrombie	Davis (TN)	Kaptur			Aderholt	Gohmert	Neugebauer	
Ackerman	DeFazio	Kildee			Akin	Granger	Nunes	
Adler (NJ)	DeGette	Kilpatrick (MI)			Alexander	Bachmann	Olson	
Altman	Delahunt	Kilroy			Baird	Barrett (SC)	Hastings (WA)	
Andrews	DeLauro	King (IA)			Bartlett	Bartlett	Heller	
Arcuri	Diaz-Balart, L.	Kissell			Biggert	Hensarling	Pence	
Austria	Diaz-Balart, M.	Klein (FL)			Bilirakis	Herger	Platts	
Baca	Dicks	Kosmas			Blackburn	Hersheth Sandlin	Polis (CO)	
Bachus	Dingell	Kratovil			Boehner	Hunter	Posey	
Baldwin	Donnelly (IN)	Kucinich			Bonner	Inglis	Price (GA)	
Barrow	Doyle	Lance			Boozman	Issa	Radanovich	
Barton (TX)	Dreier	LaTourette			Boustany	Jenkins	Rehberg	
Bean	Driehaus	Lee (CA)			Boyd	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (KY)	
Becerra	Edwards (MD)	Lee (NY)			Brady (TX)	Jones	Rohrabacher	
Berkley	Edwards (TX)	Levin			Brown (GA)	Jordan (OH)	Rooney	
Berman	Ehlers	Latham			Brown (SC)	King (NY)	Roskam	
Berry	Ellison	LoBiondo			Burgess	Kingston	Royce	
Bilbray	Ellsworth	Lofgren, Zoe			Cantor	Kirk	Ryan (WI)	
Bishop (GA)	Emerson	Lowey			Carter	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Scalise	
Bishop (NY)	Engel	Langevin			Chaffetz	Kline (MN)	Schmidt	
Blumenauer	Eshoo	Larsen (WA)			Coffman (CO)	Lamborn	Sensenbrenner	
Blunt	Etheridge	Larson (CT)			Cole	Latta	Smith (TX)	
Boccieri	Farr	Lathan			Conaway	Lewis (CA)	Shadegg	
Boren	Fattah	LoBiondo			Crenshaw	Linder	Stusher	
Boswell	Filner	Lofgren, Zoe			Culberson	Lucas	Simpson	
Boucher	Foster	Lowey			Davis (KY)	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NE)	
Brady (PA)	Frank (MA)	Lynch			Dent	Lummis	Smith (TX)	
Bright	Frelinghuysen	Maffei			Doggett	Lungren, Daniel	Taylor	
Brown, Corrine	Fudge	Maloney			Duncan	E.	Thompson (PA)	
Brown-Waite,	Gerlach	Manzullo			Fallin	Marchant	Thornberry	
Ginny	Gingerly (GA)	Markey (CO)			Flake	Marshall		
Burton (IN)	Gordon (TN)	Markey (MA)			Fleming	McCarthy (CA)	Tiahrt	
Butterfield	Grayson	Matheson			Forbes	McCaul	Wamp	
Buyer	Green, Al	Matsui			Fortenberry	McClintock	Westmoreland	
Calvert	Green, Gene	McCarthy (NY)			Franks (AZ)	McHenry	Wilson (SC)	
Camp	Griffith	McCullum			Galligan	McMorris	Wittman	
Campbell	Grijalva	McCotter			Garrett (NJ)	Rodgers	Wolf	
Cao	Guthrie	McDermott			Gillibrand	Mica	Young (AK)	
Capito	Gutierrez	McGovern			Miller (FL)	Miller (FL)	Young (FL)	
Capps	Hall (NY)	McHugh						
Capuano	Hall (TX)	McIntyre						
Cardoza	Halvorson	McKeon						
Carnahan	Hare	McMahon						
Carney	Harman	McNerney						
Carson (IN)	Hastings (FL)	Meek (FL)						
Cassidy	Heinrich	Meeks (NY)						
Castle	Higgins	Melancon						
Castor (FL)	Hill	Michaud						
Chandler	Himes	Miller (MI)						
Childers	Hinchey	Miller (NC)						
Clarke	Hinojosa	Miller, Gary						
Clay	Hirono	Miller, George						
Cleaver	Hodes	Minnick						
Clyburn	Hoekstra	Mitchell						
Coble	Holden	Mollohan						
Cohen	Holt	Moore (KS)						
Connolly (VA)	Honda	Moore (WI)						
Cooper	Hoyer	Moran (VA)						
Costa	Inslee	Murphy (CT)						
Costello	Israel	Murphy (NY)						
Courtney	Jackson (IL)	Murphy, Patrick						
Crowley	Jackson-Lee	Murphy, Tim						
Cuellar	(TX)	Murtha						
Cummings	Johnson (GA)	Myrick						
Dahlkemper	Johnson (IL)	Nadler (NY)						
Davis (AL)	Johnson, E. B.	Napolitano						
Davis (CA)	Kagen	Neal (MA)						
Davis (IL)	Kanjorski	Nye						

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Buchanan	Deal (GA)
NOT VOTING—15	
Bishop (UT)	Lewis (GA)
Bono Mack	Sánchez, Linda
Braley (IA)	T.
Conyers	Mack
Gonzalez	Sessions
Kennedy	Putnam
	Sullivan
	Ruppertsberger
	Whitfield

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members have 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1707

Messrs. REHBERG, MARSHALL, KIRK, ROONEY, DOGETT, and BARTLETT changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Donnelly (IN) Kline (MN)
Doyle Kosmas Petri
Dreier Kratovil Pingree (ME)
Driehaus Kucinich Platts
Duncan Lamborn Poe (TX)
Edwards (MD) Lance Polis (CO)
Edwards (TX) Langevin Pomeroy
Ehlers Larsen (WA) Posey
Ellison Larson (CT) Price (GA)
Ellsworth Latham Price (NC)
Emerson LaTourette Putnam
Engel Latta Quigley
Eshoo Lee (CA) Radanovich
Etheridge Lee (NY) Rahall
Fallin Levin Rangel
Farr Lewis (CA) Rehberg
Fattah Linder Reichert
Filner Lipinski Reyes
Flake LoBiondo Richardson
Fleming Logren, Zoe Rodriguez
Forbes Lowey Roe (TN)
Fortenberry Lucas Rogers (AL)
Foster Luetkemeyer Rogers (KY)
Foxx Luján Rogers (MI)
Frank (MA) Lummis Rohrabacher
Franks (AZ) Lungren, Daniel Rooney
Frelinghuysen E. Ros-Lehtinen
Fudge Lynch Roskam
Gallegly Maffei Ross
Garrett (NJ) Maloney Rothman (NJ)
Gerlach Manzullo Roybal-Allard
Giffords Merchant Royce
Gingrey (GA) Markey (CO) Rush
Gohmert Markey (MA) Ryan (OH)
Goodlatte Marshall Ryan (WI)
Gordon (TN) Massa Salazar
Granger Matheson Sanchez, Loretta
Graves Matsui Sarbanes
Grayson McCarthy (CA) Scalise
Green, Al McCarthy (NY) Shakowsky
Green, Gene McCaul Schauer
Griffith McClintock Schiff
Grijalva McCollum Schmidt
Guthrie McCotter Schrock
Gutierrez McDermott Schrader
Hall (NY) McGovern Schwartz
Hall (TX) McHenry Scott (GA)
Halvorson McHugh Scott (VA)
Hare McIntyre Sensenbrenner
Harman McKeon Serrano
Harper McMahon Sessions
Hastings (FL) Morris Sestak
Hastings (WA) Rodgers Shadegg
Heinrich McNeerney Shea-Porter
Heller Meek (FL) Sherman
Hensarling Meeks (NY) Shimkus
Herger Melancon Shuler
Hershett Sandlin Mica Shuster
Higgins Michaud Simpson
Hill Miller (FL) Sires
Himes Miller (MI) Skelton
Hinchey Miller (NC) Slaughter
Hinojosa Miller, Gary Smith (NE)
Hirono Miller, George Smith (NJ)
Hodes Minnick Smith (TX)
Hoekstra Mitchell Smith (WA)
Holden Mollohan Snyder
Holt Moore (KS) Souder
Honda Moore (WI) Space
Hoyer Moran (KS) Speier
Hunter Moran (VA) Spratt
Inglis Murphy (CT) Stark
Inslee Murphy (NY) Stearns
Israel Murphy, Patrick Stupak
Issa Murphy, Tim Sutton
Jackson (IL) Murtha Tanner
Jackson-Lee Myrick Tauscher
(TX) Nadler (NY) Taylor
Jenkins Napolitano Teague
Johnson (GA) Neal (MA) Terry
Johnson (IL) Neugebauer Thompson (CA)
Johnson, E. B. Nunes Thompson (MS)
Johnson, Sam Thompson (PA)
Jones Oberstar Thornberry
Jordan (OH) Obey Tiahrt
Kagen Olson Tiberti
Kanjorski Olver Tierney
Kaptur Ortiz Titus
Kildee Pallone Tonko
Kilpatrick (MI) Pascrell Towns
Kilroy Pastor (AZ) Tsongas
Kind Paul Turner
King (IA) Paulsen Upton
King (NY) Payne Van Hollen
Kingston Pence Velázquez
Kirk Perlmutter Visclosky
Kirpatrick (AZ) Perriello Walden
Kissell Peters Walz
Klein (FL) Peterson Wamp

Wasserman Welch Wolf
Schultz Westmoreland Woolsey
Pitts Waters Wexler Wu
Platts Watson Whiffield Yarmuth
Poe (TX) Watt Wilson (OH) Young (AK)
Lance Polis (CO) Waxman Wilson (SC) Young (FL)
Pomeroy Weiner Wittman

NOT VOTING—10

Bono Mack Lewis (GA) Sánchez, Linda
Buyer Loebssack T.
Gonzalez Mack Sullivan
Kennedy Ruppersberger

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members have 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1722

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 PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mrs. Wanda Evans, one of his secretaries.

RECOGNIZING 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF NATIONAL CENTER FOR MISSING AND EXPLOITED CHILDREN

Mr. TONKO. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 454) recognizing the 25th anniversary of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 454

Whereas an estimated 800,000 children are reported missing each year in the United States;

Whereas 200,000 of that number are abducted by family members, and 58,000 are abducted by non-family members, for which the primary motive is sexual assault;

Whereas each year 115 children are the victims of the most serious abductions, kidnapped by non-family members and either ransomed, murdered, or taken with the intent to keep;

Whereas the National Center for Missing & Exploited Children (NCMEC) serves as the national resource center and information clearinghouse for missing and exploited children;

Whereas NCMEC was established by Congress in 1984;

Whereas NCMEC has assisted law enforcement in the recovery of more than 138,500 children;

Whereas NCMEC's Amber Alert program has led to 443 recoveries;

Whereas in 2008, NCMEC helped recover more children than any other year in the organization's 25-year history, raising the recovery rate from 62 percent in 1990 to 97 percent today;

Whereas NCMEC operates the toll-free 24-hour national missing children's hotline, which has handled more than 2,377,000 calls;

Whereas NCMEC provides assistance to families and law enforcement agencies in lo-

cating and recovering missing and exploited children, both nationally and internationally;

Whereas NCMEC offers technical assistance and training to law enforcement in identifying and locating non-compliant sex offenders;

Whereas NCMEC has a team of forensic artists who create age progression photos, which has assisted in the successful recovery of 895 children;

Whereas NCMEC CyberTipline has handled more than 686,000 reports;

Whereas NCMEC's Child Victim Identification Program has reviewed and analyzed 23,000,000 child pornography images and videos, 8,600,000 in 2008 alone;

Whereas NCMEC's sex offender tracking team has already located 402 missing sex offenders;

Whereas NCMEC operates a child victim identification program to assist law enforcement in identifying victims of child pornography;

Whereas NCMEC develops and disseminates programs and information about Internet safety and the prevention of child abduction and sexual exploitation;

Whereas NCMEC facilitates the deployment of the National Emergency Child Locator Center during periods of national disasters; and

Whereas NCMEC deploys Team Adam, a rapid response and support system comprised of retired law enforcement officers, to provide on-site technical assistance to local law enforcement agencies investigating cases of child abduction and sexual exploitation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives recognizes the 25th anniversary of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PLATTS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TONKO. Madam Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H. Res. 454.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 454, which recognizes the 25th anniversary of the National Center For Missing and Exploited Children. The NCMEC serves as the national resource center for missing and exploited children.

It is estimated that 800,000 children are reported missing every year in the United States. Two hundred thousand of that number are abducted by family members, and 58,000 are abducted by nonfamily members, for which the primary motive is sexual assault. It is with great sadness that this national tragedy continues year after year.

We recognize today the National Center's persistent efforts in reuniting families and stopping the abuse and exploitation of our children. During its

25-year history, the organization has assisted in the recovery of more than 138,000 children. NCMEC's Amber Alert Program alone has led to 443 recoveries. NCMEC's efforts have led to a rise in the recovery rate of missing children from 62 percent in 1990 to 97 percent today.

The organization offers assistance and training to law enforcement around the country in identifying and locating missing and exploited children, as well as non-compliant sex offenders. NCMEC also actively combats children's pornography by reviewing millions of images and videos in a national effort to identify victims of child pornography and the perpetrators behind these heinous crimes.

Madam Speaker, NCMEC acts as the ultimate advocate for our Nation's most vulnerable individuals. The organization sends a message to parents around the country that our Nation will never abandon its search for the thousands of children missing at any given moment. It is important to recognize that for the individuals at the NCMEC, the mission is never quite complete.

□ 1730

On May 25th of 2009, we recognize the 27th National Missing Children's Day. The day marks the anniversary of the disappearance of 6-year-old Etan Patz. For nearly three decades, the search for Etan and many other children has continued as part of the persistent efforts of the NCMEC.

Madam Speaker, once again I express my support for the center, and I thank Representative POE for bringing this resolution to the floor. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution, which seeks to pay tribute and recognize the important work of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children.

I am honored to yield such time as he may consume to the sponsor of this important resolution, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Pennsylvania yielding and the support of the gentleman from New York.

I'm proud to sponsor H. Res. 454, which recognizes the 25th anniversary of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children.

As founder and co-Chair of the Victims' Rights Caucus, along with my friend from California, Mr. COSTA, I am thankful for the work that the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children does to protect the Nation's children.

At the time the Center was founded 25 years ago, there were little or no resources available to assist law enforcement with the cases of missing children. In fact, there was no way for po-

lice to enter information about missing children into the FBI's national crime computer. Today, thanks to the work of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, this is no longer the case.

Each year, approximately 800,000 American children are reported missing. When a child is missing, the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children works tirelessly alongside families and law enforcement agencies in locating, finding, and recovering the children and bringing them home to their parents.

Many people may be familiar with John Walsh from his TV show America's Most Wanted, but they may not realize the tragic events that led to his advocating on behalf of children and his work with America's Most Wanted.

In 1981, Adam Walsh, son of John and Reve Walsh, was abducted from a toy department store in Florida at a shopping mall. Two weeks later, fishermen found Adam's decapitated head. They never found his body. He was 6 years old.

Last year, after 27 years of not knowing who killed their son, police announced that Adam's murderer was a serial killer who had died a decade earlier while serving five life sentences in prison. Ottis Toole was his killer's name, and although we know this knowledge did not take away the Walshes' pain, we hope that it gave them some peace of mind and a sense of justice.

Even during the years of unanswered questions, John Walsh turned his loss into advocating on behalf of children. He helped fight for the passage of the important Federal legislation, such as the Missing Children's Act of 1982 and the Missing Children's Assistance Act of 1984.

The Missing Children's Assistance Act of 1984 established a national resource center and a clearinghouse for missing and exploited children, thus creating the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. President Reagan officially opened the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children on June 13, 1984. Twenty-five years later, we thank John Walsh for his pioneer efforts and recognize the center for their work on behalf of America's children.

We celebrate today that, since 1990, the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children's recovery rate of missing children has increased from 62 percent to 97 percent. Many children owe their rescue to the center, and many parents are grateful for the return of their kids, thanks to the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children.

This legislation is sponsored by both the Victims' Rights Caucus and the Caucus for Missing and Exploited and Runaway Children. I would like to thank my friend and fellow co-Chair of the Victims' Rights Caucus, JIM COSTA, and the co-Chairs of the Missing and Exploited Children's Caucus, JUDY

BIGGERT, BART STUPAK, ZOE LOFGREN and FRANK WOLF.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. TONKO. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania have any further speakers?

Mr. PLATTS. Madam Speaker, yes, I do. I have at least two additional speakers.

Mr. TONKO. Madam Speaker, I reserve my time.

Mr. PLATTS. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, I rise to support this resolution. I think, in recognizing the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children here on its 25th anniversary, it is time for us to reflect on just what a role it played in terms of increasing the recovery rate over time of missing children.

If you think about the last 25 years and the fact that 138,000 missing children have been recovered, returned to their families, but that in the early years that rate ran at 62 percent and now that rate is up to 97 percent, you begin to get an appreciation for just what the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children were able to do for humanity, for these children, for these families.

As mentioned, it was officially opened in June of 1984 by President Ronald Reagan, and since its inception, it has become the leading organization worldwide dealing with the issue of missing and exploited kids.

I've been pleased to support many of the initiatives that it's worked for, including:

The Jacob Wetterling Crimes Against Children Registration Act, which was in 1994, and it mandated that sex offender registries be established in every State;

Megan's Law of 1996, which mandated that every State provide community notification when dangerous sex offenders are released, was driven by the push from the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children;

The PROTECT Act of 2003, which created a national AMBER Alert Program and strengthened law enforcement's ability to punish violent criminals who prey upon children;

And, of course, the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006, which created a national sex offender public database. And it's because of that work over the years that that rate is up to 97 percent today.

Now, despite all that's been accomplished, I'm sure there is much more that can be done, should be done. I congratulate the NCMEC for its 25th anniversary. I congratulate it for its work on behalf of so many child recoveries to date.

And let this resolution remind us that there is nothing more important than the safety of our Nation's children, and that the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children has done such great work in this regard.

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

Mr. PLATTS. Madam Speaker, I am honored to yield to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN), who played an important role in the foundation and formation of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children in 1984, as much time as he may consume.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Madam Speaker, it is hard to believe that it was 25 years ago that this Congress worked to facilitate the establishment of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children.

I recall being on the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee when John Walsh and his wife testified before us. It was at a time when they did not know who had murdered their child.

It was at a time in this country where we specifically prohibited the use of the FBI in attempting to participate in any activities to try and find missing children. We had a statutory delay for any participation by the FBI. There was a lack of coordination that was not only in existence, but was promoted by law at that time.

And I recall, after John Walsh and his wife testified before us, the shrugging of shoulders by some who basically had to tell the Walshes that there was nothing that we could do here on the Federal level.

John Walsh and his wife did not take that as an answer. They spoke to many of us here in the Chamber, but actually those of us on the subcommittee and committee at that time, and challenged us to try and find a way to make it possible that we could have a seamless web between the Federal Government, the State government and local government when the question was a missing child. And the strength and persistence of that couple, combined with others who joined them around the country was extraordinary at that time.

It seems so commonplace now for us to talk about the 25th anniversary of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. It seems so commonplace for us to talk about hundreds of thousands of children being reported missing yearly, and the fact that there was almost a collective shrug of the shoulder at that time saying, it is a terrible tragedy, but there's nothing we can do about it.

It seems so commonplace now that when a child is missing, with all of the various laws that have followed after the creation of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, that almost instantaneously you have law enforcement across the board communicating with one another and creating a mechanism by which there can be the exchange of information and the encouragement of the exchange of information so that we can find these children.

One thing we knew 25 years ago, and it remains the same today, the sooner

you know that a child is missing, the better the chances are of being able to find that child. The sooner you have law enforcement involved, along with the communities, the better the chances are that you will have a successful recovery of that child and a successful reuniting of that family.

So I hope people understand why we celebrate the 25th anniversary of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children and that it has been the result of thousands upon thousands of people working for this effort.

Had it not been for a single couple, the Walshes, who, out of tragedy, decided to make something positive, had it not been for them coming here to the Congress and insisting that we look at this issue and insisting that there was something that can be done and insisting that just because we used to do it the old way was no reason or no excuse for not trying to do something different, had it not been for them, we would not be celebrating the 25th anniversary, nor would we be celebrating the thousands upon thousands of successful reunites that have taken place around this country.

So this is a wonderful recognition of the center, but I hope it will also be a tremendous recognition of the contributions made by two wonderful Americans, the Walshes.

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

Mr. PLATTS. Madam Speaker, I, again, urge a "yes" vote in support of this important resolution and commend Mr. POE for his sponsorship, as well as Mr. LUNGREN for his important work in the foundation of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 454, recognizing the 25th anniversary of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children.

In 1979, while on his way to school, 6-year-old Etan Patz disappeared from the streets of New York City. In 1981, 6-year-old Adam Walsh disappeared from a Florida shopping mall. The media attention and search efforts that resulted from these two cases focused the nation's attention on the problem of child abduction and the need for a coordinated effort to address this problem.

The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, NCMEC, as it is called in acronym, was created by Congress in 1984, through the Missing Children's Assistance Act. NCMEC works in partnership with the U.S. Department of Justice and is the nation's resource center and clearinghouse for information on missing and exploited children. Since 1984, NCMEC has assisted law enforcement with more than 154,000 missing child cases, resulting in the recovery of more than 138,000 children.

NCMEC's mission includes helping to prevent child abduction and sexual exploitation; helping to find missing children; and assisting victims of child abduction and sexual exploitation, their families, and the professionals who serve them. NCMEC provides assistance to families and law enforcement agencies in

locating and recovering missing and exploited children, both nationally and internationally.

NCMEC offers many services, including a 24-hour call center. NCMEC's toll-free national hotline, 1-800-THE-LOST, has handled more than 2.3 million calls.

NCMEC also manages a distribution system for missing-child photos; a system of case management and technical assistance for law enforcement and families; training programs for Federal, State and local law enforcement; and programs designed to help stop the sexual exploitation of children.

NCMEC is the only private, non-profit organization that combines these resources to provide support to law enforcement, state clearinghouses, and parents working to find missing children.

I stand in support of this resolution recognizing the 25th Anniversary of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. I ask for my colleagues' support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TONKO. Madam Speaker, the resolution before the House, H. Res. 454, recognizing the 25th Anniversary of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, is one that obviously brings with it many happy endings for at least 138,000 families.

And while not all of the stories are those happy endings, the center has provided itself as a resource, as a network that has devoted itself to the reconnection of our youth to their families. And so, with that outstanding record and with the concerns for missing children still alive and haunting us as a society, I strongly encourage a "yes" vote on the resolution.

I yield back my remaining time, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 454.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. PLATTS. Madam 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.

□ 1745

CONGRATULATING AIRCRAFT OWNERS AND PILOTS ASSOCIATION ON ITS 70TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. BOCCIERI. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 472) congratulating and saluting the seventieth anniversary of the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association (AOPA) and their dedication to general aviation, safety and the important contribution general aviation provides to the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 472

Whereas the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association (AOPA) was formed 70 years ago, in May 1939, on the eve of World War II;

Whereas the AOPA is committed to improving general aviation safety;

Whereas the AOPA created the AOPA Air Safety Foundation, the only organization dedicated solely to that end, nearly 60 years ago;

Whereas the AOPA represents more than 415,000 members, or 7 out of every 10 pilots in the United States;

Whereas the AOPA has, for 7 decades, provided those pilots with education, information, and advocacy at all levels of government;

Whereas the AOPA was among the earliest proponents of civilian use of the Global Positioning Satellite System, setting the stage for development of the Next Generation Air Transportation System;

Whereas the AOPA was a leading advocate of the General Aviation Revitalization Act of 1994, which led to the recovery of the United States general aviation light aircraft manufacturing industry, a major United States export and a plus on the trade balance sheet;

Whereas the AOPA has developed and maintained close working relationships with agencies of the Federal Government, especially the Department of Transportation, the Department of Homeland Security, the Federal Aviation Administration, and the Transportation Security Administration; and

Whereas those relationships have allowed the public and private sectors to address various issues of legitimate concern to the Federal government in ways that impose the least possible burden on general aviation pilots and aircraft owners: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) congratulates and salutes the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association (AOPA) for celebrating its 70th anniversary;

(2) commends the AOPA for creating the AOPA Air Safety Foundation nearly 60 years ago to improve general aviation safety;

(3) commends the AOPA for helping lead the recovery of the United States general aviation light aircraft manufacturing industry; and

(4) commends the AOPA for setting the stage for development of the Next Generation Air Transportation System.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOCCIERI) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOCCIERI. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on House Resolution 472.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of House Resolution 472, congratulating and saluting the 70th anniversary of the Aircraft

Owners and Pilots Association and their dedication to the general aviation, safety, and the important contribution that general aviation provides to the United States of America.

AOPA was incorporated on May 15, 1939, as a nonprofit organization dedicated to general aviation. AOPA represents more than 414,000 members, which is about 70 percent of all United States pilots. In 1950, AOPA created the Air Safety Foundation, which provides general aviation pilots with training, education, and research on information and safety that are important to all pilots.

AOPA was a leading advocate in the General Aviation Revitalization Act of 1994 which led to the recovery of the U.S. general aviation and light aircraft manufacturing industry. In recent years, AOPA has been active on many general aviation issues such as global positioning navigation, flight service station modernization, FAA reauthorization, and the Next Generation Air Transportation System, known as NextGen.

House Resolution 472 congratulates and salutes the 70th anniversary of AOPA and its dedication to general aviation, safety, and the important contribution made by all aviators to the United States. In addition, the resolution commends AOPA for creating the Air Safety Foundation, leading the recovery of general aviation of light aircraft in the manufacturing industry and setting the stage for the development of NextGen.

For these reasons and others, I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 472.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETRI. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 472. I'm a cosponsor of the resolution introduced by my colleague, Mr. DENT of Pennsylvania, congratulating the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association on the organization's 70th anniversary.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 472. I am a cosponsor of the resolution introduced by Mr. DENT congratulating the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association (AOPA) on the organization's 70th anniversary.

For decades, AOPA has provided important safety information to pilots all over the country, making it a valuable safety partner with the FAA and the House Transportation Committee.

In addition, AOPA continues to perform an advocacy function for pilots and aircraft owners providing a helpful voice both at the FAA and here in Congress. Representing roughly 415,000 pilots and aircraft owners, AOPA has been a valuable stakeholder helping to shape policy solutions to safety issues facing the general aviation industry.

Finally, in representing pilots and aircraft owners, AOPA represents a general aviation industry that is critical to our nation's economy. The manufacturing of general aviation aircraft as well as the maintenance and operation of general aviation aircraft supports 1,265,000 high-quality jobs here in the United States. General aviation also inspires the love

for flying that has led to so many U.S. commercial airline pilot careers.

I support the adoption of the resolution.

I yield such time as he may consume to the author of the resolution, Representative CHARLES DENT.

Mr. DENT. Thank you, Congressman PETRI, for your part of this legislation.

On May 15, 2009, the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, or AOPA, celebrated its 70th anniversary. Since its inception on the eve of the Second World War, AOPA has grown to be one of the strongest voices for general aviation in the United States.

Throughout its rich history, AOPA has developed and maintained close working relationships with Federal Government agencies including the Department of Transportation, Department of Homeland Security, Federal Aviation Administration, and the Transportation Security Administration. By working closely with these agencies, AOPA has helped us create the safest and most efficient aviation system in the world.

For the last 7 years, AOPA has also fostered a dynamic relationship with Congress, and specifically the members of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on which I serve. The association's first political activity was to urge the U.S. Senate to pass legislation establishing the civilian pilot training program which allows thousands of American pilots to gain their certification through Federal Government support. Decades later, AOPA remains a key actor in the development in our Nation's aviation policy having played a vital role in the crafting and passage of this year's FAA Reauthorization Act.

Today, AOPA's membership exceeds 400,000, including seven out of every 10 pilots in this Nation. I'm confident every Member of Congress currently has a valuable relationship with the general aviation pilots flying in their districts.

On a personal note, AOPA members from the Lehigh Valley area serve on my aviation advisory board proved to be some of the most informed and influential participants. Their expertise has truly been a great resource for me as I serve on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and the Aviation Subcommittee.

Madam Speaker, I believe the passage of this resolution congratulating AOPA on its 70 years of service is a fitting way to salute the many pilots who help make our aviation system the safest and most efficient in the world. And at this time I would like to encourage everybody to support this legislation and urge its adoption.

Mr. PETRI. At this time, Madam Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to my colleague from Michigan, VERN EHLERS.

Mr. EHLERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As a student pilot, and as the co-chairman of the House General Aviation Caucus, as well as a proud member

of the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 472, honoring the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association on their 70th anniversary.

Since 1939, AOPA has effectively represented the general aviation community at the local, State, and Federal levels. With a membership of more than 415,000—or two-thirds of all of the pilots in the United States—AOPA is the largest and one of the most influential aviation associations in the world. I have been a member for a number of years.

General aviation is a catch-all category that includes all nonscheduled, all nonmilitary aviation. There are more than 230,000 general aviation aircraft in the United States, which use nearly 19,000 small and regional airports. These airports help connect people and industries that do not always have easy access to our commercial airports.

Recently, general aviation has come under attack by the media and those that view general aviation as a corporate indulgence or an expensive toy used exclusively by the wealthy. That is simply not true. Actually, the fact is that companies that utilize general aviation are more productive and, thus, more competitive.

I can give two examples from my hometown of Grand Rapids, Michigan.

Recently, I was talking to a businessman there. He's a contractor. He's built a number of buildings. They've decided to expand into the Upper Peninsula of Michigan and into Canada. As you know, Michigan is surrounded by the Great Lakes so it's very hard to get from point A to point B quickly. However, they bought an airplane, and they were able to zip easily from the Grand Rapids headquarters to all the work sites in Canada and in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan. More often than not, these airplanes pay for themselves.

I have another businessman in Grand Rapids who told me that his airplane saved him a considerable amount of money because when his executives went to visit his plants scattered around the U.S.—most of them in forests because he's in the lumbering business and he has 30-some businesses around the country—it takes at least one person one day to get to any of these sites using commercial aviation because they have to go to a major commercial airport, rent a car and drive 30, 40 miles into the forest to their site. But with their own private airplane, they could usually land within a few miles. They can complete three business visits in 1 day instead of one.

So, as they say, these airplanes pay for themselves.

In addition, most of the private pilots I know are not rich but middle class working people that love to fly. In the wake of these disparaging stories that have appeared in the media, the AOPA and its supporters in Con-

gress have worked hard to educate the public and spread the word about the importance of general aviation to our economy and our transportation system.

Every private pilot is passionate about flying, and the AOPA is the organization they rely on to stay abreast of current political events and aviation events and to advocate on their behalf.

I congratulate the AOPA on this historic anniversary, and I wish them continued success, and I look forward to celebrating future anniversaries with them as well. And I hope by then, I am able to fly more often than I am while I'm in the Congress.

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

I would like to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his efforts to promote general aviation. It's very clear, having, myself, several classifications as a multiengine commercial instrument single engineer, that general aviation needs to do all it can to promote and respond to the needs of its pilots—in particular, training of the pilots. It is very important that we recognize the significance of this organization and what it means to general aviation.

I concur with the remarks of the ranking member and also concur with the gentleman and his remarks with respect to the importance of this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation, H. Res. 472, introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT), which congratulates and salutes the 70th anniversary of the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association (AOPA) and its dedication to general aviation (GA), safety, and the important contribution that GA provides to the United States. The resolution also commends AOPA for creating the Air Safety Foundation, leading the recovery of the GA light aircraft manufacturing industry, and setting the stage for the development of the Next Generation Air Transportation System by being an early proponent of the civilian use of the Global Positioning System. I thank Representative DENT for his leadership on this measure.

AOPA was incorporated on May 15, 1939, as a non-profit organization dedicated to GA. Since then, the organization has been a leading advocate for GA pilots and now represents about 415,000 members. AOPA has also provided GA pilots with valuable safety education and training through the Air Safety Foundation, which was created in 1950. The Air Safety Foundation is the largest non-profit organization dedicated solely to GA safety.

AOPA was a primary supporter of the General Aviation Revitalization Act (GARA) of 1994. The GA industry boomed following the passage of GARA, which placed fair and reasonable limitations on the time period during which a manufacturer would be legally liable for aircraft defects.

I congratulate AOPA for working to support GA over the past 70 years. GA stimulates local and regional economies—it comprises over one percent of the U.S. Gross Domestic Product and supports almost 1.2 million jobs. In addition, GA provides communities with es-

sential services, and affords businesses the flexibility and mobility that they require. Many industries and public services depend on GA to be successful and efficient, including emergency medicine, firefighting, news services, energy exploration, and farming.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Res. 472.

Mr. PETRI. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I urge passage of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BOCCIERI. Madam Speaker, the swift passage of this bill is very important.

I yield back my time as well.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOCCIERI) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 472.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RALPH REGULA FEDERAL BUILDING AND UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

Mr. BOCCIERI. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1687) to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at McKinley Avenue and Third Street, SW., Canton, Ohio, as the "Ralph Regula Federal Building and United States Courthouse," as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1687

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. RALPH REGULA FEDERAL BUILDING AND UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The Administrator of General Services shall ensure that the federally occupied building located at McKinley Avenue and Third Street, SW., Canton, Ohio, is known and designated as the "Ralph Regula Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

(b) REFERENCES.—With respect to the period in which the building referred to in subsection (a) is federally occupied, any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to that building shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Ralph Regula Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOCCIERI) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOCCIERI. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 1687.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1800

Mr. BOCCIERI. Madam Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the bill I introduced, H.R. 1687, as amended, and urge its quick passage.

This bill designates the building located at McKinley and Third Streets, S.W., Canton, Ohio, as the Ralph Regula Federal Building and United States Courthouse. The bill has strong, bipartisan support.

While I know Congressman Regula as my predecessor, many of you on both sides of the aisle were also fortunate enough to call him a colleague, a mentor, and a friend. He was a true steward of his district and earned every accolade from his constituents, who knew him only as Ralph. He combined a unique blend of procedural acumen, hard work, and collegial personality in rising to a position of leadership on the House Appropriations Committee. All the while, he never forgot where he came from, consistently setting the standard and making sure that his constituents received the assistance they needed with their problems.

As a former teacher and principal, Ralph was a leader in pushing to improve our students' reading skills, develop teacher training, and increase Pell Grant funding. He also increased by millions of dollars the amount of Federal money committed to research in fighting cancer, heart disease, and birth defects.

Ralph was a leader in alternative energy. And he was an early champion of fuel cell technology, helping my district earn a reputation as a national leader in fuel cell research and development.

Congressman Ralph Regula served with distinction and represented the 16th District of Ohio for over 30 years—in fact, it was 36 years. He is a native Ohioan, born in Beach City, Ohio, on December 3, 1924. After high school, Congressman Ralph Regula served in the United States Navy with distinction and honor in World War II. He later graduated from college and earned his law degree in Canton, Ohio, at William McKinley School of Law. He went on to become a lawyer and later a State legislator.

He was first elected to Congress in 1972 and served 18 consecutive terms, retiring last year to spend more time with his lovely, lovely wife, Mary, and college sweetheart, as well as their three children and four grandchildren.

As much as I wish to claim this as an original idea, I have to give thanks and credit to Senator SHERROD BROWN, who first introduced this legislation last December before I was sworn in.

It is appropriate that we honor Congressman Ralph Regula with this bill because in many ways this building would not exist without his efforts, having laid the groundwork for it many, many years ago.

The Ralph Regula Federal Building and United States Courthouse will continue Ralph's legacy, serving Stark County for many years to come. It is most fitting and proper to honor Congressman Regula with this designation.

I support this bill, as amended, and urge its immediate passage.

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

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank the chairman and the sponsor, the gentleman from Ohio, for sponsoring this legislation. He mentioned the history of Mr. Regula. He obviously served honorably the people of the 16th District in Ohio for 18 consecutive terms, from 1973 until last Congress, becoming the second longest-serving Republican Member in the House, Mr. Speaker.

Congressman Regula has a great legacy and has had a long and distinguished career in public service, always, always serving his country. Early on, he served in I think the most honorable way that one can ever serve this country, and that is in the Armed Forces, in the Navy. After completing his legal education, he went into private practice of law. In the early 1960s, Congressman Regula served as a member of the Ohio State Board of Education, and then he went on to serve in the Ohio House of Representatives, also in the Ohio State Senate prior to his election in the Congress.

Naming this Federal building in Ohio is appropriate to recognize Congressman Regula's commitment to public service, to his constituents, and to this Nation. The respect that he earned while serving in Congress is really demonstrated by what we are seeing today, the fact that this bill is sponsored by Ohio representatives from both sides of the aisle.

Again, I want to thank the sponsor of this legislation. I support the passage of this bill and urge my colleagues to do the same. Again, this is a man who has served this country with distinction.

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

Mr. BOCCIERI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

(Mr. SERRANO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SERRANO. I thank the gentleman.

Today, I rise in support of H.R. 1687, legislation to bring well-deserved recognition to Congressman Ralph Regula, who was first elected to Congress in 1972.

Congressman Regula retired in January of this year after serving in Congress for 18 consecutive terms. He had a wealth of experience on the House Appropriations Committee, serving as chairman of both the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee and the Interior Subcommittee.

When I assumed the chairmanship of the House Financial Services Appropriations Committee in this Congress, Congressman Regula was the ranking member, and he was a mentor and a partner. I learned a lot about how to be an effective chairman from Congressman Regula by watching him in action and talking to him as my ranking member.

As a Member from an urban district, New York City, I also learned a lot about him and about farming. And I must tell you, I learned something that may sound funny to some folks, but I learned the difference between jelly and jam, and he was an expert on the subject. What I most treasure is his friendship because Congressman Regula was a true and generous friend to me.

The designation of this Federal building and courthouse in Canton, Ohio, as the Ralph Regula Federal Building and United States Courthouse is an appropriate honor for this man who has devoted his life to public service. He served in the Navy, was a lawyer, a member of the Ohio State Board of Education, the Ohio House of Representatives, and the Ohio State Senate before joining Congress and beginning his many years of distinguished and dedicated service on behalf of his constituents of the 16th Congressional District of Ohio.

We are doing something really good today; we are honoring a man who deserved this. And let me just conclude by saying this: I imagine when we leave here—when the day comes that I leave here—you want to be remembered for your work, but I think more than that you want to be remembered by your colleagues as how you treated them and how you interacted with them. Ralph Regula was a gentleman. Ralph Regula was a colleague. Ralph Regula never had anything nasty to say about anyone. And as I said before, coming from a community where I came from and coming from a community where he would tell me about driving his pickup truck and going out to his farm, it was two different worlds, and yet I learned to admire him, to love him, and to respect him.

And so today I wanted to join this celebration to say thank you to him. And I know, Mr. Speaker, it's somewhere outside the rules of the House to speak to a TV audience or to people in the gallery, so I won't do that, but I suspect that Congressman Regula is watching us today and needs to know that we care about him, that we care a lot, and that this is an honor, one of many, that he truly deserves.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

Mr. LATOURETTE. Thank you, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, for the recognition. And I want to thank Mr. BOCCIERI of Ohio for introducing this piece of legislation.

Mr. BOCCIERI—I can't call him Congressman Regula's replacement because nobody can replace Congressman Regula, but he is his successor. And, unluckily, I also happen to be his successor as the dean of the Ohio Republican Delegation because in the last two elections you guys have wiped everybody out, and at eight terms, I'm the head guy on our side in the State of Ohio.

But, as has been mentioned, Ralph served 36 years here. And 36 years is the longest that any Republican Member of Congress has served from the State of Ohio. He had a lot to do, and I think Mr. PETRI is going to talk about his work with the parks when he was the chairman of the Interior Subcommittee, but Ralph's real gift, when it came to our side of the aisle at least, back in happier days—and Mr. BOCCIERI, happier days are when the Republicans were in the majority, that definition. Ralph guided us. And if you looked at the Ohio delegation back in the 1990s, most of us were the chairmen of full committees. We had two cardinals, Mr. Regula and Mr. Hobson of Springfield. And that was all Ralph's doing. He made a commitment to make sure that there was an Ohioan on every committee that mattered.

When I was elected—I'm a lawyer by training—I said, Ralph, I think I would like to be on the Judiciary Committee. And he said, What are you, nuts? We need a Republican from Ohio on the Transportation Committee. And he put me there, and it was one of the happiest times of my life.

There are two things that I want to talk about. Mr. SERRANO is right about his observations, but I came in the Class of 1994, so I'm one of those Republican revolutionaries that created the first majority since 1954. And Mr. Speaker, you may remember—and others may remember—that at that time there was a lot of rhetoric in this Chamber and there were some things that became targets. And parks became targets. But what I will always remember is that it was the desire on my side of the aisle to zero-fund things like the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities. And I thought that was misguided, and Congressman Regula, as the chairman of the Interior Subcommittee, also felt that that was misguided. And as a result, although those agencies saw reductions during that time, they were never zeroed out. And I think in this appropriation cycle we will finally get back to the level of funding that they received prior to 1994.

I will tell you that a few years before Congressman Regula's retirement he was in line as the most senior guy to become the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. And he worked very hard at that. He created an organization called CARE, and worked hard—raised a lot of money in what you had to do and all that other business—and he was denied that honor, that oppor-

tunity. I will tell you that, in my mind, it had a lot to do not with the quality of the other candidates, who were both excellent. It had a lot to do with the fact that Ralph had angered people back in the 1990s because he wouldn't eliminate the National Endowment for the Arts, he wouldn't eliminate the National Endowment for the Humanities, he wouldn't agree to shut down the Department of Education. And as a result, even though Ralph had a long and distinguished career here, I think he was punished.

The other thing I want to say about Ralph is his partner, his life partner, Mary—Mary, of course, is the brains behind the First Ladies' Library. Mr. Speaker, if you ever happen to be traveling through the State of Ohio and you have to take a restroom break or you have to get off and get a soda, stop at the First Ladies' Library, because it really is an amazing creation that wouldn't be in existence today if it wasn't for Mary Regula, with the support of her husband, Ralph Regula.

So, Mr. BOCCIERI, I again want to thank you very much. This is an amazingly wonderful bipartisan effort on your part, and Senator BROWN, who you mentioned, to name something after somebody who really deserves to have something named after him. I never have served with a finer public servant than Congressman Regula. I know that that building will make him proud, and it should make the citizens of Canton, Ohio, proud as well. And I thank you for honoring my friend.

Mr. BOCCIERI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I wish to thank the gentleman from Ohio. His remarks were not only appropriate, they were well-guided in terms of what Mr. Regula meant not only to our part of Ohio, but what he meant to America.

Campaigning through the district and having the occasion to work with Congressman Regula while I was in the State legislature, people knew him not as a conservative, not as a liberal, not as a Democrat or Republican, but just as Ralph. And that type of leadership, that type of portrayal of American politics is what we should all rise to emulate. He was a man of his word, a man of integrity, and a man who believed in the Constitution. And he told me, he said, When you go to Congress, John, make sure that you protect the Constitution and, in particular, the fact that we own the checkbook, we write the checks, we appropriate the money, we here in Congress are responsible for the taxpayers' dollars. He was responsible for millions and millions of dollars coming back to the State of Ohio, whether it was research in fuel-cell technology or whether it was the First Ladies' Library that his wife had such a brilliant idea to anchor in our part of Ohio and the Midwest, or just funding for all the medical research that we're doing in our State, he was a leader. And he believed in the innovation and

creativity of the American people, and in particular of all Ohioans. He was a man of great integrity, and someone who obviously I, as Congressman LATOURRETTE said, would not be able to replace, but certainly respect as his successor.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield to the gentlelady from California, our Speaker of the House of Representatives, Speaker PELOSI.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and thank him for giving us this opportunity to come to the floor to sing the praises of our former colleague—we always will have him as a colleague in our hearts, but former colleague on the floor, Congressman Ralph Regula of Ohio.

□ 1815

As many of you know and as has been acknowledged, Ralph Regula served in the House with great distinction for 38 years of service, 38 years of service and not only service, great leadership. Last year we sadly said good-bye to him, but now tonight we will honor him by creating a longstanding testament to his leadership, designating the courthouse and Federal building in his hometown of Canton as the Ralph Regula Federal Building and United States Courthouse.

I want to acknowledge Congressman JOHN BOCCIERI for his work in shepherding this legislation through Congress and for doing an exceptional job, I believe, following in the footsteps of Ralph Regula in representing Ohio's 16th Congressional District.

Congressman Regula's entire life was devoted to public service and still is. He was a distinguished Navy veteran of World War II. He served our country in that way, and he served in both the Ohio Senate and the Ohio House of Representatives as well as the State Board of Education. And aren't we fortunate that when he came to Congress, he was already an experienced legislator with a strong commitment to educating our children.

Thirty-eight years. Imagine that. Some of our Members weren't even born when Ralph Regula came to the Congress. Thirty-eight years in the House of Representatives, earning the distinction of being the second-longest-serving Republican in the Congress.

Congressman Regula's leadership benefited our entire Nation. It was a personal privilege for me to work with him on the Appropriations Committee. I saw firsthand his leadership, his knowledge of the issues, the respect that he commanded for all who came before him and the respect he had from both sides of the aisle.

I personally am grateful to him for transforming San Francisco's former Army base—he was very much a part of doing that—the Presidio, into one of our Nation's premier parks, and we have honored him on many occasions in San Francisco, most recently at Fort Baker.

None of us can come together and talk about Ralph Regula without talking about Mary Regula because they

served here in Congress as a team. Ralph would be the first to say that it was the love of Mary and their three children and four grandchildren that made his leadership possible. And we all know that Mary is the one who made a decision that we would have a National First Ladies' Library in Canton, Ohio, to honor the contribution to our Nation of the First Ladies of America. It's a phenomenal thing. She had an idea, she executed it, and now people can visit and see that important part of American history thanks to Mary Regula.

Today we honor a great congressional leader, a great friend to all of us, and a great man. I urge all of my colleagues to understand the privilege that we have of expressing our appreciation for Ralph Regula's leadership by supporting this legislation, and I join my colleagues from Ohio on both sides of the aisle for the honor that we are paying to Ralph Regula tonight. And I again thank JOHN BOCCIERI for shepherding this through the Congress.

Mr. BOCCIERI. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I concur with the Speaker's eloquent remarks, especially about Mary, who champions women in their role in politics. And for my two daughters who are sitting behind me and the ones I have at home, she has been a shepherd for all in the 16th District as well as our country.

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

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI).

Mr. PETRI. I thank my colleague for yielding. I thank the previous speakers, particularly the Speaker of the House for taking the time from her busy schedule to come down here to honor a distinguished colleague on the occasion of naming the Federal courthouse in his hometown after him, and that's the gentleman I had the privilege of serving with for nearly 30 years and getting to know and one whom I admire a great deal, and that is Ralph Regula.

You've heard about the spirit with which Ralph Regula approached his responsibilities as a legislator. It was positive. He worked with all Members of this body, and he did what he thought was in the best interest of this country and this institution.

You learn a lot about Members of this body when you visit their districts. And my wife and young daughter and I had the habit, as we would drive back to Wisconsin for the August break, of picking a different route across the country and taking a few extra days and stopping to see historic and interesting places and making it an educational and fun thing rather than just an ordeal to go across the country. And one year we decided to go through and visit John Seiberling, another colleague in Akron, Ohio, from a distinguished family, Seiberling Tire

and all that, and he had his home which they had lost in the Depression, Stan Hywet, which is one of the largest private homes in the United States.

And in the course of doing that, he took us through the thing, and I discovered that he and Ralph Regula had worked together for many years to create what is now, I believe, the largest national park east of the Mississippi, the Cuyahoga. I know they were both tremendously proud of that. It was a wonderful opportunity for that area of Ohio because there are large cities on various sides of this and it provides recreational and other opportunities for a large population. And if they had not acted when they did, it might not be there today. It was done by those two Representatives working as best they could with colleagues in both political parties and will stand, I think, as a lasting monument to their joint efforts on behalf of our country and certainly the people of their region in Ohio.

Ralph and Mary were and are a great team. And one other thing I think I might mention, Ralph is kind of a gentleman farmer, I guess, and he used to spend a lot of time working there, and he loved his grandchildren and family and all of that. But Ronald Reagan was kind of a gentleman farmer, too. He had this ranch out in California where he cleared brush and was trying to develop it. And it turned out that he and Ralph were talking over at the White House for some reason about some other things, and Reagan discovered that Ralph was going back to work on some fencing on his farm and he asked him if he could explain how he did it. So Ralph came back to a meeting afterward and said that Reagan had taken careful notes and everything else and then a week or two later gave him, I think, a signed copy of the instructions that Ralph had given to him, that it was a good fence.

Ralph did a great job and it's an appropriate honor. I strongly support the passage of this legislation.

Mr. BOCCIERI. Mr. Speaker, just a few more comments and I think we will be wrapping this up very soon.

To piggyback on what the gentleman was suggesting, as I said earlier, Ralph was not known as a Democrat or a Republican, a conservative or a liberal; he was just known as "Ralph." I remember, in some closing remarks at a recent banquet that we were at, I was telling folks, and I feel at liberty to say this, I'm a freshman Member here, that this collegiality that we are sharing right now becomes few and far between at times and we need to return this Chamber, this body, our dialogue to that kind of respect for each other, where we may disagree on ideas, as Democrats and Republicans, we both believe in the end goal. And like a married couple, we may argue about how we get to the end destination, taking this exit ramp, that road, but at the end of the day, like a married couple, we always end up where we need to go.

And we need to respect that. And I think that this bill respects the service of Ralph Regula and his contributions to northeast Ohio, and in particular what it will mean to the people of Stark County who go there to find relief and find help from their government. And every day they walk into that building, that building that's being built right now, they will see his designation, his name, and it will be a remembrance of what he meant.

Just one last comment, Mr. Speaker. This district that I am currently representing and serving in is, by all measures, arguably a swing district. It has Democrat and Republican registrations, even Independents inside the race. But yet he held this district for 36 years, and the Congressman before him held this district for 18 years, and the other Federal building in the city is named after him, Frank T. Bow. And so what this says is that the people of northeast Ohio, in particular the 16th District, they respect legislators, they respect Congressmen like Ralph Regula and his predecessor because they believe in our greatest asset, which is our people.

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

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I will be brief.

I want to echo the words of the gentleman from Ohio. I think they were very well-stated. I also want to thank the Speaker of the House for coming down today and speaking in such well-deserved words but kind words to a man that really loved this institution, loved this country, and served both so very well.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1687, as amended, introduced by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOCCIERI), designates the building located at McKinley Avenue and Third Streets, SW. in Canton, Ohio, as the "Ralph Regula Federal Building and United States Courthouse". The bill has broad bipartisan support.

The designation honors the exemplary public service of our former colleague from Canton, Ohio, Ralph Regula. Ralph represented the 16th district of Ohio for 36 years, from January 3, 1973 to January 3, 2009. Former President Gerald Ford, while serving as the House leader, recommended Ralph Regula for an appointment to the Committee on Appropriations. He served with distinction on the Subcommittee on the Interior and the Subcommittee on Labor, Health, and Human Services.

Ralph Strauss Regula was born in Beach City, Ohio, on December 3, 1924. During World War II, Congressman Regula served in the United States Navy. He later went on to earn a B.A. from Mount Union College in 1948, and then graduated from the William McKinley School of Law in Canton, Ohio, in 1952.

Congressman Regula served in many different capacities in his long tenure in public service. He was a member of the Ohio State Board of Education from 1960–1964. Regula was then elected to the Ohio State House of Representatives from 1965–1967, and subsequently served in the Ohio State Senate in

1967–1972. He then went on to be elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in the 93rd Congress, and served for 36 years.

Congressman Regula last served as the ranking member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government, and was one of the longest serving Republican Members of Congress. Congressman Regula retired at the end of the 110th Congress after a career of nearly 50 years of public service. Congressman Regula is married to Mary Regula and has three children and four grandchildren.

It is most fitting and proper to honor Congressman Regula with this designation.

I support H.R. 1687, as amended, and urge its passage.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. With that, Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BOCCIERI. Mr. Speaker, at this time I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KISSELL). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOCCIERI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1687, 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.

Mr. BOCCIERI. 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.

RECOGNIZING CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE RECREATIONAL BOATING COMMUNITY

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 410) recognizing the numerous contributions of the recreational boating community and the boating industry to the continuing prosperity and affluence of the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 410

Whereas the boating community in the United States includes over 59,000,000 individuals, generates more than \$33,000,000,000 annually in the United States economy, and provides jobs for 337,000 citizens of the United States who earn wages totaling \$10,400,000,000 annually;

Whereas boaters often serve as stewards of the marine environment of the United States, educating future generations of the value of these resources, and preserving such resources for such generations' enjoyment;

Whereas there are approximately 1,400 active boat builders in the United States, using materials and services contributed from all 50 States;

Whereas boating, as an activity, provides opportunities for families to be together, ap-

peals to all age groups, and has a beneficial effect on the physical fitness and scholastic performance of those who participate; and

Whereas, July 1, 2009, would be an appropriate day to establish as National Boating Day; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) the recreational boating community and the boating industry of the United States should be commended for their numerous contributions to the economy of the United States, the well-being of United States citizens, and responsible environmental stewardship of the marine resources of the United States; and

(2) the President should issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe National Boating Day with appropriate programs and activities that emphasize family involvement and provide an opportunity to promote the boating industry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on House Resolution 410.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 410, recognizing the numerous contributions of the recreational boating community and the boating industry to the continuing prosperity and affluence of the United States.

This bipartisan resolution was introduced by Representatives RON KLEIN of Florida and HENRY BROWN of South Carolina, along with the co-Chairs of the Congressional Boating Caucus, Representatives GENE TAYLOR of Mississippi and CANDICE MILLER of Michigan.

House Resolution 410 honors the 59 million boaters in the United States. As evidenced by the bipartisan cosponsors of this resolution, American boaters span all across the country, including my constituents in Washington State who take to the waters of the Puget Sound.

□ 1830

Boating provides a great activity for thousands of families. Mr. Speaker, on our lakes and certainly on our great coasts—to fish, to dive, to snorkel or to simply enjoy America's stunning natural marine resources.

Boating isn't just a recreational activity. The boating industry is one of America's great industries that includes about 1,400 active boat builders in the United States, including many in my district, using materials and

services contributed from all 50 States. These are American jobs that are creating a uniquely American product. Additional jobs include electricians, carpenters, painters, and engineers who work to repair or to refit recreational vessels—along with all the crew members and employees at our many marinas and harbors.

When taken together, boating in America generates more than \$33 million annually for our economy, and it provides 337,000 jobs, totaling \$10.4 billion in wages every year. For these reasons, I am urging my colleagues to support House Resolution 410.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in support of House Resolution 410, a resolution recognizing the recreational boating community and industries.

I now recognize for as much time as he may consume our colleague from South Carolina, Mr. HENRY BROWN.

Mr. BROWN of South Carolina. I appreciate my colleague from Wisconsin for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my support for House Resolution 410, legislation I was proud to introduce with Representative KLEIN. As the Representative for 75 percent of South Carolina's coast and for many of my State's recreational and commercial boaters, I am proud of this resolution, which recognizes the numerous contributions of the recreational boating community and of the boating industry.

Boating is big business in the State of South Carolina, with more than \$826 million in sales a year and with nearly 9,000 boating industry employees across the State. Boats are owned by families of all income levels in communities across my State and the Nation. In my district alone, there are 82,441 registered recreational boats, and there are 145 boating businesses which range from small charter operations and marinas to major boat engine manufacturers at Cummins Marine, an employer of hundreds of my constituents.

Nationally, the recreational boating community includes over 59 million Americans, and it makes a significant impact on our economy. Boaters also serve as stewards of the marine environment as the boating community has a long history of educating future generations on the value of these resources and on how to preserve them for their enjoyment. Additionally, through annual motorboat fuel taxes, boaters contribute more than \$100 million towards fish restoration and towards other environmental programs.

More than anything else, boating is important to American families as it provides opportunities for them to spend quality time together. It appeals to all age groups, and it has the beneficial effect on the physical fitness and scholastic performance of those who participate.

At the request of my constituent, Mr. Bill Hanahan, I worked to include language in this resolution, marking the

important role that boating plays for American families. As Mr. Hanahan said, Joining family and friends on the water is a great way to escape the chaos of our busy lives, create quality memories together and appreciate nature in all its glory.

Boating does just that, and I encourage all of my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield 4 minutes to the cosponsor of this resolution, Mr. KLEIN of Florida.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN) for yielding me time, and I also want to commend him for his leadership on this important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 410, a resolution I introduced with my friend from South Carolina, the Honorable HENRY BROWN, along with the distinguished co-Chairs of the Congressional Boating Caucus, the Honorable GENE TAYLOR from Mississippi and the Honorable CANDICE MILLER from Michigan.

Our resolution highlights the important contributions of the recreational boating community and the boating industry as to the quality of our lives and as to our continued economic prosperity. I urge President Obama to issue a proclamation calling upon the American people to observe July 1 as National Boating Day.

Boating is a famous symbol for south Florida, where I come from, and for other parts around the country. Millions of residents in our community and tourists take to the waters of south Florida to boat, to fish, to dive, to snorkel, and to view scenic tours along our pristine coastline and along our unique intercoastal waterway. Palm Beach County alone has over 40,000 registered boaters. Fort Lauderdale's majestic canals have earned it the nickname "the Venice of America."

The significance of the boating community is not only symbolic. The industry is a major economic engine in Florida, responsible for over \$2.8 billion in direct sales and for 30,000 jobs Statewide. In my district alone, there are over 34,000 registered boats. The industry produces \$193 million, and it employs over 2,000 of my constituents.

As everyone here knows, the contributions of the boating community extend far beyond the Sunshine State. The boating community includes 59 million people and 13.6 million registered boats throughout the United States. In addition, the recreational boating industry provides more than \$37 billion in sales and in services to the U.S. economy, and it provides over 300,000 jobs throughout our country.

One need only look at the geographic diversity among members of the Congressional Boating Caucus, of which I am a proud member, to measure the broad influence and contributions of the boating community and of the boating industry. Members come from

33 States, including Tennessee, Pennsylvania, Kansas, and West Virginia.

Clearly, boating is not just a coastal pastime. It is an American pastime. Boating also brings us closer to our natural resources and treasures. I strongly believe that an appreciation for environmental stewardship comes through an interaction with nature. For example, it's hard to comprehend the beauty of our coral reefs until you see it under water with your own eyes through a boat. Once you do, you begin to understand their importance and the need to protect them for the continued health of our oceans.

Boating gives us these cherished opportunities to commune with nature, and it should be no surprise that boaters can be impassioned stewards of the environment, teaching future generations of boaters to have a healthy respect and appreciation for our natural resources.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 410, and I thank the gentleman from Washington again for bringing H. Res. 410 to the floor.

I urge its passage.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to our colleague from Indiana, Representative SOUDER.

Mr. SOUDER. I thank my friend and colleague from Wisconsin for his leadership on Transportation and for the time to speak on this bill.

As a member of the Boating Caucus, since we first formed this, I am really pleased to be supportive of this resolution. In northeast Indiana, basically, I represent a lot of water with plants and farms in between.

In Kosciusko County, we have 100 lakes. In Steuben County, we have 100 lakes. Along this ridge, one water system heads towards Lake Erie; one water system heads towards Lake Michigan, and the other goes down into the Mississippi Valley. Because of geological potholes basically connected together, sometimes through small dams and sometimes in natural larger lakes, we have the bulk of the lakes in Indiana. It is when the glaciers pulled back. So in this zone, I would guess we may have 40 to 60 percent of the natural lakes in the State of Indiana. Some have been, historically in United States' history, big attractions, not necessarily as big a tourist attraction as in Florida or as in Wisconsin or, for that matter, as in Washington State, but Winona Lake was a big Chautauqua area.

In Kosciusko County, we have a number of State parks on these lakes, and so we're proud to bring in lots of regional tourism and people who enjoy them. They're sometimes lined up to get to the open space on our lakes in Indiana.

Yet, as the number one manufacturing district in the United States—I can't remember the latest figures—I believe we're fifth in the manufacturing of boats. Many of those boats go

down to Florida and to the coasts. The inboard-outboard engine and the jet engine were both invented in my district, working with Volvo in Sweden. Many of the larger boat companies are based there—everything from float boats to fishing boats to high-powered speed-boats. It is a critical part of our district. It has been a pleasure to work with the boating industry as we work on how to get retail floor plan financing for boats.

We hear a lot right now about GM and Chrysler—the auto companies. I represent Elkhart County, along with Congressman JOE DONNELLY. We've been working to make sure of the RV industry, 58 percent of which is there; but if you'll notice and look carefully at the retail floor plan financing and at SBA and at what they've done through TALF and other things, you'll see it says cars, trucks, RVs, motorcycles, and boats, because the same challenge that we're facing in the auto industry is true for the boating industry, which is how do we make sure there are adequate boats being purchased from manufacturers; how do we make sure there is the financing to keep them afloat, and then how do we make sure of the dealers. If they can only get one-fourth of their normal inventory there, here in this peak season for selling boats, it isn't going to work.

So this is a very unusual time and an important time for the boating industry. Not only are we entering the summer season in the Great Lakes region and in other areas of the country where boating and recreation are at a peak, but it's also a time of survival. It is probably the biggest challenge to the boat manufacturers since the luxury tax nearly sunk them years ago.

So I stand, honored to speak on behalf of this resolution because it's very important that we call to the attention of the American people not only the great pleasures of recreational boating but also the importance of having our boating industry survive.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, we have no further speakers. So, at this point, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I fully support House Resolution 410, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 410, introduced by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KLEIN), which recognizes the recreational boating community and boating industry for their contributions to the national economy and urges the President to issue a proclamation to observe July 1, 2009 as National Boating Day.

In the United States, the boating community consists of over 59 million people and over 13 million registered recreational boats. The boating community supports over 330,000 American jobs with total wages totaling approximately \$10.4 billion a year. There are approximately 1400 boat builders in the United States that construct and repair boats using materials and services from all 50 States. In addition, recreational boating and the boating industry

contribute over \$33 billion to the American economy annually.

In my state of Minnesota, there are over 866,000 registered boats—the third largest number of boats of any state in the country. In fact, Minnesota has the most boats per capita of any state: there is one boat for every six people.

Whether it is on the river, a lake, along the ocean, inter-coastal or intra-coastal waterway, recreational boaters support and depend on over 12,000 marinas all across the United States.

Recreational boating is an American pastime. It is a family activity that appeals to all age groups and is a constructive outlet for entertainment. Whether water skiing, snorkeling, fishing, or just relaxing on the water, boating is a perfect reason to turn off the television and put away the video games and to bring families and friends closer together. For these reasons, July 1, 2009, should be established as National Boating Day.

I support H. Res. 410, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 410, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 410.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING NATIONAL PIPELINE SAFETY DAY

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 484) expressing support for designation of June 10th as “National Pipeline Safety Day”.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 484

Whereas there are more than 2,000,000 miles of gas and hazardous liquid pipelines in this country operated by over 3,000 companies;

Whereas these pipelines play a vital role in the lives of people in the United States by delivering the energy we need to heat our homes, drive our cars, cook our food and operate our businesses;

Whereas in the past decade significant new pipelines have been built to help move North American sources of oil and gas to refineries and markets;

Whereas, on June 10, 1999, a hazardous liquid pipeline ruptured and exploded in a park in Bellingham, Washington, killing two 10-year-old boys and a young man, destroying a salmon stream, and causing hundreds of millions of dollars in damages and economic disruption;

Whereas in response to this June 10th pipeline tragedy Congress passed significant new pipeline safety regulations in the form of the Pipeline Safety Improvement Act of 2002 and

the Pipeline Inspection, Protection, Enforcement, and Safety Act of 2006;

Whereas in the past decade the U.S. Department of Transportation’s Pipelines and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, with support from a diverse group of stakeholders, has instituted a variety of important new rules and pipeline safety initiatives such as the Common Ground Alliance, pipeline emergency training with the National Association of State Fire Marshals, and the Pipelines and Informed Planning Alliance;

Whereas even with all these new pipeline safety improvements, in 2008 alone there were still 274 significant pipeline incidents causing over \$395,000,000 in property damage and uncounted economic disruption;

Whereas even though pipelines are the safest method to transport huge quantities of fuel, pipeline incidents such as the 1994 pipeline explosion in Edison, New Jersey that left 100 people homeless, the 1996 butane pipeline explosion in Texas that left 2 teenagers dead, the 2000 pipeline explosion near Carlsbad, New Mexico, that killed 12 people in an extended family, the 2004 pipeline explosion in Walnut Creek, California, that killed 5 workers, and the 2007 propane pipeline explosion in Mississippi that killed a teenager and her grandmother are still occurring;

Whereas these millions of miles of pipelines are still out of sight and therefore out of mind for the majority of individuals, local governments, and businesses, leading to pipeline damage and general lack of oversight;

Whereas greater awareness of pipelines and pipeline safety can improve public safety;

Whereas a “National Pipeline Safety Day” can provide a focal point for creating greater pipeline safety awareness; and

Whereas June 10, 2009, is the 10th anniversary of the Bellingham, Washington, pipeline tragedy that was the impetus for many of the above-mentioned safety improvements and would be an appropriate day to designate as “National Pipeline Safety Day”: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the designation of National Pipeline Safety Day;

(2) encourages State and local governments to observe the day with appropriate activities that promote pipeline safety;

(3) encourages all pipeline safety stakeholders to use this day to create greater public awareness of all the advancements that can lead to even greater pipeline safety; and

(4) encourages individuals across the Nation to become more aware of the pipelines that run through our communities and do what they can to encourage safe practices and damage prevention.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on House Resolution 484.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise to ask the House of Representatives to support the designation of June 10, tomorrow, as National Pipeline Safety Day. There are more than 2 million miles of gas and hazardous liquid pipelines in our country. Pipelines play a vital role in the lives of the American people by delivering the energy we need to heat our homes, to drive our cars, to cook our food, and to operate our businesses.

In the past decade, significant new pipelines have been built to help move oil and gas to refineries and to markets. These pipelines are invisible to most people and, therefore, are out of sight and are out of mind. This can lead to pipeline damage and to a general lack of government oversight.

On June 10 of 1999, a pipeline leak caused a massive explosion in my district in Bellingham, Washington. The rupture released more than a quarter of a million gallons of gasoline into Whatcom Creek. The gasoline ignited, sending a fireball racing down the creek, which killed two 10-year-old boys and an 18-year-old man. The two boys—Stephen Tsiorvas and Wade King—were playing in the creek on a summer day, near their homes, and 18-year-old Liam Wood had just graduated from high school and was fly fishing for trout.

□ 1845

Previous generations certainly ask themselves, Where were you when President Kennedy was shot? But in my district, people literally ask the question and know the answer to, Where were you when the pipeline exploded? It had that much of an impact in my district.

In response to this tragedy and several other pipeline explosions across the country, Congress passed legislation to strengthen pipeline safety regulations. The 2002 Pipeline Safety Improvement Act increased penalty fines, improved pipeline testing timelines, provided whistleblower protection, and allowed for State oversight. In 2006, Congress reauthorized the 2002 law by passing the Pipeline Inspection, Protection, Enforcement, and Safety Act, or the PIPES Act. Since that day in June, we’ve made significant progress in ensuring the safety of our Nation’s pipelines. The frequency of so-called “high-consequence events” to pipelines has diminished almost 35 percent in the last 10 years. Due to the integrity management program required by the new law, pipeline operators have made extensive repairs to their pipelines that otherwise would have led to future accidents.

The 811 One-Call program now provides a number that people can call before they dig to make sure that they won’t hit a pipeline when they do dig. “Call 811, the One-Call program.” And Congress has significantly increased the number of pipeline inspectors in

the field. However, we must remain vigilant. That's why I have introduced House Resolution 484, a resolution to recognize tomorrow, June 10, 2009, the 10-year anniversary of the Bellingham pipeline explosion, as National Pipeline Safety Day. My resolution encourages individuals, State and local governments, and pipeline safety stakeholders to use this day to create greater public awareness of pipelines and pipeline safety. It has the support of Washington State Governor Christine Gregoire, the Whatcom County Council, the Pipeline Safety Trust, the Pipeline Association for Public Awareness, the American Gas Association and the American Public Gas Association.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I do encourage my colleagues to support House Resolution 484.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I would like to express my support for House Resolution 484, designating June 10 as National Pipeline Safety Day, and yield such time as he may consume to my colleague from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART).

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman for his generosity with the time.

I rise in support of this resolution, designating National Pipeline Safety Month. Mr. Speaker, pipelines obviously play an important role in our society through the operation of our homes, our businesses, and the delivery of energy to drive our cars, to cook our food, to keep us warm in the winter and cool in the summer. It is an undeniable reality that energy affects all aspects of our lives, and all Americans need it and depend on energy.

That's why it's unfortunate that some in the majority and in the administration, frankly, are proposing this cap-and-trade legislation that many are calling cap-and-tax legislation that would dramatically increase the cost of energy for all Americans, every single American. Estimates say that this bill could increase a cost to a family of four close to \$3,000 a year, \$2,937 a year, to be exact, and raise electrical rates on families by 90 percent after adjusting for inflation, boost gasoline prices by 74 percent on American families, and natural gas prices by 54 percent. If that were not bad enough, it would also put American businesses at a huge competitive disadvantage with their competitors from other countries that don't pursue that kind of legislation, be it China or India.

Now let's take a look at what some key players in the administration have recently stated about this legislation, some facts. For example, Peter Orszag, as CBO director and currently as the OMB director, testified to the Ways and Means Committee on September 18, 2008. He said, "Decreasing emission would also impose costs on the econ-

omy. Much of those costs will be passed along to consumers in the form of higher prices for energy and energy-intensive goods."

Mr. Orszag's written testimony stated that the average annual household cost was \$1,300. That's for a 15 percent cut in CO₂ emissions, which, by the way, happens to be 80 percent less than the cut sought by this administration.

Another fact. On March 17, 2009, Energy Secretary Steven Chu, testifying before the Science Committee said, "The cap-and-trade bill will likely increase the cost of electricity."

Another fact I would like to bring up today, Energy Secretary Steven Chu said advocating adjusting trade duties as a "weapon" to protect U.S. manufacturing, because otherwise, again, U.S. manufacturing would be put at a huge disadvantage. He said establishing a carbon tariff would help "level the playing field" if other countries haven't imposed mandatory reductions in carbon emissions; again, referring to the fact that it would put our industry at a huge, huge disadvantage. Again Mr. Chu said, "If other countries don't impose a cost on carbon, then we will be at a disadvantage," and he went on to say, "and we would look at considering duties to offset that cost." But the legislation doesn't have those in the bill.

Again, what we are looking at then is, the United States will impose a self-inflicted wound to put our industry and our country at a huge disadvantage, increasing costs of energy to all consumers in this great country of ours at a time in particular when everybody is hurting.

Last month on May 21, the current CBO director testified before the House Budget Committee and said, "CBO has been very clear that a cap-and-trade system or a carbon tax would raise the price of carbon emissions, and the cost would ultimately be borne by households." Again, it's not rocket science, Mr. Speaker. And again, "It's also widely understood that if we raise the price of carbon emissions and our trading partners do not, then that creates an additional challenge for carbon-emitting industries." Those are his words. I added that part about the rocket science, to be fair; but those are his words.

So it's fitting that we are now here talking about pipelines and energy. I just hope that we don't forget the big picture as well and that we don't impose this huge cost on our consumers and those who use gasoline and turn on lights, like everybody does, that manufacturers using energy, like every industry does, that we don't put them at a huge disadvantage.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the parents of the three young men who died in the explosion would be very interested to hear the thoughts of the gentleman from Florida on energy.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I believe this resolution highlights the need to

properly maintain pipelines and encourages the development of pipeline safety programs. I support the passage of this resolution and urge my colleagues to do the same.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. PETRI and Mr. MICA as well as Mr. YOUNG, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Ms. BROWN for all their help in putting this resolution together and getting it to the floor today. I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 484.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 484, introduced by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN), which expresses support for designating June 10th as "National Pipeline Safety Day".

Pipelines have a critical place in our national infrastructure. The national pipeline network of over 2.2 million miles efficiently delivers gasoline, natural gas, oil, and other essential energy products across the country each day. However, because of the volatile nature of the products they deliver, if pipelines are not properly cared for, or they are carelessly tampered with, there can be serious consequences.

That is what occurred in 1986 in Mounds View, Minnesota, when a Williams pipeline ruptured. Vaporized gasoline combined with air and liquid gasoline flowed along neighborhood streets. About 20 minutes after the accident occurred, the gasoline vapor was ignited when an automobile entered the area. Fire spread rapidly along the path of the liquid gasoline, killing a woman and her daughter and severely burning another victim. According to accident investigators, there were known deficiencies in the cathodic protection applied to the first 10 miles of the pipeline and Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 484, introduced by the corrosion to the weld seams. Employees also had failed to shut-off the manually operated gate valve until one and half hours into the spill.

According to the National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB), had the valve been remotely operable or had remote-operated valves been installed on the line at the time of the accident, the pipeline could have been shut down by the dispatcher soon after the failure was detected, thereby decreasing substantially the amount of product released into the neighborhood. Ignition of the fuel may not have been prevented; however, the extent and severity of the damage could have been reduced.

The NTSB first identified the need for rapid shutdown of failed pipelines to limit the release of product following a pipeline rupture in a 1970 study, entitled "Effects of Delay in Shutting Down Failed Pipeline Systems and Methods of Providing Rapid Shutdown". Since then, a number of accidents that highlight the need to reduce the release of hazardous gases or liquids have occurred. In 1995, the NTSB recommended that the Department of Transportation's Research and Special Programs Administration (RSPA) expedite requirements for rapid shutdown of failed pipeline segments on high-pressure pipelines in high-consequence areas.

However, RSPA failed to act on the NTSB's recommendations, opting instead to further study the issue. That prompted Congress to pass the Accountable Pipeline Safety and

Partnership Act of 1996 (P.L. 104–304), which required the Secretary of Transportation to assess the effectiveness of remotely operated valves and to prescribe standards, within two years of enactment, for installation of the valves based on that assessment. The regulations were not issued until 2001—too late for the victims of the 1999 hazardous liquid pipeline explosion in Bellingham, Washington.

The June 10, 1999, explosion caused the release of about 237,000 gallons of gasoline into a creek that flowed through Whatcom Falls Park in Bellingham, Washington. The gasoline ignited, sending a fireball about 1.5 miles down the creek, which took the lives of two 10-year-old boys, Stephen Tsiorvas and Wade King, and an 18-year-old young man, Liam Wood. Eight additional inhalation injuries occurred, a single-family residence and the city of Bellingham's water treatment plant were severely damaged, and the wildlife in Whatcom Creek was completely destroyed.

Investigators found, among other things, that Olympic Pipe Line had no remote-operated shut off valves on the line, which could have prevented the release of hundreds of thousands of gasoline and the loss of three young lives. Following the Bellingham accident, RSPA ordered the pipeline company to install an automatic check valve just downstream of the rupture location so that the volume of product released would be limited in the event of a future pipeline rupture in that area. Again, a case of too little, too late.

Pipeline accidents, such as the ones in Mounds View and Bellingham, are not isolated incidents. According to the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA), which now oversees the safety of our nation's pipeline infrastructure, 2,888 significant pipeline incidents occurred between 1999–2008, resulting in 173 fatalities, 632 injuries, and \$2.7 billion in property damage.

In response to these incidents, Congress passed the Pipeline Safety Improvement Act of 2002 (P.L. 107–355), which increased penalties for violations of safety standards; developed qualification programs for employees who perform sensitive tasks; strengthened pipeline testing requirements; required government mapping of the pipeline system; established a public education program for communities that live around pipelines; and enhanced whistleblower protections.

In 2006, Congress furthered these pipeline safety efforts by passing the Pipeline Inspection, Protection, Enforcement, and Safety Act (P.L. 109–468), which required development of an integrity management program for distribution pipelines; implemented long-standing NTSB safety recommendations on the installation of excess flow valves, development of hours-of-service standards for pipeline employees, and adoption of safety standards for Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) systems; and increased pipeline inspection and enforcement personnel.

Despite these significant measures, much work remains to be done. PHMSA has not implemented many of the mandates from the 2006 Act. Over the next several months, as we look to reauthorization of the pipeline safety program in fiscal year 2011, we will work with PHMSA to ensure full implementation of the Act.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Res. 484.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 484.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL HOMEOWNERSHIP MONTH

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 502) recognizing National Homeownership Month and the importance of homeownership in the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 502

Whereas the month of June is recognized as National Homeownership Month;

Whereas the people of the United States are one of the best-housed populations in the world;

Whereas owning a home is a fundamental part of the American dream and is the largest personal investment many families will ever make;

Whereas homeownership provides economic security for homeowners by aiding them in building wealth over time and strengthens communities through a greater stake among homeowners in local schools, civic organizations, and churches;

Whereas creating affordable homeownership opportunities requires the commitment and cooperation of the private, public, and nonprofit sectors, including the Federal Government and State and local governments;

Whereas homeownership can be sustained through appropriate homeownership education and informed borrowers; and

Whereas affordable homeownership will play a vital role in resolving the crisis in the United States housing market: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) fully supports the goals and ideals of National Homeownership Month;

(2) recognizes the importance of homeownership in building strong communities and families; and

(3) reaffirms the importance of homeownership in the Nation's economy and its central role in our national economic recovery.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY G. MILLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and to insert extraneous material thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation which recognizes June as National Homeownership Month. As Chair of the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity, I am indeed committed to good public policy that will assist citizens to realize the American dream of homeownership. I would like to thank Representative GARY MILLER for his continued leadership on ensuring that this resolution comes to the floor every year. This is the seventh time that he has introduced this resolution, and I appreciate his commitment to America's homeowners. Preserving homeownership is more important today than ever before, with foreclosures reaching record levels and millions more Americans struggling to stay in their homes. Homeownership has historically been the single most important wealth-building tool available to families in this country. However, homeownership, as we know it, is at risk. The foreclosure crisis has all but erased the gains we have made in increasing homeownership rates, especially for minorities; and the gains those families thought they had achieved through increases in home equity have also diminished as now 20 percent of homeowners owe more on their homes than they are worth.

The combination of unemployment, unsustainable and predatory mortgages, and uncooperative mortgage servicers has created a perfect storm of record rates, of loan defaults and foreclosures. According to the Mortgage Bankers Association, a record 12 percent of mortgages are either in default or in foreclosure. According to the Center For Responsible Lending, 6,500 foreclosures occur each day in the United States. By the end of 2009, there will be 2.4 million families in foreclosure. We must keep families in their homes, and this Congress and the administration have developed programs to do just that. For example, the Making Home Affordable program, announced by President Barack Obama in March, builds on legislation I introduced at the beginning of this Congress to end this unending avalanche of foreclosures.

Despite the commitment from the administration and Congress to reduce foreclosures, mortgage servicers have been reluctant to modify troubled loans. In fact, NeighborWorks recently found in its survey of housing counseling agencies that servicers are generally uncooperative. They take up to 60 days to respond to requests and frequently lose important documents. In order to be true to the spirit of National Homeownership Month, I call on all mortgage servicers to fully participate in the Making Home Affordable program and to work with families to maintain their ownership.

Vulnerable homeowners are also threatened by scam artists who offer to

rescue or help struggling homeowners stay in their homes for an exorbitant fee that must be paid up front. They often deliver either nothing or a higher payment than the homeowner was paying before contacting these companies. The Federal Trade Commission has begun to crack down on these scammers, and I support these efforts.

Prospective homeowners are also caught up in this economic crisis. Because they have no other home to sell, first-time homebuyers have the ability to help stabilize housing prices and neighborhoods. Housing experts are saying that now is the time to buy, but many first-time homebuyers are finding themselves locked out of the housing market. Many families who would otherwise be buying homes now lack the required down payment. Fortunately, the recently enacted \$8,000 tax credit for first-time homebuyers is now being monetized so that these homeowners can use it to pay closing costs or to assist with their down payment.

America's homeowners face many challenges this month and will face many more this year. This resolution demonstrates this Congress' commitment to assisting them and first-time homebuyers in achieving the American dream of homeownership.

□ 1900

I urge all of my colleagues to support this important resolution.

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

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the month of June is recognized as National Homeownership Month. On June 3, 2009, I introduced this bipartisan resolution with 12 of my colleagues, including the ranking member, and I would like to thank MAXINE WATERS. As I recall, you have been here every time on the floor speaking with me. You are an ardent supporter of housing. You understand the benefit of that to communities and how it really helps people who need homes.

We are in a tough time, but we need to acknowledge the importance of homeownership in building strong communities and families. Owning a home is a fundamental part of the American Dream and is the largest personal investment most families will ever make.

For millions of American families, homeownership provides an entry into the middle class, and is a key to building wealth. Moreover, in addition to providing financial benefits to individuals, homeownership also helps strengthen communities. Homeowners have a greater stake in the success of their local schools, civic organizations and churches.

We have recently experienced significant upheaval in the U.S. housing market which has affected the entire economy. My home State of California in particular has been heavily impacted by the mortgage crisis, with thousands

of families losing their homes. Despite all of this occurring in the current housing market, we need to remember that homeownership has historically been the single largest creator of wealth for most Americans.

As someone who has been involved in the housing industry for more than 35 years, I have seen my fair share of housing downturns. From these experiences, I have learned that at a time of stress, it is important to ensure that liquidity continues to flow to the housing market in order to keep the markets functioning.

The loan limit increases for FHA and GSEs included in enacted law are finally providing affordable, safe mortgages for homeowners who were previously forced to resort to risky loans that impaired their ability to keep their home.

Additionally, I have also cosponsored the Homebuyer Tax Credit Act, which was introduced by my fellow Southern Californian, KEN CALVERT, to bring stability to the housing market and encourage responsible homeownership. Congressman KEN CALVERT's bill would expand the homebuyer tax credit provisions included in the enacted stimulus bills. During these economically challenging times, it is more important than ever to provide tax relief to hard-working families.

In the first quarter of 2009, the homeownership rate was 67.3 percent. It has become more difficult for many people to retain homeownership today. Many families are trying very hard just to be able to make their house payment each and every month.

In the past we have seen downturns in the seventies, eighties and nineties. This is probably the most significant one I have ever seen. At this point in time we need to acknowledge that supporting homeownership is a worthy goal of this Congress, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution by voting "yes."

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to request of my colleague that we join in a little colloquy prior to going to our closing.

Representative MILLER, I know that you have been involved with real estate and housing and development and you understand a lot about the housing markets. And while we have identified that there certainly are problems we have been going through, a crisis with foreclosures and a kind of a meltdown, I am extremely hopeful that we are going to be able to stabilize this housing market and that we can continue to encourage our families to seek homeownership opportunities.

I think we see some indications of the banks getting stronger and being able to pay back money that the United States citizens have invested in the banks in order to stabilize this housing market. But I would like to have your opinion: Based on your expertise and your involvement for so

many years, do you think that we are beginning to have a turnaround?

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Well, you have worked very closely with me over the years on dealing with conforming loan limits in high-cost areas for Freddie and Fannie, and in California we almost felt like stepchildren for years. The limits were so low that people in California could not be able to use them to buy a home, and they were forced into riskier loans that many times you and I fought hard to change.

We have raised the GSEs and the FHA loan limit in California and are helping a tremendous amount of people refinance their homes, or people who need to sell a home and people buying a home be able to get into the marketplace at probably at least 100 basis points cheaper than they would be able to get into a jumbo loan.

I don't know if it is over, Maxine. I really wish I could say it was. I remember back in the early eighties when the prime went to 21.5 percent. You remember that. As a developer, I was paying a 24.5 percent interest rate for construction projects I had, and if anybody could even get a loan for 12 percent, they would buy a house at that point in time. But you couldn't get it.

I hope we are doing what is right, providing liquidity in the marketplace to encourage people to take advantage of the deals that are out there today. But you see more and more lenders having to foreclose on homes, and they are putting them on the marketplace. In fact, I have a bill right now that Chairman FRANK is going to be bringing up before the committee that allows banks, instead of forcing those homes on the marketplace, they can lease those homes for up to 5 years, and that way you get a lot of these distress sales off the marketplace.

Hopefully we can find a reasonable bottom at that point in time and the market will start to come back. But you have such a glut of foreclosed properties on the market today that it keeps driving values down further and further, and that makes it more difficult for people to be able to stay in their home, because many times they owe more than it is worth.

So hopefully we can get together, and we have done many of these things in a bipartisan fashion, and create a structure that will create a bottom and get us out of this. I am looking forward to that.

But I am really thankful to you for your help and your cooperation and your support for the housing market. You have a passion for that, as I do, and I know SPENCER BACHUS does and Chairman FRANK does also, and hopefully working together in a bipartisan fashion we can find a bottom and move the American people in a positive fashion forward.

Ms. WATERS. Thank you very much. I do appreciate your comments, and I value them because of your experience.

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is with great enthusiasm that I support H. Res 502, recognizing June as National Homeownership Month and the importance of homeownership in the United States.

Since the founding of this great nation, homeownership has been fundamentally tied to the American Dream. However, the right to own land or a home has not always been an inclusive one—for many generations homeownership was denied to communities of color and women. While we have taken great strides to rectify past injustices, much remains to be done, which reflects the importance of this resolution.

Owning a home represents much more than a roof and walls to protect one's family from the elements, or a space to raise a family. A home is the single most valuable asset one can own, and the wealth it can generate over time is crucially important for rising out of poverty. This reason alone, reflects the irreversible damage that the foreclosure crisis is inflicting on our communities.

The bursting of the housing bubble and the economic crisis have resulted in the loss of countless American homes; countless dreams have been disrupted, and countless Americans are now struggling to deal with the ramifications of the actions of greedy, dishonest businesspeople more focused on personal gain than on truly honoring the dream of homeownership.

We now find ourselves at a critical point in American history. The housing and financial markets are undergoing fundamental changes; and while the Administration and this legislative body continue to work to implement programs to sustain homeownership, we must not forget those of us who are still working to realize the dream of owning their own home.

I firmly believe that homeownership should be a dream realized by every responsible American, and believe that we should continue to work to provide opportunities to make those realizations possible.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 502.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1886, PAKISTAN ENDURING ASSISTANCE AND COOPERATION ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2009, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2410, FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 2010 AND 2011

Mr. PERLMUTTER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-143) on the resolution (H. Res. 522) providing for

consideration of the bill (H.R. 1886) to authorize democratic, economic, and social development assistance for Pakistan, to authorize security assistance for Pakistan, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2410) to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and the Peace Corps for fiscal years 2010 and 2011, to modernize the Foreign Service, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF MILLARD FULLER

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 385) celebrating the life of Millard Fuller, a life which provides all of the evidence one needs to believe in the power of the human spirit to inspire hope and lift the burdens of poverty and despair from the shoulders of one's fellow man.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 385

Whereas Mr. Millard Fuller, as the founder of Habitat for Humanity and as a dedicated citizen, displayed extraordinary commitment, selflessness, and benevolence throughout a lifetime of philanthropy and goodwill;

Whereas Mr. Fuller, despite achieving financial success by which he could live out the rest of his life in well-earned comfort, instead chose to devote himself to a cause greater than himself, abandoning his fortune for a life of service;

Whereas this commitment was most profoundly manifested in the establishment of Habitat for Humanity in Americus, Georgia, an organization whose core principle was, in Millard Fuller's own words, "To make it socially, morally, politically and religiously unacceptable to have substandard housing and homelessness";

Whereas Habitat for Humanity has, since its founding in 1976, and with the help of countless volunteers, constructed over 300,000 homes for 1,500,000 of the world's less fortunate, providing hope that would otherwise be lost and promise that would otherwise lay unrealized;

Whereas Habitat for Humanity's success has left an enduring mark of progress on the world, an achievement facilitated by Millard Fuller's leadership and commitment to a higher ideal, to a more empathetic and noble world, and to a vision of what can be achieved when a united people extend their hands in selfless service;

Whereas Mr. Fuller's life has been previously and deservedly honored by President William Jefferson Clinton, who awarded him the Nation's highest civilian honor, the Presidential Medal of Freedom in 1996; and

Whereas Millard Fuller passed away on February 3, 2009, leaving behind a loving wife, Linda Fuller, a proud family, and a world filled with inexhaustible gratitude: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) celebrates the life of Millard Fuller, a life which provides all the evidence one needs to believe in the power of the human spirit to inspire hope and lift the burdens of poverty and despair from the shoulders of one's fellow man;

(2) honors Millard Fuller for three decades of leadership and service through Habitat for Humanity, and the millions he and his organization have inspired to embrace a passion for the good and the just; and

(3) urges the people of the United States to recognize and pay tribute to Millard Fuller's life and legacy of service by carrying on his vision for a kinder, gentler world, following the example he so emphatically set.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY G. MILLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and to insert extraneous materials thereon.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to recognize and celebrate the life of Mr. Millard Fuller, the founder and strength behind one of our Nation's most well-known and beloved nonprofit institutions.

Mr. Fuller led Habitat for Humanity from its founding in 1976 until 2005. He was an amazing man who was able to turn a simple idea into a global housing juggernaut serving over 100 countries. Through his leadership, Habitat for Humanity has created affordable homes for more than 300,000 families and 1 million people, families that otherwise would have remained in substandard housing.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that it is appropriate for this body to pass this resolution for a gentleman who certainly is worthy of having this recognition.

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

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of House Resolution 502, celebrating the life of Millard Fuller, founder of Habitat for Humanity. Millard Fuller, along with his wife, Linda, founded Habitat for Humanity in 1976.

Habitat for Humanity operates as a nonprofit Christian housing ministry. Working together with local affiliates, Habitat provides safe, decent and affordable housing for people of all backgrounds. Since its founding, Habitat for Humanity has built more than 300,000 homes worldwide in 3,000 communities and provided housing for more than 1.5 million people.

Habitat for Humanity provides needy families with an opportunity for homeownership. The average cost of a Habitat home in the U.S. is \$60,000. Habitat for Humanity sells homes at no profit to Habitat homeowners. In order to purchase a home, a Habitat homeowner

must invest hundreds of hours in sweat equity into building not only their Habitat house, but houses for others as well. A Habitat homeowner is also responsible for making a down payment and monthly mortgage payments.

Habitat for Humanity is able to finance its operations through mortgage payments made by Habitat homeowners, donations and volunteer labor. Habitat also accepts government funds, so long as they have no conditions that would violate Habitat principles.

In my State of California, Habitat for Humanity has worked tirelessly to provide housing for needy Californians. Thousands of people have a decent place to live because of the work of many volunteers and the generosity of thousands of donors.

Mr. Speaker, Habitat for Humanity is an organization that deserves to be honored. I urge my colleagues to join me and vote "yes" on this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to my colleague and friend, the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. SANFORD BISHOP.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it often takes loss to remind ourselves of our unwavering appreciation and unfaltering gratitude for those few extraordinary people who, despite their ability to enjoy tremendous success and reward for themselves, instead commit their energies and talents to the betterment of the world.

Millard Fuller of Americus, Georgia, was one of those extraordinary few. He passed away February 2nd, leaving behind a wife and family, but, more importantly, a legacy that is all the evidence one needs to believe in the power of the human spirit to inspire hope and lift the burdens of poverty and despair from the shoulders of one's fellow man.

Throughout his life, Millard Fuller's talent and passion were put on display in no small number of ways. He grew to be a great entrepreneur, founding a marketing company that made him a millionaire before he was 30 years old. He was a great lawyer and headed the Southern Poverty Law Center in Montgomery, Alabama. He was a great Christian, one who walked away from his hard-earned wealth to pursue a life of service and philanthropy through the founding of the tremendously successful Habitat for Humanity.

Millard led the organization for more than three decades, and through the application of what he called the "economics of Jesus," helped to provide over 300,000 homes to the destitute and downtrodden across the globe.

However, more than any of these things, Millard was a great man. His selflessness serves as an inspiration to people throughout the Nation and all across the world.

Born to a grocer in Lanett, Alabama, Millard refused to allow his modest beginnings to define the course of his life. Although he attained great fortune

from his tireless efforts as a businessman, he soon found that in order to live a life of fulfillment, he had to dedicate himself to a simple life of devotion and service to a higher purpose.

□ 1915

He traveled to Africa in order to observe what he could do to improve the lot of the impoverished. He became a staunch advocate for aid to Africa's poor and traveled the United States for assistance in his efforts for Africa.

After moving to Americus, Georgia, which is located in the Second Congressional District of Georgia, which I'm proud to represent, Millard and his supporters founded what would become the most visible and effective manifestation of his desire to make a difference, an organization dedicated to providing housing and support for the poor, Habitat for Humanity.

For more than 30 years, Habitat for Humanity, with the help of countless volunteers, ranging from the average citizen to former President Jimmy Carter, built hundreds of thousands of homes for the world's disadvantaged. Its mission has reflected a simple philosophy best expressed in Millard's own words. He said, "We want to make it socially, morally, politically and religiously unacceptable to have substandard housing and homelessness."

In 1996, President Bill Clinton recognized Millard's dedication by awarding him The Presidential Medal of Freedom.

In 2005, Millard also founded the Fuller Center for Housing, a nonprofit housing ministry dedicated to eliminating poverty housing worldwide by providing the structure, guidance and support that communities need to build and repair homes for the impoverished among them.

It is my great honor to sponsor H. Res. 385, which celebrates the life of Millard Fuller and the impact that he had on so many. As this resolution is voted on today, let us seek to emulate Millard Fuller's passion for the good and the just and his selfless spirit of a better, gentler world.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution to honor the life and the memory and the legacy of Millard Fuller.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, in closing, you have to admire an individual who applies Christian principles to his life. He didn't just talk good. He didn't just tell a story, he created good and he created a life for many people.

There's nothing like looking in the eyes of an individual or a family who is moving in a new home, especially when the family was involved in that home, building that home, and helping build homes for other people. You have to admire him for what he did, and all the individuals in this country and other countries who give of their time, their talent and their resources for the betterment of humanity.

And at this point in time, I would ask for an "aye" vote on a man who deserves it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, let me just agree with my colleague, who talked about the living out of beliefs.

I read a story in one the newspapers today which I thought was one of the most theologically unsound things I've seen or read recently. It compared the times President Obama and President Bush said the name "Jesus," as if there is something that is magically going to happen as a result of calling the name. And I think we are going into a slippery slope when we begin to compare people by how they call the name of their deity.

But in the case of Millard Fuller, he acted out his beliefs. And we believe in, at least my religious tradition, that there can be no faith, measurable faith, unless there are works. And we say faith without works is dead. And so you see today on the political scene, a lot of talk about religion, but after all is said and done, there's almost always more said than done. And so we have reason to stand up and celebrate Mr. Fuller, who put his faith into action.

I never had the opportunity to work on more than two Habitat homes, and I really hate the fact that I've not been able to do more. But I appreciate the fact that former President Jimmy Carter has become one of the most ardent supporters of Habitat for Humanity and has actually worked on tens and tens of homes, not only in this country, but around the world.

And by the organization's 25th anniversary, tens of thousands of people like President Jimmy Carter were volunteering with Habitat, and more than a half million people were living in Habitat homes. I am proud to count myself among the numbers of Habitat volunteers, and I'm also proud that I have the opportunity to speak in favor of Millard Fuller, a prolific writer, authoring 10 books, and a man who put his faith in action.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 385.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING THE U.S. BORDER PATROL ON ITS 85TH ANNIVERSARY

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 498) honoring and congratulating the U.S. Border Patrol on its 85th anniversary.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 498

Whereas in the early 20th century, control of the border was sporadic and piecemeal, and included mounted guards, Texas Rangers, and military troops;

Whereas Supervising Inspector Frank W. Bershore wrote to the Commissioner-General of Immigration in 1918, ‘‘If the services of men now being drafted cannot be spared for this work, it may be that the various departments vitally interested would give favorable consideration to the formation of an independent organization, composed of men without the draft age. The assertion is ventured that such an organization, properly equipped and trained, made up of seasoned men, would guard the border more effectively against all forms of lawlessness than a body of soldiers of several times the same number . . .’’;

Whereas the prohibition of alcohol and numerical limits placed on immigration to the United States by the Immigration Acts of 1921 and 1924 further exposed our inability to control our borders;

Whereas in response to this urgent need the Labor Appropriations Act of 1924 officially established the U.S. Border Patrol with an initial force of 450 officers to help defend our borders;

Whereas over the past 85 years the border patrol has undergone enormous changes, but their primary mission has remained the same, to detect and prevent the illegal entry of persons into the United States;

Whereas since 1998, the Border Patrol has seized more than 15,567,100 pounds of marijuana and more than 189,769 pounds of cocaine nationwide;

Whereas the border patrol is on the front line of the U.S. war on drugs, having seized more than 14,241 pounds of cocaine and more than 1,800,000 pounds of marijuana in fiscal year 2007;

Whereas in the wake of the attacks of September 11, 2001, the border patrol has taken on a new mission as part of the U.S. Customs and Border Protection agency, with the priority mission of preventing terrorists and terrorist weapons from entering the United States;

Whereas the U.S. Border Patrol today is our Nation’s first line of defense against many threats, patrolling 8,000 miles of international borders with Mexico and Canada and the coastal waters around Florida and Puerto Rico;

Whereas the mission of the agency says, ‘‘We are the guardians of our Nation’s borders. We are America’s frontline. We safeguard the American homeland at and beyond our borders. We protect the American public against terrorists and the instrument of terror. We steadfastly enforce the laws of the United States while fostering our Nation’s economic security through lawful international trade and travel. We serve the American public with vigilance, integrity and professionalism.’’;

Whereas the Border Patrol has adopted a clear strategic goal, to establish and maintain operational control of the border of the United States;

Whereas this strategy consists of five main objectives, establishing substantial probability of apprehending terrorists and their weapons as they attempt to enter illegally between the ports of entry, deterring illegal entries through improved enforcement, detecting, apprehending, and deterring smugglers of humans, drugs, and other contraband, leveraging ‘‘Smart Border’’ technology to multiply the effect of enforcement personnel, and reducing crime in border communities and consequently improving quality of life and economic vitality of targeted areas;

Whereas today over 18,800 agents risk their lives in pursuit of these objectives;

Whereas the Border Patrol recognizes 104 official line of duty deaths in service to their country;

Whereas the U.S. Border Patrol has spent past 85 years keeping this country safe from threats like terrorists, illicit drugs, weapons, and criminals;

Whereas the Border Patrol Inspectors of the past and the Border Patrol Agents of today perform their duties on foot, in automobiles, by horse, and in boats;

Whereas today the Border Patrol uses state of the art technologies to aid in the performance of their duties; infrared cameras, remote video surveillance, unattended underground sensors, and ground radar support their National Strategy;

Whereas they use canine teams to detect both humans and narcotics at immigration checkpoints as well as in daily operations;

Whereas their Special Response Teams and Tactical Unit are specially trained for domestic and international emergencies and they have Search, Trauma, and Rescue teams, which provide humanitarian and rescue capabilities, performing countless rescues every year; and

Whereas the Border Patrol is also supported in their mission with air and marine assets and personnel from CBP Air and MarineNow, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) expresses its support for the Border Patrol’s goals and objectives;

(2) expresses its gratitude to the U.S. Border Patrol for its commitment to protecting the United States; and

(3) congratulates the Border Patrol and its exemplary workforce on 85 years of service to the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Resolution 498, honoring and congratulating the United States Border Patrol on its 85th anniversary, and I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

As the chairwoman of the Committee on Homeland Security Subcommittee for Border, Maritime and Global Counterterrorism, I have been fortunate enough to visit the border several times to see firsthand the good work of the Border Patrol. I have seen it, not just on the southern border with Mexico, but also that with Canada.

These dedicated men and women patrol America’s borders, often in harsh climates, in isolated conditions, under dangerous conditions, in order to keep our Nation secure.

Representatives of Customs and Border Protection, the Border Patrol, and

its agents have also testified many, many times before our committee about the challenges they face, particularly the Border Patrol’s rapid growth and its evolving mission in recent years.

I don’t know if a lot of you remember, but just a few years back, our Border Patrol was only 450 people. Today it numbers almost 19,000, and it’s on track to grow to 20,000 agents by the end of next year.

When it was founded, the Border Patrol’s sole mission was to prevent persons and contraband from entering our country illegally. But, in particular, in the wake of the attacks of September 11 of 2001, the Border Patrol is also charged, it is our front line, with stopping terrorists and their weapons from entering our country.

In the early days of the Border Patrol, agents patrolled our borders without the benefit of modern technology. But today they have sensors, cameras, in addition to their traditional ‘‘sign-cutting’’ or their tracking skills, which they still use in some of the mountainous areas, especially out there in the Arizona and California desert. And through all these changes, the Border Patrol and its agents have maintained a steadfast commitment to serving our Nation.

I commend the Border Patrol and all the agents who have served honorably under the Patrol’s proud 85-year history. It is certainly fitting that the House of Representatives is marking this anniversary today with this resolution.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Mr. TEAGUE, the gentleman from New Mexico, for offering this fine resolution, and I urge all of my colleagues to give it their support.

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

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

I rise in support of H. Resolution 498, celebrating the anniversary of the Border Patrol and honoring their service.

The Border Patrol was established in the Immigration Act of 1924, and celebrated its 85th anniversary just recently on May 28, 2009.

The Border Patrol is one of the most public faces of the Department of Homeland Security. For those who aren’t familiar with the differences, the Border Patrol covers the areas between the ports of entry as opposed to the ports of entry. The 18,000 men and women in green work every day along the borders and coastlines of the United States, often in some of the most rugged and challenging terrain.

I have this outsized map here that the Marfa sector of the Border Patrol had given me from Texas. And this is just one small section of the border, but I wanted to use it to illustrate a few points. Marfa, Texas, is one of the more, let’s just say, rural parts of America, which is why it was featured in ‘‘No Country for Old Men,’’ ‘‘There Will Be Blood,’’ because it was such a kind of an undeveloped area.

The area at the bottom on the point is the big bend of Texas that you see. That's Big Bend National Park. Those mountains in that area, the Chisos, are about 7,000 feet. A lot of people think our border is just flat and that it would be very easy to see all the problems coming through, but, in fact, it's very mountainous.

The far northwest edge of this map, in the western side of the Marfa sector, is Presidio. Presidio is a point of entry. That point of entry, for example, it's called Presidio because it was a fort, and that's where General Pershing, for example, chased Pancho Villa across. There's no other legal point of entry for hundreds of miles as you go across that border through Big Bend and up until the far side, which is near Lake Amistad and Del Rio sector. These areas are very vulnerable to penetration by any number of things.

And a lot of times the Border Patrol, as well as illustrating that the National Park Service has a huge chunk there, huge chunk over in other parks, that this border is not simple, and that when people say, Can't you just put a couple of thousand agents there and control the border, well, no, it is an incredible challenge.

During my time in Congress, I have had the opportunity to visit almost every Border Patrol sector on the north and south borders. There's 2,000 miles on the south, 4,000 miles on the north. The challenges are diverse, and the criminal element seeking to exploit our open borders are inventive and have significant resources. Drug smugglers are using helicopters, ultralight aircraft, fast boats, and something as simple as coyotes, forcing illegal aliens to carry 50-pound loads of drugs on their back to bring in contraband. The challenge is endless and the mission is critical.

In the 6-plus years that the Border Patrol has been in the Department of Homeland Security, their agency has doubled in size. Congress has provided authorization funding for hundreds of miles of fencing and vehicle barriers, which combined, total over 600 miles. Efforts to provide additional technological resources to the Border Patrol through the SBInet program, that should, when complete, provide an additional capability to detect and respond to illegal entry.

A sign that the efforts to gain operational control of the border are working is the growing drug cartel violence in Mexico. Nearly 8,000 people have been killed in drug-related violence in Mexico. It's a tragic situation, and it is absolutely critical that we continue to support and strengthen the Government of Mexico, headed by President Calderon.

At the same time, we must further strengthen our own border security efforts, and cannot be dependent on another nation doing that.

The Border Patrol's years of honorable service have not been without loss. To date, 104 agents have lost their

lives in duty to their country. Additionally, hundreds of assaults, from rockings to Molotov cocktails to threats on their lives occur every year to our Border Patrol agents.

□ 1930

As we celebrate the 85th anniversary of the Border Patrol, it is important to remember and honor the agents who have paid the ultimate sacrifice in defense of our country. Luis Aguilar is the most recent who was run over by a drug smuggler trying to flee. As the guards of our borders, the Border Patrol is an important layer of security and often the last line of defense in preventing dangerous people and goods from entering the United States and infiltrating the U.S. communities.

The Border Patrol cannot let down their guard as criminal organizations are continually looking for vulnerabilities in our security to bring in contraband. The consequences of a drug load that slips through the layered defense are significant. According to the Department of Justice, in 2007 almost 32 percent of high school seniors used marijuana in the past year and 5 percent had used cocaine. The vast majority of these drugs are smuggled across our borders.

The reality of post-September 11, 2001, is that terrorist organizations may also seek to exploit openings along our borders to smuggle operatives or potential weapons. In the week since their anniversary, May 28, the Border Patrol has apprehended six alien gang members and four convicted sex offenders, seized three guns, six trailers carrying contraband, including one with 40 illegal aliens; seized 16,609 pounds of marijuana, five vehicles and an ultralight aircraft. And my favorite is about 6 a.m. last Sunday, agents spotted an individual on a surf board approximately 200 yards offshore paddling north of the international border in Imperial Beach. The surfer was holding a blue duffel bag. He released it as agents approached. Soon after, the blue duffel floated ashore and was inspected by Border Patrol agents and had five packages of marijuana with an estimated street value at \$75,000. They're creative, if nothing else, and our Border Patrol has to be creative and persistent in response.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this resolution and to honor the Border Patrol, express support for their important mission and pledge support to enhance their capabilities to gain operational control over our border.

[From www.cbp.gov, Mar. 23, 2009]

85 YEARS OF PROTECTED BY

Thursday, May 28, 2009, will mark the 85th anniversary of the United States Border Patrol. Founded in 1924, the U.S. Border Patrol was established in El Paso, Texas, and Detroit, Michigan. The Purpose: To combat the illegal entry of aliens, contraband, and the flow of illicit liquor from Mexico and Canada into the United States. The U.S. Border Patrol is steeped in a long and rich history that is passed down to each new recruit as they begin their careers at the academy. The

newly organized El Paso Border Patrol Station was assigned 25 Patrol Inspectors, many of whom were recruited from the ranks of the Texas Rangers. Today, The Border Patrol boasts over 18,000 agents, in 20 sectors, and 164 stations around the nation.

Under the authority of the Immigration Act, approved by Congress on May 28, 1924, the Border Patrol was created as a uniformed law enforcement branch of the Immigration Bureau. This prompted the establishment of the El Paso Border Patrol Sector on July 1, 1924. It was the height of Prohibition in the United States, and organized crime was a growing concern, as the mafia controlled a majority of the alcohol being smuggled into the United States. As a result, liquor smuggling from Mexico and Canada became a well organized, thriving industry. The opportunity to earn substantial sums of money became a temptation for many illegal aliens that were willing to enter the United States carrying a few crates of contraband.

It wasn't long before gun battles began to erupt between Border Patrolmen, and smugglers attempting to avoid arrest. In February 1927, El Paso Sector experienced one of the bloodiest months for the agency. As old newspapers report, during the entire month, there had not been a 24-hour period of time without a gunfight between smugglers and Patrol Inspectors. These gunfights added to the renown of the Border Patrol, as patrolmen gained a reputation for winning most of these shootouts.

Almost immediately after the establishment of the El Paso Station, a need was seen to have officers at outlying locations. Other stations soon opened within the sector. The Border Patrol began to grow, as the situation along the border was steadily deteriorating. As the prohibition era reached the peak of its infamy; lawlessness and violence became more common along the water borders of the Detroit Sector. Several Detroit Sector Patrol Inspectors were killed in the line of duty during this period, as smugglers attempting to bring contraband across the border resorted to violence to protect their cargo from the Border Patrol Inspectors.

Eighty-five years later, the Border Patrol has evolved into the finest law enforcement organization in the world. On a daily basis, the Border Patrol is confronted with a large number of threats that would never have been conceived of at the time of the agency's inception. Criminal organizations have evolved as well, adopting a wide variety of weapons and technology to aid them in their efforts to enter the United States while smuggling human cargo and other contraband. Since 9-11, the agency has had to adapt yet again, to our nations newest threat; terrorism. The U.S. Border Patrol has proven over its long history that its men and women are up to the task ahead, and stand ready at our nation's borders.

The U.S. Border Patrol will be hosting several events for the 85th Anniversary, including a Headquarters celebration honoring all of the men and women, past and present, who have made the Border Patrol what it is today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to my good friend, Mr. SILVESTRE REYES from the great State of Texas who, by the way, has probably over 30 years of experience in the Border Patrol Agency.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding me time, and I also want to thank you for your support of the men and women of the United States Border Patrol and the important work that you

do through your chairmanship and the subcommittee that deals with border issues.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Resolution 498, a bill that honors and congratulates the United States Border Patrol on its 85th anniversary. And I also want to thank my good friend and neighbor, HARRY TEAGUE from New Mexico, the gentleman that has sponsored this legislation, for his support of the United States Border Patrol men and women. And the ranking member as well, thank you for your support. I think that the men and women of the United States Border Patrol do incredible work.

The United States Border Patrol has a unique and rich history that began on May 28, 1924, when Congress passed the Labor Appropriations Act which officially established the U.S. Border Patrol in El Paso, Texas, and Detroit, Michigan. Established during the height of Prohibition in the United States, the initial 450 patrol inspectors were not only charged with preventing the entry of undocumented immigrants into the United States but were also responsible for combating the entry of illicit liquor from Mexico and from Canada.

Eighty-five years later, the Border Patrol has evolved to include almost 19,000 agents in 20 sectors and 164 stations around our country. The brave men and women of the Border Patrol are currently responsible for securing 8,000 miles of our international borders, both with Mexico and Canada and the coastal water around Florida and Puerto Rico. Since 9/11, the Border Patrol has been on the front lines in our national strategy to detect and apprehend terrorists and their weapons as they attempt to illegally enter the United States.

Before coming to Congress, I served for 26½ years in the U.S. Border Patrol. For half of that time, I was a Border Patrol sector chief, first in McAllen, Texas, and then in El Paso, Texas. As the only Member of Congress with a background in border enforcement, I am keenly aware of the invaluable work that these brave men and women perform for our country each and every day. We have a lot to thank them for.

In these times of heightened security, the U.S. Border Patrol and those agents are not only vital in helping to protect our country from terror threats and illegal entry of drugs but they also apprehend and deter human smugglers and bring them to justice. Oftentimes these agents are the first people to respond in humanitarian situations in the desert by providing first aid, food, water, and shelter to people that have gotten in trouble because of the heat and the distance that they're forced to travel in remote areas. Border Patrol agents perform countless rescues every year and provide critical training to law enforcement, both at home and abroad.

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

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 30 more seconds.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Border Patrol is vital to our Homeland Security strategy and has evolved into one of our country's finest law enforcement organizations. I'm a proud cosponsor of Mr. TEAGUE's resolution in honor of their 85th anniversary. I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill, and I thank the men and women of the United States Border Patrol for working each and every day to keep us safe.

Mr. SOUDER. I continue to reserve.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman who authored this particular resolution, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. TEAGUE).

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 498, a resolution honoring and congratulating the U.S. Border Patrol on its 85th anniversary. This bill shows our support for the men and women who have served and are currently serving in our Nation's Border Patrol, and I encourage my colleagues to vote with me in support of this resolution.

The Border Patrol has undergone incredible changes over the past 85 years. They have grown from an initial force of 450 to over 18,800 agents today. They have learned to deal with new threats such as terrorists and weapons of mass destruction. And they have adapted ground-breaking technologies—such as infrared cameras and unattended underground sensors—to better face the challenges confronting them.

But despite these changes, their primary mission has stayed the same: to detect and prevent illegal entry of persons into the United States. As we all know, doing this is no easy task. They must patrol over 8,000 miles of international borders with Mexico and Canada and the coastal waters around Florida and Puerto Rico. They are our first line of defense against many threats, including terrorists, illicit drugs, weapons, and criminals; and they perform admirably at these tasks.

Since 1998, the Border Patrol has seized more than 15 million pounds of marijuana and 189,000 pounds of cocaine. Most importantly, border agents have very dangerous jobs. They risk their well-being every day on our behalf. In 85 years, 104 Border Patrol officers have lost their lives in the line of duty. In my district, the Border Patrol has an especially active presence, the El Paso Border Patrol sector, which covers all of New Mexico, covers 262 miles of border and employs over 2,600 agents. In fiscal year 2008 alone, they made over 30,000 apprehensions and seized over 87,000 pounds of marijuana.

Also in my district, in the town of Artesia, we have the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center at this facility which covers over 220 acres of space.

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

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. TEAGUE. The Border Patrol agents, along with the other Federal agents, get the training they need to better perform their duties and adapt to the new challenges facing them.

In closing, the functions of the Border Patrol are more important today than ever. We have given them an incredibly difficult task and the brave men and women of the Border Patrol deserve the full support of Congress in achieving their goals.

I would like to thank Congresswoman SANCHEZ, Chairman REYES, Chairman THOMPSON, Congressman McCaul, and Majority Leader HOYER for their leadership in helping bring this resolution to the floor.

Again, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in support of this resolution.

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

First, I want to thank my friend and chairman of the subcommittee, Ms. SANCHEZ, who's been an excellent leader of our subcommittee and we work together closely on many things, not just noncontroversial bills like today. I thank Mr. TEAGUE for his leadership and my long-time friend, Mr. REYES, also the chairman of the Intelligence Committee, not only for his work in Congress but his work with the Border Patrol.

And again and most personally, today I want to thank every agent, every Border Patrol agent in America for helping protect us, as well as Chief David Aguilar for his leadership and further service. It sometimes gets a tad boring, sometimes it gets a little hot. On the Canadian border, sometimes it gets a little cold. It isn't exactly the most exciting job in America at all times, but what each of these agents does is extremely important to the safety of our Nation.

It may not be quite politically correct right now to talk about terrorism, but in fact it is a key part of our first line of defense in the border, and the Border Patrol is a key part of that. And we haven't had a terrorist attack on our soil since 9/11, partly because of our men and women in green.

It may not be quite politically correct right now to talk about stopping illegal immigration; but quite frankly, the safety of our Nation, the integrity of American citizenship requires legal, orderly entry. This isn't to say how many there should be, what type of immigration law we should have, but requires an orderly, legal process. So do many American jobs require this.

And it may not be quite politically correct right now to talk about stopping illegal drugs, but in doing so, the agents of the Border Patrol have made our streets safer, they have helped prevent child and spousal abuse, they have lowered emergency rooms admissions, they have helped people make child support payments by helping them hold their jobs because of illegal narcotics and other things causing them

to lose their jobs or by intercepting them or driving the prices up because of what they intercept.

We're never going to stop all drug abuse. And every Border Patrol agent knows he can't. But what he knows is he can intercept large numbers that would have gone to the streets and the homes of America and would have resulted in huge problems in crime and family safety in America.

So maybe we don't want to call it the war on drugs anymore. Instead we call it a disease, and for those who get addicted, it is a disease. But in fact unlike doctors and nurses who fight cancer, or researchers who fight cancer or people who fight lupus or diabetes, the Border Patrol agents are getting shot at and they die.

So whether we want to call it a war or whatever we want to call it, the individuals who use these illegal narcotics do not wake up one morning and suddenly discover that a heroin needle got put in their arm or that somehow they were snorting crack in their sleep or snorting cocaine in their sleep. In fact, it is somewhat different. And I want to make sure that our men and women of the Border Patrol understand that there is bipartisan support to making sure that we keep our border secure; that we continue to block illegal narcotics; that we continue to block terrorists; and you are our first line of defense on our huge borders, and we cannot thank you enough for risking your lives for the rest of us.

I yield back.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman from Indiana, my ranking member on the subcommittee that oversees all of the border issues for America. He's been a strong advocate for the Border Patrol as well as for all of the agencies, really, that sit within our jurisdiction. And so I thank him for taking the time tonight to be down here and helping to work on this bill.

You know, the Border Patrol just doesn't work at the southern and the northern border. As was mentioned, we'll see them in Puerto Rico and some other areas, and also we send them to other countries to train people as to the whole issue of border patrol and how to take a look at what's coming in. In fact, in Iraq we've sent several to help to set up some of the border patrol issues out there in that country.

□ 1945

So we have a large group of men and women who come to work every single day, love America, and work very hard on behalf of the American people. And for this reason, Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support House Resolution 498, honoring and congratulating the Border Patrol on its 85th anniversary, and I urge the rest of my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 498,

which honors and congratulates the U.S. Border Patrol on its 85th anniversary.

Much has changed since 1924, when Congress formally established the U.S. Border Patrol and charged just 450 officers with securing our Nation's borders.

Today, more than 18,000 Border Patrol agents patrol 8,000 miles of international borders with Mexico, Canada and the coastal waters around Florida and Puerto Rico.

Previously, the Border Patrol was responsible only for stopping illegal aliens and contraband from crossing our borders—an enormous challenge on its own.

But in the wake of the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, Border Patrol's mission was expanded to include preventing terrorists and their instruments from entering the United States.

One thing has not changed in the last 85 years, however.

The men and women of the Border Patrol continue to risk their lives serving the American public with vigilance, integrity and professionalism.

As Chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security, I have been to our borders and seen firsthand Border Patrol agents serving our Nation, often under very difficult conditions.

That is why I am pleased to support this resolution, in honor of all those helping to secure America's borders today and throughout the Border Patrol's 85-year history.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would thank the gentleman from New Mexico, Mr. TEAGUE, for authorizing H. Res. 498.

His congressional district includes Artesia, New Mexico, home to the Border Patrol Academy, where thousands of new Border Patrol agents have been trained.

Mr. TEAGUE'S constituents are fortunate to have a strong advocate for that fine facility and for the Border Patrol as an organization.

Again, I urge all of my colleagues to support this very worthy resolution, and join in honoring and congratulating the U.S. Border Patrol on its 85th anniversary.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in support of H. Res. 498, a resolution honoring and celebrating the United States Border Patrol on its 85th Anniversary.

The United States Border Patrol is a federal law enforcement agency within U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP), a component of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). The Border Patrol was founded on May 28, 1924 as an agency of the United States Department of Labor to prevent illegal entries along the Mexico-United States border.

The Border Patrol's mission remains as the deterrence, detection and apprehension of illegal immigrants and individuals involved in the illegal drug trade who generally do not enter the United States through designated ports of entry.

Ever since its founding, the U.S. Border Patrol has been there defending our borders and homeland. They were there to prevent Ahmed Ressam, also known as the "Millennium Bomber," from entering this country and killing our citizens with explosives he intended to detonate at the Los Angeles International Airport during the holiday season prior to the 2000 millennium. They were there to apprehend Richard Goldberg, a suspected child molester, after he was arrested in Ottawa, Canada. Goldberg was on the FBI's "Top 10 Fugitives List" and was featured on "America's Most Wanted." Further, just this month, they were there to seize close to \$1.5 million in cocaine and marijuana along the Southern border.

The Border Patrol is this nation's first line of defense against many threats. They patrol over 8,000 miles of international borders with Mexico and Canada as well as the coastal waters around Florida and Puerto Rico.

The brave men and women of the Border Patrol work tirelessly to secure and facilitate trade and travel while enforcing hundreds of U.S. regulations, including immigration and drug laws. They keep our country safe from threats such as terrorists, illicit drugs, weapons, and criminals. Today over 18,800 Border Patrol Agents risk their lives in defense of our country. These brave men and women join thousands of others who have served our country in the Border Patrol over the last 85 years.

America can rest assured that its borders and homeland will be protected by the courageous men and women of the U.S. Border Patrol. I commend the U.S. Patrol on its proud and distinguished history of protecting the United States and strongly urge my colleagues to support this important resolution.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 498.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STATUTORY PAY-AS-YOU-GO ACT OF 2009—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 111-46)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the Budget and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Today I am pleased to submit to the Congress the enclosed legislative proposal, the "Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2009," or "PAYGO," together with a sectional analysis.

The deficits that my Administration inherited reflect not only a severe economic downturn but also years of failing to pay for new policies—including large tax cuts that disproportionately benefited the affluent. This failure of fiscal discipline contributed to transforming surpluses projected at the beginning of this decade into trillions of dollars in deficits. I am committed to returning our Government to a path of fiscal discipline, and PAYGO represents a key step back to the path of shared responsibility.

PAYGO would hold us to a simple but important principle: we should pay for

new tax or entitlement legislation. Creating a new non-emergency tax cut or entitlement expansion would require offsetting revenue increases or spending reductions.

In the 1990s, statutory PAYGO encouraged the tough choices that helped to move the Government from large deficits to surpluses, and I believe it can do the same today. Both houses of Congress have already taken an important step toward righting our fiscal course by adopting congressional rules incorporating the PAYGO principle. But we can strengthen enforcement and redouble our commitment by enacting PAYGO into law.

Both the Budget I have proposed and the Budget Resolution approved by the Congress would cut the deficit in half by the end of my first term, while laying a new foundation for sustained and widely shared economic growth through key investments in health, education, and clean energy. Enacting statutory PAYGO would complement these efforts and represent an important step toward strengthening our budget process, cutting deficits, and reducing national debt. Ultimately, however, we will have to do even more to restore fiscal sustainability.

I urge the prompt and favorable consideration of this proposal.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, June 9, 2009.

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 gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

AIR FORCE LIEUTENANT COLONEL MARK E. STRATTON, II

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, noble sacrifice dominates the character of a man who so willingly dedicates his life for others. There are none who understand that any better today than the men and women in our U.S. military. They personify the very essence of what it means to be an American.

Today, under the morning sky at Arlington Cemetery, myself and other Members of Congress—ROB WITTMAN from Virginia, JO BONNER from Alabama, and Senator SESSIONS from Alabama—joined several hundred other family members and friends as a 21-gun salute and “Taps” was played for United States Air Force Lieutenant

Colonel Mark E. Stratton, II. The somber silence of the grave sites was broken with this tribute.

Colonel Stratton trained as a navigator on an Air Force KC-135. In his honor, one of these massive aircraft flew low and slow over Arlington Cemetery, over the flag-draped coffin of one of Air Force's finest. He gave his life helping the Afghan people to know dignity of a life lived in freedom.

He was assigned to the Joint Staff at the Pentagon here in Washington, D.C. and he served as the commander of the Panjshir Provincial Reconstruction Team in Afghanistan. On May 26, 2009, Mark died near Bagram Airfield of wounds that he sustained from an improvised explosive device, what we call an IED.

Mark had strong Texas ties. He graduated from Texas A&M University in December of 1991 with a degree in political science. And while at Texas A&M, he was a member of Squadron 1 in the Corps of Cadets. He received his commission through the Reserve Officer Training Corps in 1992. He has numerous Air Force commendations, including the Purple Heart and the Bronze Star.

He is remembered by friends as a man of unquestionable character and loyalty. He was a patriotic individual who exemplified the spirit of the American airman.

Lieutenant Colonel Gil Delgado, Mark's former roommate at Texas A&M, described Mark as a man who passionately loved God, his family, his friends and his country, and it showed in everything Mark did.

Through his heroic work in Afghanistan, Mark lived a life helping other people. His time was spent building roads and clinics, schools and canals for the Afghan people. He was an ambassador for the American spirit. He described the job to family and friends as the best he had ever had in his entire career. When he was killed, Mr. Speaker, the villagers in Afghanistan had a memorial service in his honor.

Mark held a deep sense of tradition. Just a few weeks prior to his death, Mark made a special effort to share his Texas Aggie spirit with the Afghan friends that he had met. Mr. Speaker, each April 21, the day Texas gained independence, Aggies from Texas A&M observed what is called Aggie Muster. This occasion is where all Aggies gather in all parts of the world to honor Aggies who have died the previous year.

Even though Mark was the only Aggie within 100 miles of his forward operating base, he convinced the Panjshir Provincial Governor and his security detail to join him atop a nearby mountain to observe the very special occasion of Aggie Muster. One Aggie Air Force colonel and Afghan villagers paid tribute to Americans who died the previous year; that must have been a sight to see.

Texas Aggies have a long tradition of military service. In fact, during World

War II, Texas A&M produced over 14,000 officers, more than came from West Point or Annapolis combined. Mark was a proud Texas Aggie.

Mark is survived by his wife, Jennifer, and their three children, along with his mother, stepfather, and his brother, Michael. Mark's late father and namesake served as an Army captain in the Vietnam War. His stepmother, Debby Young, lives in southwest Houston. Mark's brother, Michael, and stepbrother, Steven, also live in the Houston area.

A great testament to Mark's life is the lives he forever changed through his work; every structure, every canal and road well traveled. Every school Mark helped build will offer generations of Afghan children the opportunity that comes from education. Every clinic he helped build will be a place where sickness will be cured, where human suffering is relieved, and where lives are being saved every day.

Mark has left a noble legacy as he has come to the end of this Earthly journey. It is for others now to pick up the torch he used to light a way for the Afghan people in the rugged mountains and deserts of this remote nation.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said, “The legacy of heroes is the memory of a great name and the inheritance of a great example.” Next year, on April 21, at Aggie Muster, Lieutenant Colonel Mark Stratton's name will be called. His name and life will be remembered by Aggies and other grateful Americans and by his Air Force buddies. But no doubt the people of Afghanistan will also remember the man from America, the Air Force colonel who built their schools, their water wells, and their villages. And maybe those villagers will return once more to that mountaintop and pay tribute to this American hero, Lieutenant Colonel Mark Stratton.

And that's just the way it is.

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR HEALTH CARE ACT—TITLE 42

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. RICHARDSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce H.R. 2744, the Equal Rights for Health Care Act—Title 42. The concept of equal rights is a pillar of our Nation and the reason why so many immigrate here to the United States.

Indeed, the U.S. was founded on the principle that all Americans should have the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. In order to enjoy this blessing of life and liberty, however, one must be healthy, and that means they have the benefit of equal treatment and research.

For example, men and women have different symptoms when it comes to heart disease. Unlike men, most women do not experience chest pain. Instead, 71 percent of the women report

having flu-like symptoms, and patients, doctors, and researchers need to make sure that emergency attendants, tests, and prescription drugs are informed about the differences that we might have.

H.R. 2744, the Equal Rights for Health Care Act—Title 42, will prohibit discrimination in health care services and research programs that receive Federal funding based upon sex, race, color, national origin, sexual orientation, gender identity, or disability status.

Civil rights laws have historically been a powerful mechanism for effecting necessary change in the United States. Each law represents a national commitment to end discrimination and to establish a mandate to bring the excluded into the mainstream. These equal rights laws ensure that the Federal Government delivers on the Constitution's promise of equal opportunities so that every individual has the right to develop his or her talents. Health care should be no exception.

In 1971, only 18 percent of women, compared to 26 percent of men, had completed 4 years or more of college. In 1972, the title IX amendment was introduced by Representatives Edith Green of Oregon and Patsy Mink of Hawaii. In 1980, I attended the University of California, Santa Barbara, where I played on the women's basketball team. I witnessed firsthand that there was a difference between playing on the women's team and the men's team. For example, for women, we had to travel in two or three vans to go to all of our away games, where the men were allowed to fly on a plane. You might say why is that something that was important? Well, we lost instruction time, we had time in general lost, preparation was lost, and recuperation was lost. That's why title IX was so important.

In 2007, we celebrated the 35th anniversary of title IX, which assured the women's right to education equality. And the U.S. Department of Education showed that 56 percent of all women, compared to 44 percent of men, now have achieved 4 years or more of college. So title IX has been working.

Federal law prohibits discrimination across a wide array of public policy arenas, none more than when you consider the difference between voting, public education, and now what we should do in health care.

H.R. 2744, the Equal Rights for Health Care Act—Title 42, seeks to have the same effect on the health care community. Despite access to health care, patients are not always in geographic proximity to medical facilities that can provide the consistent care that is needed.

According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the age-adjusted death rate for all cancers for African Americans in 2001 was 20 percent higher than Caucasian Americans. In 2002, the percentage of Hispanics and Latinos who were 65 years or older and

received adult immunization shots was only 47 percent, as compared to 70 percent of Caucasians.

In 2000, the infant mortality rate among Native Hawaiians was 60 percent higher than Caucasians.

□ 2000

And the rate of leg amputations as a result of diabetes is four times greater of African Americans who receive Medicare than their counterparts, Caucasians.

A list of disparities can go on and on, and so we must put an end to this inequality. Therefore, I have introduced H.R. 2744 so that Congress can take another step towards equal rights, and I look forward to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle joining me.

I'm proud to have a long list of diverse organizations that are supporting this legislation, groups such as the Family Equality Council, the Families United States of America, and, lastly, the National Minority Quality Forum.

I urge all my colleagues to support this legislation that ensures that equal services once and for all will also extend to health care as well, from diagnosis to treatment, and it's a part of the fast-growing health care debate. It's important that a statement of beliefs is made when we reform health care. Equality must be a founding principle, and we must insist that as health care debates move forward, we take the time to ensure that all Americans have the same rights. Let's move forward on title XLII as we did in title IX.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. HALVORSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

PUBLICATION OF THE RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT 111TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ZOE LOFGREN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Madam Speaker, I submit for publication the at-

tached copy of the Rules of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct for the U.S. House of Representatives for the 111th Congress. The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct originally adopted these rules pursuant to House Rule XI, clause 2(a)(1) on February 10, 2009, and made revisions to conform with House rules pertaining to the Office of Congressional Ethics on June 9, 2009. I am submitting these rules for publication in compliance with House Rule XI, clause 2(a)(2).

RULES, COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT, ADOPTED FEBRUARY 10, 2009, AMENDED JUNE 9, 2009, 111TH CONGRESS

FOREWORD

The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is unique in the House of Representatives. Consistent with the duty to carry out its advisory and enforcement responsibilities in an impartial manner, the Committee is the only standing committee of the House of Representatives the membership of which is divided evenly by party. These rules are intended to provide a fair procedural framework for the conduct of the Committee's activities and to help ensure that the Committee serves well the people of the United States, the House of Representatives, and the Members, officers, and employees of the House of Representatives.

PART I—GENERAL COMMITTEE RULES

RULE 1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

(a) So far as applicable, these rules and the Rules of the House of Representatives shall be the rules of the Committee and any subcommittee. The Committee adopts these rules under the authority of clause 2(a)(1) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, 111th Congress.

(b) The rules of the Committee may be modified, amended, or repealed by a vote of a majority of the Committee.

(c) When the interests of justice so require, the Committee, by a majority vote of its members, may adopt any special procedures, not inconsistent with these rules, deemed necessary to resolve a particular matter before it. Copies of such special procedures shall be furnished to all parties in the matter.

(d) The Chair and Ranking Minority Member shall have access to such information that they request as necessary to conduct Committee business.

RULE 2. DEFINITIONS

(a) "Committee" means the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

(b) "Complaint" means a written allegation of improper conduct against a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives filed with the Committee with the intent to initiate an inquiry.

(c) "Inquiry" means an investigation by an investigative subcommittee into allegations against a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives.

(d) "Investigate," "Investigating," and/or "Investigation" mean review of the conduct of a Member, officer or employee of the House of Representatives that is conducted or authorized by the Committee, an investigative subcommittee, or the Chair and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee.

(e) "Board" means the Board of the Office of Congressional Ethics.

(f) "Referral" means a report sent to the Committee from the Board pursuant to House Rules and all applicable House Resolutions regarding the conduct of a House Member, officer or employee, including any accompanying findings or other supporting documentation.

(g) "Investigative Subcommittee" means a subcommittee designated pursuant to Rule

19(a) to conduct an inquiry to determine if a Statement of Alleged Violation should be issued.

(h) "Statement of Alleged Violation" means a formal charging document filed by an investigative subcommittee with the Committee containing specific allegations against a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives of a violation of the Code of Official Conduct, or of a law, rule, regulation, or other standard of conduct applicable to the performance of official duties or the discharge of official responsibilities.

(i) "Adjudicatory Subcommittee" means a subcommittee designated pursuant to Rule 23(a) that holds an adjudicatory hearing and determines whether the counts in a Statement of Alleged Violation are proved by clear and convincing evidence.

(j) "Sanction Hearing" means a Committee hearing to determine what sanction, if any, to adopt or to recommend to the House of Representatives.

(k) "Respondent" means a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives who is the subject of a complaint filed with the Committee or who is the subject of an inquiry or a Statement of Alleged Violation.

(l) "Office of Advice and Education" refers to the Office established by section 803(i) of the Ethics Reform Act of 1989. The Office handles inquiries; prepares written opinions in response to specific requests; develops general guidance; and organizes seminars, workshops, and briefings for the benefit of the House of Representatives.

(m) "Member" means a Representative in, or a Delegate to, or the Resident Commissioner to, the U.S. House of Representatives.

RULE 3. ADVISORY OPINIONS AND WAIVERS

(a) The Office of Advice and Education shall handle inquiries; prepare written opinions providing specific advice, including reviews of requests for privately-sponsored travel pursuant to the Committee's travel regulations; develop general guidance; and organize seminars, workshops, and briefings for the benefit of the House of Representatives.

(b) Any Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives may request a written opinion with respect to the propriety of any current or proposed conduct of such Member, officer, or employee.

(c) The Office of Advice and Education may provide information and guidance regarding laws, rules, regulations, and other standards of conduct applicable to Members, officers, and employees in the performance of their duties or the discharge of their responsibilities.

(d) In general, the Committee shall provide a written opinion to an individual only in response to a written request, and the written opinion shall address the conduct only of the inquiring individual, or of persons for whom the inquiring individual is responsible as employing authority.

(e) A written request for an opinion shall be addressed to the Chair of the Committee and shall include a complete and accurate statement of the relevant facts. A request shall be signed by the requester or the requester's authorized representative or employing authority. A representative shall disclose to the Committee the identity of the principal on whose behalf advice is being sought.

(f) Requests for privately-sponsored travel shall be treated like any other request for a written opinion for purposes of paragraphs (g) through (l).

(1) The Committee's Travel Guidelines and Regulations shall govern the request submission and Committee approval process for privately-sponsored travel consistent with House Rules.

(2) A request for privately-sponsored travel of a Member, officer, or employee shall include a completed and signed Traveler Form that attaches the Private Sponsor Certification Form and includes all information required by the Committee's travel regulations. A private sponsor offering officially-connected travel to a Member, officer, or employee must complete and sign a Private Sponsor Certification Form, and provide a copy of that form to the invitee(s).

(3) Any individual who knowingly and willfully falsifies, or who knowingly and willfully fails to file a Traveler Form or Private Sponsor Certification Form may be subject to civil penalties and criminal sanctions pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 1001.

(g) The Office of Advice and Education shall prepare for the Committee a response to each written request for an opinion from a Member, officer, or employee. Each response shall discuss all applicable laws, rules, regulations, or other standards.

(h) Where a request is unclear or incomplete, the Office of Advice and Education may seek additional information from the requester.

(i) The Chair and Ranking Minority Member are authorized to take action on behalf of the Committee on any proposed written opinion that they determine does not require consideration by the Committee. If the Chair or Ranking Minority Member requests a written opinion, or seeks a waiver, extension, or approval pursuant to Rules 3(m), 4(c), 4(e), or 4(h), the next ranking member of the requester's party is authorized to act in lieu of the requester.

(j) The Committee shall keep confidential any request for advice from a Member, officer, or employee, as well as any response thereto. Upon request of any Member, officer, or employee who has submitted a written request for an opinion or submitted a request for privately-sponsored travel, the Committee may release to the requesting individual a copy of their own written request for advice or submitted travel forms, any subsequent written communications between such individual and Committee staff regarding the request, and any Committee advisory opinion or travel letter issued to that individual in response. The Committee shall not release any internal Committee staff work product, communications or notes in response to such a request, except as authorized by the Committee.

(k) The Committee may take no adverse action in regard to any conduct that has been undertaken in reliance on a written opinion if the conduct conforms to the specific facts addressed in the opinion.

(l) Information provided to the Committee by a Member, officer, or employee seeking advice regarding prospective conduct may not be used as the basis for initiating an investigation under clause 3(a)(2) or clause 3(b) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, if such Member, officer, or employee acts in good faith in accordance with the written advice of the Committee.

(m) A written request for a waiver of clause 5 of House Rule XXV (the House gift rule), or for any other waiver or approval, shall be treated in all respects like any other request for a written opinion.

(n) A written request for a waiver of clause 5 of House Rule XXV (the House gift rule) shall specify the nature of the waiver being sought and the specific circumstances justifying the waiver.

(o) An employee seeking a waiver of time limits applicable to travel paid for by a private source shall include with the request evidence that the employing authority is aware of the request. In any other instance where proposed employee conduct may reflect on the performance of official duties,

the Committee may require that the requester submit evidence that the employing authority knows of the conduct.

RULE 4. FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE

(a) In matters relating to Title I of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, the Committee shall coordinate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, Legislative Resource Center, to assure that appropriate individuals are notified of their obligation to file Financial Disclosure Statements and that such individuals are provided in a timely fashion with filing instructions and forms developed by the Committee.

(b) The Committee shall coordinate with the Legislative Resource Center to assure that information that the Ethics in Government Act requires to be placed on the public record is made public.

(c) Any Financial Disclosure Reports filed by Members of the Board of the Office of Congressional Ethics that are forwarded to the Committee by the Clerk shall not be subject to paragraphs (d) through (q) of this Rule regarding Financial Disclosure Statements filed pursuant to Title I of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978. The Office of Congressional Ethics retains jurisdiction over review of the timeliness and completeness of filings by Members of the Board as the Board's supervising ethics office.

(d) The Chair and Ranking Minority Member are authorized to grant on behalf of the Committee requests for reasonable extensions of time for the filing of Financial Disclosure Statements. Any such request must be received by the Committee no later than the date on which the Statement in question is due. A request received after such date may be granted by the Committee only in extraordinary circumstances. Such extensions for one individual in a calendar year shall not exceed a total of 90 days. No extension shall be granted authorizing a non-incumbent candidate to file a statement later than 30 days prior to a primary or general election in which the candidate is participating.

(e) An individual who takes legally sufficient action to withdraw as a candidate before the date on which that individual's Financial Disclosure Statement is due under the Ethics in Government Act shall not be required to file a Statement. An individual shall not be excused from filing a Financial Disclosure Statement when withdrawal as a candidate occurs after the date on which such Statement was due.

(f) Any individual who files a report required to be filed under title I of the Ethics in Government Act more than 30 days after the later of—

(1) the date such report is required to be filed, or

(2) if a filing extension is granted to such individual, the last day of the filing extension period, is required by such Act to pay a late filing fee of \$200. The Chair and Ranking Minority Member are authorized to approve requests that the fee be waived based on extraordinary circumstances.

(g) Any late report that is submitted without a required filing fee shall be deemed procedurally deficient and not properly filed.

(h) The Chair and Ranking Minority Member are authorized to approve requests for waivers of the aggregation and reporting of gifts as provided by section 102(a)(2)(C) of the Ethics in Government Act. If such a request is approved, both the incoming request and the Committee response shall be forwarded to the Legislative Resource Center for placement on the public record.

(i) The Chair and Ranking Minority Member are authorized to approve blind trusts as qualifying under section 102(f)(3) of the Ethics in Government Act. The correspondence

relating to formal approval of a blind trust, the trust document, the list of assets transferred to the trust, and any other documents required by law to be made public, shall be forwarded to the Legislative Resource Center for such purpose.

(j) The Committee shall designate staff counsel who shall review Financial Disclosure Statements and, based upon information contained therein, indicate in a form and manner prescribed by the Committee whether the Statement appears substantially accurate and complete and the filer appears to be in compliance with applicable laws and rules.

(k) Each Financial Disclosure Statement shall be reviewed within 60 days after the date of filing.

(l) If the reviewing counsel believes that additional information is required because (1) the Statement appears not substantially accurate or complete, or (2) the filer may not be in compliance with applicable laws or rules, then the reporting individual shall be notified in writing of the additional information believed to be required, or of the law or rule with which the reporting individual does not appear to be in compliance. Such notice shall also state the time within which a response is to be submitted. Any such notice shall remain confidential.

(m) Within the time specified, including any extension granted in accordance with clause (d), a reporting individual who concurs with the Committee's notification that the Statement is not complete, or that other action is required, shall submit the necessary information or take appropriate action. Any amendment may be in the form of a revised Financial Disclosure Statement or an explanatory letter addressed to the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

(n) Any amendment shall be placed on the public record in the same manner as other Statements. The individual designated by the Committee to review the original Statement shall review any amendment thereto.

(o) Within the time specified, including any extension granted in accordance with clause (d), a reporting individual who does not agree with the Committee that the Statement is deficient or that other action is required, shall be provided an opportunity to respond orally or in writing. If the explanation is accepted, a copy of the response, if written, or a note summarizing an oral response, shall be retained in Committee files with the original report.

(p) The Committee shall be the final arbiter of whether any Statement requires clarification or amendment.

(q) If the Committee determines, by vote of a majority of its members, that there is reason to believe that an individual has willfully failed to file a Statement or has willfully falsified or willfully failed to file information required to be reported, then the Committee shall refer the name of the individual, together with the evidence supporting its finding, to the Attorney General pursuant to section 104(b) of the Ethics in Government Act. Such referral shall not preclude the Committee from initiating such other action as may be authorized by other provisions of law or the Rules of the House of Representatives.

RULE 5. MEETINGS

(a) The regular meeting day of the Committee shall be the second Tuesday of each month, except when the House of Representatives is not meeting on that day. When the Committee Chair determines that there is sufficient reason, meetings may be called on additional days. A regularly scheduled meeting need not be held when the Chair determines there is no business to be considered.

(b) The Chair shall establish the agenda for meetings of the Committee and the Ranking

Minority Member may place additional items on the agenda.

(c) All meetings of the Committee or any subcommittee shall occur in executive session unless the Committee or subcommittee, by an affirmative vote of a majority of its members, opens the meeting to the public.

(d) Any hearing held by an adjudicatory subcommittee or any sanction hearing held by the Committee shall be open to the public unless the Committee or subcommittee, by an affirmative vote of a majority of its members, closes the hearing to the public.

(e) A subcommittee shall meet at the discretion of its Chair.

(f) Insofar as practicable, notice for any Committee or subcommittee meeting shall be provided at least seven days in advance of the meeting. The Chair of the Committee or subcommittee may waive such time period for good cause.

RULE 6. COMMITTEE STAFF

(a) The staff is to be assembled and retained as a professional, nonpartisan staff.

(b) Each member of the staff shall be professional and demonstrably qualified for the position for which the individual is hired.

(c) The staff as a whole and each individual member of the staff shall perform all official duties in a nonpartisan manner.

(d) No member of the staff shall engage in any partisan political activity directly affecting any congressional or presidential election.

(e) No member of the staff or outside counsel may accept public speaking engagements or write for publication on any subject that is in any way related to the employment or duties with the Committee of such individual without specific prior approval from the Chair and Ranking Minority Member.

(f) All staff members shall be appointed by an affirmative vote of a majority of the members of the Committee. Such vote shall occur at the first meeting of the membership of the Committee during each Congress and as necessary during the Congress.

(g) Subject to the approval of the Committee on House Administration, the Committee may retain counsel not employed by the House of Representatives whenever the Committee determines, by an affirmative vote of a majority of the members of the Committee, that the retention of outside counsel is necessary and appropriate.

(h) If the Committee determines that it is necessary to retain staff members for the purpose of a particular investigation or other proceeding, then such staff shall be retained only for the duration of that particular investigation or proceeding.

(i) Outside counsel may be dismissed prior to the end of a contract between the Committee and such counsel only by a majority vote of the members of the Committee.

(j) In addition to any other staff provided for by law, rule, or other authority, with respect to the Committee, the Chair and Ranking Minority Member each may appoint one individual as a shared staff member from the respective personal staff of the Chair or Ranking Minority Member to perform service for the Committee. Such shared staff may assist the Chair or Ranking Minority Member on any subcommittee on which the Chair or Ranking Minority Member serves. Only paragraphs (c) and (e) of this Rule and Rule 7(b) shall apply to shared staff.

RULE 7. CONFIDENTIALITY

(a) Before any Member or employee of the Committee, including members of an investigative subcommittee selected under clause 5(a)(4) of Rule X of the House of Representatives and shared staff designated pursuant to Committee Rule 6(j), may have access to information that is confidential under the rules of the Committee, the following oath (or affirmation) shall be executed in writing:

"I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will not disclose, to any person or entity outside the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, any information received in the course of my service with the Committee, except as authorized by the Committee or in accordance with its rules."

Copies of the executed oath shall be provided to the Clerk of the House as part of the records of the House. Breaches of confidentiality shall be investigated by the Committee and appropriate action shall be taken.

(b) No member of the staff or outside counsel may make public, unless approved by an affirmative vote of a majority of the members of the Committee, any information, document, or other material that is confidential, derived from executive session, or classified and that is obtained during the course of employment with the Committee.

(c) Committee members and staff shall not disclose any evidence relating to an investigation to any person or organization outside the Committee unless authorized by the Committee.

(d) Members and staff of the Committee shall not disclose to any person or organization outside the Committee, unless authorized by the Committee, any information regarding the Committee's or a subcommittee's investigative, adjudicatory or other proceedings, including but not limited to: (i) the fact or nature of any complaints; (ii) executive session proceedings; (iii) information pertaining to or copies of any Committee or subcommittee report, study or other document which purports to express the views, findings, conclusions or recommendations of the Committee or subcommittee in connection with any of its activities or proceedings; or (iv) any other information or allegation respecting the conduct of a Member, officer or employee of the House. This rule shall not prohibit the Chair or Ranking Minority Member from disclosing to the Board of the Office of Congressional Ethics the existence of a Committee investigation, the name of the Member, officer or employee of the House who is the subject of that investigation, and a brief statement of the scope of that investigation in a written request for referral pursuant to Rule 17A(k). Such disclosures will only be made subject to written confirmation from the Board that the information provided by the Chair or Ranking Minority Member will be kept confidential by the Board.

(e) Except as otherwise specifically authorized by the Committee, no Committee member or staff member shall disclose to any person outside the Committee, the name of any witness subpoenaed to testify or to produce evidence.

(f) Except as provided in Rule 17A, the Committee shall not disclose to any person or organization outside the Committee any information concerning the conduct of a respondent until it has transmitted a Statement of Alleged Violation to such respondent and the respondent has been given full opportunity to respond pursuant to Rule 22. The Statement of Alleged Violation and any written response thereto shall be made public at the first meeting or hearing on the matter that is open to the public after such opportunity has been provided. Any other materials in the possession of the Committee regarding such statement may be made public as authorized by the Committee to the extent consistent with the Rules of the House of Representatives. If no public hearing is held on the matter, the Statement of Alleged Violation and any written response thereto shall be included in the Committee's final report on the matter to the House of Representatives.

(g) Unless otherwise determined by a vote of the Committee, only the Chair or Ranking

Minority Member of the Committee, after consultation with each other, may make public statements regarding matters before the Committee or any subcommittee.

(h) The Committee may establish procedures necessary to prevent the unauthorized disclosure of any testimony or other information received by the Committee or its staff.

RULE 8. SUBCOMMITTEES—GENERAL POLICY AND STRUCTURE

(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of these Rules, the Chair and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee may consult with an investigative subcommittee either on their own initiative or on the initiative of the subcommittee, shall have access to evidence and information before a subcommittee with whom they so consult, and shall not thereby be precluded from serving as full, voting members of any adjudicatory subcommittee. Except for the Chair and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee pursuant to this paragraph, evidence in the possession of an investigative subcommittee shall not be disclosed to other Committee members except by a vote of the subcommittee.

(b) The Committee may establish other noninvestigative and nonadjudicatory subcommittees and may assign to them such functions as it may deem appropriate. The membership of each subcommittee shall provide equal representation for the majority and minority parties.

(c) The Chair may refer any bill, resolution, or other matter before the Committee to an appropriate subcommittee for consideration. Any such bill, resolution, or other matter may be discharged from the subcommittee to which it was referred by a majority vote of the Committee.

(d) Any member of the Committee may sit with any noninvestigative or nonadjudicatory subcommittee, but only regular members of such subcommittee may vote on any matter before that subcommittee.

RULE 9. QUORUMS AND MEMBER DISQUALIFICATION

(a) The quorum for an investigative subcommittee to take testimony and to receive evidence shall be two members, unless otherwise authorized by the House of Representatives.

(b) The quorum for an adjudicatory subcommittee to take testimony, receive evidence, or conduct business shall consist of a majority plus one of the members of the adjudicatory subcommittee.

(c) Except as stated in clauses (a) and (b) of this rule, a quorum for the purpose of conducting business consists of a majority of the members of the Committee or subcommittee.

(d) A member of the Committee shall be ineligible to participate in any Committee or subcommittee proceeding in which such Member is the respondent.

(e) A member of the Committee may seek disqualification from participating in any investigation of the conduct of a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives upon the submission in writing and under oath of an affidavit of disqualification stating that the member cannot render an impartial and unbiased decision. If the Committee approves and accepts such affidavit of disqualification, the Chair shall so notify the Speaker and ask the Speaker to designate a Member of the House of Representatives from the same political party as the disqualified member of the Committee to act as a member of the Committee in any Committee proceeding relating to such investigation.

RULE 10. VOTE REQUIREMENTS

(a) The following actions shall be taken only upon an affirmative vote of a majority

of the members of the Committee or subcommittee, as appropriate:

(1) Issuing a subpoena.

(2) Adopting a full Committee motion to create an investigative subcommittee.

(3) Adopting or amending of a Statement of Alleged Violation.

(4) Finding that a count in a Statement of Alleged Violation has been proved by clear and convincing evidence.

(5) Sending a letter of reproof.

(6) Adopting a recommendation to the House of Representatives that a sanction be imposed.

(7) Adopting a report relating to the conduct of a Member, officer, or employee.

(8) Issuing an advisory opinion of general applicability establishing new policy.

(b) Except as stated in clause (a), action may be taken by the Committee or any subcommittee thereof by a simple majority, a quorum being present.

(c) No motion made to take any of the actions enumerated in clause (a) of this Rule may be entertained by the Chair unless a quorum of the Committee is present when such motion is made.

RULE 11. COMMITTEE RECORDS

(a) All communications and all pleadings pursuant to these rules shall be filed with the Committee at the Committee's office or such other place as designated by the Committee.

(b) All records of the Committee which have been delivered to the Archivist of the United States shall be made available to the public in accordance with Rule VII of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

RULE 12. BROADCASTS OF COMMITTEE AND SUBCOMMITTEE PROCEEDINGS

(a) Television or radio coverage of a Committee or subcommittee hearing or meeting shall be without commercial sponsorship.

(b) Not more than four television cameras, operating from fixed positions, shall be permitted in a hearing or meeting room. The Committee may allocate the positions of permitted television cameras among the television media in consultation with the Executive Committee of the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

(c) Television cameras shall be placed so as not to obstruct in any way the space between any witness giving evidence or testimony and any member of the Committee, or the visibility of that witness and that member to each other.

(d) Television cameras shall not be placed in positions that unnecessarily obstruct the coverage of the hearing or meeting by the other media.

PART II—INVESTIGATIVE AUTHORITY

RULE 13. HOUSE RESOLUTION

Whenever the House of Representatives, by resolution, authorizes or directs the Committee to undertake an inquiry or investigation, the provisions of the resolution, in conjunction with these Rules, shall govern. To the extent the provisions of the resolution differ from these Rules, the resolution shall control.

RULE 14. COMMITTEE AUTHORITY TO INVESTIGATE—GENERAL POLICY

(a) Pursuant to clause 3(b) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee may exercise its investigative authority when:

(1) information offered as a complaint by a Member of the House of Representatives is transmitted directly to the Committee;

(2) information offered as a complaint by an individual not a Member of the House is transmitted to the Committee, provided that a Member of the House certifies in writing that such Member believes the information

is submitted in good faith and warrants the review and consideration of the Committee;

(3) the Committee, on its own initiative, undertakes an investigation;

(4) a Member, officer, or employee is convicted in a Federal, State, or local court of a felony;

(5) the House of Representatives, by resolution, authorizes or directs the Committee to undertake an inquiry or investigation; or

(6) a referral from the Board is transmitted to the Committee.

(b) The Committee also has investigatory authority over:

(1) certain unauthorized disclosures of intelligence-related information, pursuant to House Rule X, clauses 11(g)(4) and (g)(5); or

(2) reports received from the Office of the Inspector General pursuant to House Rule II, clause 6(c)(5).

RULE 15. COMPLAINTS

(a) A complaint submitted to the Committee shall be in writing, dated, and properly verified (a document will be considered properly verified where a notary executes it with the language, "Signed and sworn to (or affirmed) before me on (date) by (the name of the person)" setting forth in simple, concise, and direct statements—

(1) the name and legal address of the party filing the complaint (hereinafter referred to as the "complainant");

(2) the name and position or title of the respondent;

(3) the nature of the alleged violation of the Code of Official Conduct or of other law, rule, regulation, or other standard of conduct applicable to the performance of duties or discharge of responsibilities; and

(4) the facts alleged to give rise to the violation. The complaint shall not contain innuendo, speculative assertions, or conclusory statements.

(b) Any documents in the possession of the complainant that relate to the allegations may be submitted with the complaint.

(c) Information offered as a complaint by a Member of the House of Representatives may be transmitted directly to the Committee.

(d) Information offered as a complaint by an individual not a Member of the House may be transmitted to the Committee, provided that a Member of the House certifies in writing that such Member believes the information is submitted in good faith and warrants the review and consideration of the Committee.

(e) A complaint must be accompanied by a certification, which may be unsworn, that the complainant has provided an exact copy of the filed complaint and all attachments to the respondent.

(f) The Committee may defer action on a complaint against a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives when the complaint alleges conduct that the Committee has reason to believe is being reviewed by appropriate law enforcement or regulatory authorities, or when the Committee determines that it is appropriate for the conduct alleged in the complaint to be reviewed initially by law enforcement or regulatory authorities.

(g) A complaint may not be amended without leave of the Committee. Otherwise, any new allegations of improper conduct must be submitted in a new complaint that independently meets the procedural requirements of the Rules of the House of Representatives and the Committee's Rules.

(h) The Committee shall not accept, and shall return to the complainant, any complaint submitted within the 60 days prior to an election in which the subject of the complaint is a candidate.

(i) The Committee shall not consider a complaint, nor shall any investigation be undertaken by the Committee, of any alleged

violation which occurred before the third previous Congress unless the Committee determines that the alleged violation is directly related to an alleged violation which occurred in a more recent Congress.

RULE 16. DUTIES OF COMMITTEE CHAIR AND RANKING MINORITY MEMBER

(a) Whenever information offered as a complaint is submitted to the Committee, the Chair and Ranking Minority Member shall have 14 calendar days or 5 legislative days, whichever occurs first, to determine whether the information meets the requirements of the Committee's rules for what constitutes a complaint.

(b) Whenever the Chair and Ranking Minority Member jointly determine that information submitted to the Committee meets the requirements of the Committee's rules for what constitutes a complaint, they shall have 45 calendar days or 5 legislative days, whichever is later, after the date that the Chair and Ranking Minority Member determine that information filed meets the requirements of the Committee's rules for what constitutes a complaint, unless the Committee by an affirmative vote of a majority of its members votes otherwise, to—

(1) recommend to the Committee that it dispose of the complaint, or any portion thereof, in any manner that does not require action by the House, which may include dismissal of the complaint or resolution of the complaint by a letter to the Member, officer, or employee of the House against whom the complaint is made;

(2) establish an investigative subcommittee; or

(3) request that the Committee extend the applicable 45-calendar day period when they determine more time is necessary in order to make a recommendation under paragraph (1) or (2) of Rule 16(b).

(c) The Chair and Ranking Minority Member may jointly gather additional information concerning alleged conduct which is the basis of a complaint or of information offered as a complaint until they have established an investigative subcommittee or the Chair or Ranking Minority Member has placed on the agenda the issue of whether to establish an investigative subcommittee.

(d) If the Chair and Ranking Minority Member jointly determine that information submitted to the Committee meets the requirements of the Committee rules for what constitutes a complaint, and the complaint is not disposed of within 45 calendar days or 5 legislative days, whichever is later, and no additional 45-day extension is made, then they shall establish an investigative subcommittee and forward the complaint, or any portion thereof, to that subcommittee for its consideration. If at any time during the time period either the Chair or Ranking Minority Member places on the agenda the issue of whether to establish an investigative subcommittee, then an investigative subcommittee may be established only by an affirmative vote of a majority of the members of the Committee.

(e) Whenever the Chair and Ranking Minority Member jointly determine that information submitted to the Committee does not meet the requirements for what constitutes a complaint set forth in the Committee rules, they may (1) return the information to the complainant with a statement that it fails to meet the requirements for what constitutes a complaint set forth in the Committee's rules; or (2) recommend to the Committee that it authorize the establishment of an investigative subcommittee.

RULE 17. PROCESSING OF COMPLAINTS

(a) If a complaint is in compliance with House and Committee Rules, a copy of the complaint and the Committee Rules shall be

forwarded to the respondent within 5 days with notice that the complaint conforms to the applicable rules.

(b) The respondent may, within 30 days of the Committee's notification, provide to the Committee any information relevant to a complaint filed with the Committee. The respondent may submit a written statement in response to the complaint. Such a statement shall be signed by the respondent. If the statement is prepared by counsel for the respondent, the respondent shall sign a representation that the respondent has reviewed the response and agrees with the factual assertions contained therein.

(c) The Committee staff may request information from the respondent or obtain additional information relevant to the case from other sources prior to the establishment of an investigative subcommittee only when so directed by the Chair and Ranking Minority Member.

(d) The respondent shall be notified in writing regarding the Committee's decision either to dismiss the complaint or to create an investigative subcommittee.

RULE 17A. REFERRALS FROM THE BOARD OF THE OFFICE OF CONGRESSIONAL ETHICS

(a) The Committee has exclusive jurisdiction over the interpretation, administration, and enforcement of the Code of Official Conduct pursuant to clause 1(q) of House Rule X. Receipt of referrals from the Board under this rule does not limit the Committee's discretion to address referrals in any way through the appropriate procedures authorized by Committee Rules. The Committee shall review the report and findings transmitted by the Board without prejudice or presumptions as to the merit of the allegations.

(b)(1) Whenever the Committee receives either (A) a referral containing a written report and any findings and supporting documentation from the Board; or (B) a referral from the Board pursuant to a request under Rule 17A(k), the Chair shall have 45 calendar days or 5 legislative days after the date the referral is received, whichever is later, to make public the report and findings of the Board unless the Chair and Ranking Minority Member jointly decide, or the Committee votes, to withhold such information for not more than one additional 45-day period.

(2) At least one calendar day before the Committee makes public any report and findings of the Board the Chair shall notify in writing the Board and the Member, officer, or employee who is the subject of the referral of the impending public release of these documents. At the same time, Chair shall transmit a copy of any public statement on the Committee's disposition of the matter and any accompanying Committee report to the individual who is the subject of the referral.

(3) All public statements and reports and findings of the Board that are required to be made public under this Rule shall be posted on the Committee's website.

(c) If the OCE report and findings are withheld for an additional 45-day period pursuant to paragraph (b)(1), Chair shall—

(1) make a public statement that the Committee has decided or voted to extend the matter referred from the Board on the day of such decision or vote; and

(2) make public the written report and findings pursuant to paragraph (b) upon the termination of such additional period.

(d) If the Board transmits a report with a recommendation to dismiss or noting a matter as unresolved due to a tie vote, and the Committee votes to extend the matter for an additional period as provided in paragraph (b), the Committee is not required to make a public statement that the Committee has

voted to extend the matter pursuant to paragraph (b)(1).

(e) If the Committee votes to dismiss a matter referred from the Board, the Committee is not required to make public the written report and findings of the Board pursuant to paragraph (c) unless the Committee's vote is inconsistent with the recommendation of the Board. A vote by the Committee to dismiss a matter is not considered inconsistent with a report from the Board that the matter is unresolved by the Board due to a tie vote.

(f) Except as provided by paragraph (g):

(1) If the Committee establishes an investigative subcommittee respecting any matter referred by the Board, then the report and findings of the Board shall not be made public until the conclusion of the investigative subcommittee process pursuant to Rule 19. The Committee shall issue a public statement noting the establishment of an investigative subcommittee, which shall include the name of the Member, officer, or employee who is the subject of the inquiry, and shall set forth the alleged violation.

(2) If any such investigative subcommittee does not conclude its review within one year after the Board's referral, then the Committee shall make public the report of the Board no later than one year after the referral. If the investigative subcommittee does not conclude its review before the end of the Congress in which the report of the Board is made public, the Committee shall make public any findings of the Board on the last day of that Congress.

(g) If the vote of the Committee is a tie or the Committee fails to act by the close of any applicable period(s) under this rule, the report and the findings of the Board shall be made public by the Committee, along with a public statement by the Chair explaining the status of the matter.

(h)(1) If the Committee agrees to a request from an appropriate law enforcement or regulatory authority to defer taking action on a matter referred by the Board under paragraph (b)—

(A) The Committee is not required to make public the written report and findings of the Board pursuant to paragraph (c), except that if the recommendation of the Board is that the matter requires further review, the Committee shall make public the written report of the Board but not the findings; and

(B) The Committee shall make a public statement that it is deferring taking action on the matter at the request of such law enforcement or regulatory authority within one day (excluding weekends and public holidays) of the day that the Committee agrees to the request.

(2) If the Committee has not acted on the matter within one year of the date the public statement described in paragraph (h)(1)(B) is released, the Committee shall make a public statement that it continues to defer taking action on the matter. The Committee shall make a new statement upon the expiration of each succeeding one-year period during which the Committee has not acted on the matter.

(i) The Committee shall not accept, and shall return to the Board, any referral from the Board within 60 days before a Federal, State, or local election in which the subject of the referral is a candidate.

(j) The Committee may postpone any reporting requirement under this rule that falls within that 60-day period until after the date of the election in which the subject of the referral is a candidate. For purposes of calculating any applicable period under this Rule, any days within the 60-day period before such an election shall not be counted.

(k)(1) At any time after the Committee receives written notification from the Board of

the Office of Congressional Ethics that the Board is undertaking a review of alleged conduct of any Member, officer, or employee of the House at a time when the Committee is investigating, or has completed an investigation of the same matter, the Committee may so notify the Board in writing and request that the Board cease its review and refer the matter to the Committee for its consideration immediately. The Committee shall also notify the Board in writing if the Committee has not reached a final resolution of the matter or has not referred the matter to the appropriate Federal or State authorities by the end of any applicable time period specified in Rule 17A (including any permissible extension).

(2) The Committee may not request a second referral of the matter from the Board if the Committee has notified the Board that it is unable to resolve the matter previously requested pursuant to this section. The Board may subsequently send a referral regarding a matter previously requested and returned by the Committee after the conclusion of the Board's review process.

RULE 18. COMMITTEE-INITIATED INQUIRY OR INVESTIGATION

(a) Notwithstanding the absence of a filed complaint, the Committee may consider any information in its possession indicating that a Member, officer, or employee may have committed a violation of the Code of Official Conduct or any law, rule, regulation, or other standard of conduct applicable to the conduct of such Member, officer, or employee in the performance of the duties or the discharge of the responsibilities of such individual. The Chair and Ranking Minority Member may jointly gather additional information concerning such an alleged violation by a Member, officer, or employee unless and until an investigative subcommittee has been established. The Chair and Ranking Minority Member may also jointly take appropriate action consistent with Committee Rules to resolve the matter.

(b) If the Committee votes to establish an investigative subcommittee, the Committee shall proceed in accordance with Rule 19.

(c) Any written request by a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives that the Committee conduct an investigation into such person's own conduct shall be considered in accordance with subsection (a) of this Rule.

(d) An inquiry shall not be undertaken regarding any alleged violation that occurred before the third previous Congress unless a majority of the Committee determines that the alleged violation is directly related to an alleged violation that occurred in a more recent Congress.

(e)(1) An inquiry shall be undertaken by an investigative subcommittee with regard to any felony conviction of a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives in a Federal, State, or local court who has been sentenced. Notwithstanding this provision, the Committee has the discretion to initiate an inquiry upon an affirmative vote of a majority of the members of the Committee at any time prior to conviction or sentencing.

(2) Not later than 30 days after a Member, officer or employee of the House is indicted or otherwise formally charged with criminal conduct in any Federal, State or local court, the Committee shall either initiate an inquiry upon a majority vote of the members of the Committee or submit a report to the House describing its reasons for not initiating an inquiry and describing the actions, if any, that the Committee has taken in response to the allegations.

RULE 19. INVESTIGATIVE SUBCOMMITTEE

(a)(1) Upon the establishment of an investigative subcommittee, the Chair and Rank-

ing Minority Member of the Committee shall designate four members (with equal representation from the majority and minority parties) to serve as an investigative subcommittee to undertake an inquiry. Members of the Committee and Members of the House selected pursuant to clause 5(a)(4)(A) of Rule X of the House of Representatives are eligible for appointment to an investigative subcommittee, as determined by the Chair and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee. At the time of appointment, the Chair shall designate one member of the subcommittee to serve as the Chair and the Ranking Minority Member shall designate one member of the subcommittee to serve as the ranking minority member of the investigative subcommittee. The Chair and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee may serve as members of an investigative subcommittee, but may not serve as non-voting, ex-officio members.

(2) The respondent shall be notified of the membership of the investigative subcommittee and shall have 10 days after such notice is transmitted to object to the participation of any subcommittee member. Such objection shall be in writing and must be on the grounds that the subcommittee member cannot render an impartial and unbiased decision. The subcommittee member against whom the objection is made shall be the sole judge of any disqualification and may choose to seek disqualification from participating in the inquiry pursuant to Rule 9(e).

(b) In an inquiry undertaken by an investigative subcommittee—

(1) All proceedings, including the taking of testimony, shall be conducted in executive session and all testimony taken by deposition or things produced pursuant to subpoena or otherwise shall be deemed to have been taken or produced in executive session.

(2) The Chair of the investigative subcommittee shall ask the respondent and all witnesses whether they intend to be represented by counsel. If so, the respondent or witnesses or their legal representatives shall provide written designation of counsel. A respondent or witness who is represented by counsel shall not be questioned in the absence of counsel unless an explicit waiver is obtained.

(3) The subcommittee shall provide the respondent an opportunity to present, orally or in writing, a statement, which must be under oath or affirmation, regarding the allegations and any other relevant questions arising out of the inquiry.

(4) The staff may interview witnesses, examine documents and other evidence, and request that submitted statements be under oath or affirmation and that documents be certified as to their authenticity and accuracy.

(5) The subcommittee, by a majority vote of its members, may require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, documents, and other items as it deems necessary to the conduct of the inquiry. Unless the Committee otherwise provides, the subpoena power shall rest in the Chair and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee and a subpoena shall be issued upon the request of the investigative subcommittee.

(6) The subcommittee shall require that testimony be given under oath or affirmation. The form of the oath or affirmation shall be: "Do you solemnly swear (or affirm) that the testimony you will give before this subcommittee in the matter now under consideration will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth (so help you God)?" The oath or affirmation shall be administered by the Chair or subcommittee

member designated by the Chair to administer oaths.

(c) During the inquiry, the procedure respecting the admissibility of evidence and rulings shall be as follows:

(1) Any relevant evidence shall be admissible unless the evidence is privileged under the precedents of the House of Representatives.

(2) The Chair of the subcommittee or other presiding member at any investigative subcommittee proceeding shall rule upon any question of admissibility or relevance of evidence, motion, procedure or any other matter, and may direct any witness to answer any question under penalty of contempt. A witness, witness counsel, or a member of the subcommittee may appeal any rulings to the members present at that proceeding. A majority vote of the members present at such proceeding on such appeal shall govern the question of admissibility, and no appeal shall lie to the Committee.

(3) Whenever a person is determined by a majority vote to be in contempt of the subcommittee, the matter may be referred to the Committee to determine whether to refer the matter to the House of Representatives for consideration.

(4) Committee counsel may, subject to subcommittee approval, enter into stipulations with the respondent and/or the respondent's counsel as to facts that are not in dispute.

(d) Upon an affirmative vote of a majority of the subcommittee members, and an affirmative vote of a majority of the full Committee, an investigative subcommittee may expand the scope of its inquiry.

(e) Upon completion of the inquiry, the staff shall draft for the investigative subcommittee a report that shall contain a comprehensive summary of the information received regarding the alleged violations.

(f) Upon completion of the inquiry, an investigative subcommittee, by a majority vote of its members, may adopt a Statement of Alleged Violation if it determines that there is substantial reason to believe that a violation of the Code of Official Conduct, or of a law, rule, regulation, or other standard of conduct applicable to the performance of official duties or the discharge of official responsibilities by a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives has occurred. If more than one violation is alleged, such Statement shall be divided into separate counts. Each count shall relate to a separate violation, shall contain a plain and concise statement of the alleged facts of such violation, and shall include a reference to the provision of the Code of Official Conduct or law, rule, regulation or other applicable standard of conduct governing the performance of duties or discharge of responsibilities alleged to have been violated. A copy of such Statement shall be transmitted to the respondent and the respondent's counsel.

(g) If the investigative subcommittee does not adopt a Statement of Alleged Violation, it shall transmit to the Committee a report containing a summary of the information received in the inquiry, its conclusions and reasons therefore, and any appropriate recommendation.

RULE 20. AMENDMENTS TO STATEMENTS OF ALLEGED VIOLATION

(a) An investigative subcommittee may, upon an affirmative vote of a majority of its members, amend its Statement of Alleged Violation anytime before the Statement of Alleged Violation is transmitted to the Committee; and

(b) If an investigative subcommittee amends its Statement of Alleged Violation, the respondent shall be notified in writing and shall have 30 calendar days from the

date of that notification to file an answer to the amended Statement of Alleged Violation.

RULE 21. COMMITTEE REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

(a) Whenever an investigative subcommittee does not adopt a Statement of Alleged Violation and transmits a report to that effect to the Committee, the Committee may by an affirmative vote of a majority of its members transmit such report to the House of Representatives:

(b) Whenever an investigative subcommittee adopts a Statement of Alleged Violation but recommends that no further action be taken, it shall transmit a report to the Committee regarding the Statement of Alleged Violation; and

(c) Whenever an investigative subcommittee adopts a Statement of Alleged Violation, the respondent admits to the violations set forth in such Statement, the respondent waives the right to an adjudicatory hearing, and the respondent's waiver is approved by the Committee—

(1) the subcommittee shall prepare a report for transmittal to the Committee, a final draft of which shall be provided to the respondent not less than 15 calendar days before the subcommittee votes on whether to adopt the report;

(2) the respondent may submit views in writing regarding the final draft to the subcommittee within 7 calendar days of receipt of that draft;

(3) the subcommittee shall transmit a report to the Committee regarding the Statement of Alleged Violation together with any views submitted by the respondent pursuant to subparagraph (2), and the Committee shall make the report, together with the respondent's views, available to the public before the commencement of any sanction hearing; and

(4) the Committee shall by an affirmative vote of a majority of its members issue a report and transmit such report to the House of Representatives, together with the respondent's views previously submitted pursuant to subparagraph (2) and any additional views respondent may submit for attachment to the final report; and

(d) Members of the Committee shall have not less than 72 hours to review any report transmitted to the Committee by an investigative subcommittee before both the commencement of a sanction hearing and the Committee vote on whether to adopt the report.

RULE 22. RESPONDENT'S ANSWER

(a)(1) Within 30 days from the date of transmittal of a Statement of Alleged Violation, the respondent shall file with the investigative subcommittee an answer, in writing and under oath, signed by respondent and respondent's counsel. Failure to file an answer within the time prescribed shall be considered by the Committee as a denial of each count.

(2) The answer shall contain an admission to or denial of each count set forth in the Statement of Alleged Violation and may include negative, affirmative, or alternative defenses and any supporting evidence or other relevant information.

(b) The respondent may file a Motion for a Bill of Particulars within 10 days of the date of transmittal of the Statement of Alleged Violation. If a Motion for a Bill of Particulars is filed, the respondent shall not be required to file an answer until 20 days after the subcommittee has replied to such motion.

(c)(1) The respondent may file a Motion to Dismiss within 10 days of the date of transmittal of the Statement of Alleged Violation or, if a Motion for a Bill of Particulars has been filed, within 10 days of the date of the

subcommittee's reply to the Motion for a Bill of Particulars. If a Motion to Dismiss is filed, the respondent shall not be required to file an answer until 20 days after the subcommittee has replied to the Motion to Dismiss, unless the respondent previously filed a Motion for a Bill of Particulars, in which case the respondent shall not be required to file an answer until 10 days after the subcommittee has replied to the Motion to Dismiss. The investigative subcommittee shall rule upon any motion to dismiss filed during the period between the establishment of the subcommittee and the subcommittee's transmittal of a report or Statement of Alleged Violation to the Committee or to the Chair and Ranking Minority Member at the conclusion of an inquiry, and no appeal of the subcommittee's ruling shall lie to the Committee.

(2) A Motion to Dismiss may be made on the grounds that the Statement of Alleged Violation fails to state facts that constitute a violation of the Code of Official Conduct or other applicable law, rule, regulation, or standard of conduct, or on the grounds that the Committee lacks jurisdiction to consider the allegations contained in the Statement.

(d) Any motion filed with the subcommittee pursuant to this rule shall be accompanied by a Memorandum of Points and Authorities.

(e)(1) The Chair of the investigative subcommittee, for good cause shown, may permit the respondent to file an answer or motion after the day prescribed above.

(2) If the ability of the respondent to present an adequate defense is not adversely affected and special circumstances so require, the Chair of the investigative subcommittee may direct the respondent to file an answer or motion prior to the day prescribed above.

(f) If the day on which any answer, motion, reply, or other pleading must be filed falls on a Saturday, Sunday, or holiday, such filing shall be made on the first business day thereafter.

(g) As soon as practicable after an answer has been filed or the time for such filing has expired, the Statement of Alleged Violation and any answer, motion, reply, or other pleading connected therewith shall be transmitted by the Chair of the investigative subcommittee to the Chair and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee.

RULE 23. ADJUDICATORY HEARINGS

(a) If a Statement of Alleged Violation is transmitted to the Chair and Ranking Minority Member pursuant to Rule 22, and no waiver pursuant to Rule 26(b) has occurred, the Chair shall designate the members of the Committee who did not serve on the investigative subcommittee to serve on an adjudicatory subcommittee. The Chair and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee shall be the Chair and Ranking Minority Member of the adjudicatory subcommittee unless they served on the investigative subcommittee. The respondent shall be notified of the designation of the adjudicatory subcommittee and shall have 10 days after such notice is transmitted to object to the participation of any subcommittee member. Such objection shall be in writing and shall be on the grounds that the member cannot render an impartial and unbiased decision. The member against whom the objection is made shall be the sole judge of any disqualification and may choose to seek disqualification from serving on the subcommittee pursuant to Rule 9(e).

(b) A majority of the adjudicatory subcommittee membership plus one must be present at all times for the conduct of any business pursuant to this rule.

(c) The adjudicatory subcommittee shall hold a hearing to determine whether any

counts in the Statement of Alleged Violation have been proved by clear and convincing evidence and shall make findings of fact, except where such violations have been admitted by respondent.

(d) At an adjudicatory hearing, the subcommittee may require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, documents, and other items as it deems necessary. Depositions, interrogatories, and sworn statements taken under any investigative subcommittee direction may be accepted into the hearing record.

(e) The procedures set forth in clause 2(g) and (k) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall apply to adjudicatory hearings. All such hearings shall be open to the public unless the adjudicatory subcommittee, pursuant to such clause, determines that the hearings or any part thereof should be closed.

(f)(1) The adjudicatory subcommittee shall, in writing, notify the respondent that the respondent and respondent's counsel have the right to inspect, review, copy, or photograph books, papers, documents, photographs, or other tangible objects that the adjudicatory subcommittee counsel intends to use as evidence against the respondent in an adjudicatory hearing. The respondent shall be given access to such evidence, and shall be provided the names of witnesses the subcommittee counsel intends to call, and a summary of their expected testimony, no less than 15 calendar days prior to any such hearing. Except in extraordinary circumstances, no evidence may be introduced or witness called in an adjudicatory hearing unless the respondent has been afforded a prior opportunity to review such evidence or has been provided the name of the witness.

(2) After a witness has testified on direct examination at an adjudicatory hearing, the Committee, at the request of the respondent, shall make available to the respondent any statement of the witness in the possession of the Committee which relates to the subject matter as to which the witness has testified.

(3) Any other testimony, statement, or documentary evidence in the possession of the Committee which is material to the respondent's defense shall, upon request, be made available to the respondent.

(g) No less than 5 days prior to the hearing, the respondent or counsel shall provide the adjudicatory subcommittee with the names of witnesses expected to be called, summaries of their expected testimony, and copies of any documents or other evidence proposed to be introduced.

(h) The respondent or counsel may apply to the subcommittee for the issuance of subpoenas for the appearance of witnesses or the production of evidence. The application shall be granted upon a showing by the respondent that the proposed testimony or evidence is relevant and not otherwise available to respondent. The application may be denied if not made at a reasonable time or if the testimony or evidence would be merely cumulative.

(i) During the hearing, the procedures regarding the admissibility of evidence and rulings shall be as follows:

(1) Any relevant evidence shall be admissible unless the evidence is privileged under the precedents of the House of Representatives.

(2) The Chair of the subcommittee or other presiding member at an adjudicatory subcommittee hearing shall rule upon any question of admissibility or relevance of evidence, motion, procedure, or any other matter, and may direct any witness to answer any question under penalty of contempt. A witness, witness counsel, or a member of the

subcommittee may appeal any ruling to the members present at that proceeding. A majority vote of the members present at such proceeding on such an appeal shall govern the question of admissibility and no appeal shall lie to the Committee.

(3) Whenever a witness is deemed by a Chair or other presiding member to be in contempt of the subcommittee, the matter may be referred to the Committee to determine whether to refer the matter to the House of Representatives for consideration.

(4) Committee counsel may, subject to subcommittee approval, enter into stipulations with the respondent and/or the respondent's counsel as to facts that are not in dispute.

(j) Unless otherwise provided, the order of an adjudicatory hearing shall be as follows:

(1) The Chair of the subcommittee shall open the hearing by stating the adjudicatory subcommittee's authority to conduct the hearing and the purpose of the hearing.

(2) The Chair shall then recognize Committee counsel and the respondent's counsel, in turn, for the purpose of giving opening statements.

(3) Testimony from witnesses and other relevant evidence shall be received in the following order whenever possible:

(i) witnesses (deposition transcripts and affidavits obtained during the inquiry may be used in lieu of live witnesses if the witness is unavailable) and other evidence offered by the Committee counsel,

(ii) witnesses and other evidence offered by the respondent,

(iii) rebuttal witnesses, as permitted by the Chair.

(4) Witnesses at a hearing shall be examined first by counsel calling such witness. The opposing counsel may then cross-examine the witness. Redirect examination and recross examination by counsel may be permitted at the Chair's discretion. Subcommittee members may then question witnesses. Unless otherwise directed by the Chair, questions by Subcommittee members shall be conducted under the five-minute rule.

(5) The Chair shall then recognize Committee counsel and respondent's counsel, in turn, for the purpose of giving closing arguments. Committee counsel may reserve time for rebuttal argument, as permitted by the Chair.

(k) A subpoena to a witness to appear at a hearing shall be served sufficiently in advance of that witness' scheduled appearance to allow the witness a reasonable period of time, as determined by the Chair of the adjudicatory subcommittee, to prepare for the hearing and to employ counsel.

(l) Each witness appearing before the subcommittee shall be furnished a printed copy of the Committee rules, the relevant provisions of the Rules of the House of Representatives applicable to the rights of witnesses, and a copy of the Statement of Alleged Violation.

(m) Testimony of all witnesses shall be taken under oath or affirmation. The form of the oath or affirmation shall be: "Do you solemnly swear (or affirm) that the testimony you will give before this subcommittee in the matter now under consideration will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth (so help you God)?" The oath or affirmation shall be administered by the Chair or Committee member designated by the Chair to administer oaths.

(n) At an adjudicatory hearing, the burden of proof rests on Committee counsel to establish the facts alleged in the Statement of Alleged Violation by clear and convincing evidence. However, Committee counsel need not present any evidence regarding any count that is admitted by the respondent or any fact stipulated.

(o) As soon as practicable after all testimony and evidence have been presented, the subcommittee shall consider each count contained in the Statement of Alleged Violation and shall determine by a majority vote of its members whether each count has been proved. If a majority of the subcommittee does not vote that a count has been proved, a motion to reconsider that vote may be made only by a member who voted that the count was not proved. A count that is not proved shall be considered as dismissed by the subcommittee.

(p) The findings of the adjudicatory subcommittee shall be reported to the Committee.

RULE 24. SANCTION HEARING AND CONSIDERATION OF SANCTIONS OR OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS

(a) If no count in a Statement of Alleged Violation is proved, the Committee shall prepare a report to the House of Representatives, based upon the report of the adjudicatory subcommittee.

(b) If an adjudicatory subcommittee completes an adjudicatory hearing pursuant to Rule 23 and reports that any count of the Statement of Alleged Violation has been proved, a hearing before the Committee shall be held to receive oral and/or written submissions by counsel for the Committee and counsel for the respondent as to the sanction the Committee should recommend to the House of Representatives with respect to such violations. Testimony by witnesses shall not be heard except by written request and vote of a majority of the Committee.

(c) Upon completion of any proceeding held pursuant to clause (b), the Committee shall consider and vote on a motion to recommend to the House of Representatives that the House take disciplinary action. If a majority of the Committee does not vote in favor of the recommendation that the House of Representatives take action, a motion to reconsider that vote may be made only by a member who voted against the recommendation. The Committee may also, by majority vote, adopt a motion to issue a Letter of Reproval or take other appropriate Committee action.

(d) If the Committee determines a Letter of Reproval constitutes sufficient action, the Committee shall include any such letter as a part of its report to the House of Representatives.

(e) With respect to any proved counts against a Member of the House of Representatives, the Committee may recommend to the House one or more of the following sanctions:

(1) Expulsion from the House of Representatives.

(2) Censure.

(3) Reprimand.

(4) Fine.

(5) Denial or limitation of any right, power, privilege, or immunity of the Member if under the Constitution the House of Representatives may impose such denial or limitation.

(6) Any other sanction determined by the Committee to be appropriate.

(f) With respect to any proved counts against an officer or employee of the House of Representatives, the Committee may recommend to the House one or more of the following sanctions:

(1) Dismissal from employment.

(2) Reprimand.

(3) Fine.

(4) Any other sanction determined by the Committee to be appropriate.

(g) With respect to the sanctions that the Committee may recommend, reprimand is appropriate for serious violations, censure is appropriate for more serious violations, and expulsion of a Member or dismissal of an of-

ficer or employee is appropriate for the most serious violations. A recommendation of a fine is appropriate in a case in which it is likely that the violation was committed to secure a personal financial benefit; and a recommendation of a denial or limitation of a right, power, privilege, or immunity of a Member is appropriate when the violation bears upon the exercise or holding of such right, power, privilege, or immunity. This clause sets forth general guidelines and does not limit the authority of the Committee to recommend other sanctions.

(h) The Committee report shall contain an appropriate statement of the evidence supporting the Committee's findings and a statement of the Committee's reasons for the recommended sanction.

RULE 25. DISCLOSURE OF EXONERATORY INFORMATION TO RESPONDENT

If the Committee, or any investigative or adjudicatory subcommittee at any time receives any exoneratory information respecting a Complaint or Statement of Alleged Violation concerning a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives, it shall make such information known and available to the Member, officer, or employee as soon as practicable, but in no event later than the transmittal of evidence supporting a proposed Statement of Alleged Violation pursuant to Rule 26(c). If an investigative subcommittee does not adopt a Statement of Alleged Violation, it shall identify any exoneratory information in its possession at the conclusion of its inquiry and shall include such information, if any, in the subcommittee's final report to the Committee regarding its inquiry. For purposes of this rule, exoneratory evidence shall be any evidence or information that is substantially favorable to the respondent with respect to the allegations or charges before an investigative or adjudicatory subcommittee.

RULE 26. RIGHTS OF RESPONDENTS AND WITNESSES

(a) A respondent shall be informed of the right to be represented by counsel, to be provided at the respondent's own expense.

(b) A respondent may seek to waive any procedural rights or steps in the disciplinary process. A request for waiver must be in writing, signed by the respondent, and must detail what procedural steps the respondent seeks to waive. Any such request shall be subject to the acceptance of the Committee or subcommittee, as appropriate.

(c) Not less than 10 calendar days before a scheduled vote by an investigative subcommittee on a Statement of Alleged Violation, the subcommittee shall provide the respondent with a copy of the Statement of Alleged Violation it intends to adopt together with all evidence it intends to use to prove those charges which it intends to adopt, including documentary evidence, witness testimony, memoranda of witness interviews, and physical evidence, unless the subcommittee by an affirmative vote of a majority of its members decides to withhold certain evidence in order to protect a witness, but if such evidence is withheld, the subcommittee shall inform the respondent that evidence is being withheld and of the count to which such evidence relates.

(d) Neither the respondent nor respondent's counsel shall, directly or indirectly, contact the subcommittee or any member thereof during the period of time set forth in paragraph (c) except for the sole purpose of settlement discussions where counsels for the respondent and the subcommittee are present.

(e) If, at any time after the issuance of a Statement of Alleged Violation, the Committee or any subcommittee thereof determines that it intends to use evidence not

provided to a respondent under paragraph (c) to prove the charges contained in the Statement of Alleged Violation (or any amendment thereof), such evidence shall be made immediately available to the respondent, and it may be used in any further proceeding under the Committee's rules.

(f) Evidence provided pursuant to paragraph (c) or (e) shall be made available to the respondent and respondent's counsel only after each agrees, in writing, that no document, information, or other materials obtained pursuant to that paragraph shall be made public until—

(1) such time as a Statement of Alleged Violation is made public by the Committee if the respondent has waived the adjudicatory hearing; or

(2) the commencement of an adjudicatory hearing if the respondent has not waived an adjudicatory hearing; but the failure of respondent and respondent's counsel to so agree in writing, and therefore not receive the evidence, shall not preclude the issuance of a Statement of Alleged Violation at the end of the period referenced to in (c).

(g) A respondent shall receive written notice whenever—

(1) the Chair and Ranking Minority Member determine that information the Committee has received constitutes a complaint;

(2) a complaint or allegation is transmitted to an investigative subcommittee;

(3) that subcommittee votes to authorize its first subpoena or to take testimony under oath, whichever occurs first; and

(4) the Committee votes to expand the scope of the inquiry of an investigative subcommittee.

(h) Whenever an investigative subcommittee adopts a Statement of Alleged Violation and a respondent enters into an agreement with that subcommittee to settle a complaint on which the Statement is based, that agreement, unless the respondent requests otherwise, shall be in writing and signed by the respondent and the respondent's counsel, the Chair and Ranking Minority Member of the subcommittee, and outside counsel, if any.

(i) Statements or information derived solely from a respondent or respondent's counsel during any settlement discussions between the Committee or a subcommittee thereof and the respondent shall not be included in any report of the subcommittee or the Committee or otherwise publicly disclosed without the consent of the respondent.

(j) Whenever a motion to establish an investigative subcommittee does not prevail, the Committee shall promptly send a letter to the respondent informing the respondent of such vote.

(k) Witnesses shall be afforded a reasonable period of time, as determined by the Committee or subcommittee, to prepare for an appearance before an investigative subcommittee or for an adjudicatory hearing and to obtain counsel.

(l) Prior to their testimony, witnesses shall be furnished a printed copy of the Committee's Rules of Procedure and the provisions of the Rules of the House of Representatives applicable to the rights of witnesses.

(m) Witnesses may be accompanied by their own counsel for the purpose of advising them concerning their constitutional rights. The Chair may punish breaches of order and decorum, and of professional responsibility on the part of counsel, by censure and exclusion from the hearings; and the Committee may cite the offender to the House of Representatives for contempt.

(n) Each witness subpoenaed to provide testimony or other evidence shall be provided the same per diem rate as established, authorized, and regulated by the Committee on House Administration for Members, offi-

cers and employees of the House, and, as the Chair considers appropriate, actual expenses of travel to or from the place of examination. No compensation shall be authorized for attorney's fees or for a witness' lost earnings. Such per diem may not be paid if a witness had been summoned at the place of examination.

(o) With the approval of the Committee, a witness, upon request, may be provided with a transcript of the witness' own deposition or other testimony taken in executive session, or, with the approval of the Chair and Ranking Minority Member, may be permitted to examine such transcript in the office of the Committee. Any such request shall be in writing and shall include a statement that the witness, and counsel, agree to maintain the confidentiality of all executive session proceedings covered by such transcript.

RULE 27. FRIVOLOUS FILINGS

If a complaint or information offered as a complaint is deemed frivolous by an affirmative vote of a majority of the members of the Committee, the Committee may take such action as it, by an affirmative vote of a majority deems appropriate in the circumstances.

RULE 28. REFERRALS TO FEDERAL OR STATE AUTHORITIES

Referrals made under clause 3(a)(3) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives may be made by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the members of the Committee.

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

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

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.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

THE 30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP: HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 6, 2009, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I thank you and Speaker of the House PELOSI for allowing the 30-Something Working Group, which has been empowered by the Speaker's office, to come down to the House floor every so often and share with our colleagues here in the House really some of the burning questions of our constituents out there, especially those that affect younger individuals and younger families, and to talk about how this House, under new leadership with a new face in the White House, is rising to answer those questions and meet those challenges.

We'll put this poster up at the end of the hour as well, but we are always eager to hear feedback from people who want to know more about the 30-Something Working Group. Madam Speaker, thanks to members of your class, we have a number of new members of the 30-Something Working Group and they've been coming down and joining us occasionally in these hours. We're glad to have Mr. ALTMIRE with us and hopefully some guests to join us this evening as we try to focus our discussion this evening on an issue of just incredible importance to our constituents. That is the issue of health care for all Americans.

We sit at a moment of great economic peril for this country and the people that we represent. There is not an hour or minute, frankly, that goes by when we are back in our districts where we're not talking to a family or to a shop owner, to a factory worker, to a small business man about the difficulty that they face in this economy. It's getting harder and harder to keep businesses open. It's getting harder and harder to hold onto your job. And for the now 9½ percent of Americans that are out of work, it's getting hard to find a way back into the workforce.

For those of us who believe that now is the time to pass not incremental health care reform but major structural health care reform, we support that not just because we think that it's a moral imperative, as the richest Nation in the world, that we shouldn't be the outlier in the global health care system by which we still stand as the only country in the industrialized world that has such a high percentage of our citizens without access to our health care system; not just that, as the country which claims to be the leader of the free world, we still sit in a country where children go to bed at night sick because their parents can't afford a doctor; but because we believe that it's part and parcel of how we start to get this economy back on firm footing again.

For families out there that have seen their wages remain flat over the last 5 years and have seen the percentage of their income dedicated to health care costs grow exponentially, they didn't

figure out that this economy was in trouble last fall when the banks collapsed. They knew it long ago. For our auto companies that have been struggling for a very long time to compete competitively on a global stage when \$1,500 of every car that they sell is attributable to health care costs, \$1,500 more than their competitors in Japan or Germany, they knew that the health care system was dragging this economy down long before last fall. And for small- and medium-sized businesses across this country who have seen their premiums dedicated to keep their employees insured grow by 10 or 12 or 14 percent a year, far outpacing the similar increase in revenues coming into their coffers, they knew that health care was weighing this economy down long before the newspapers discovered that this economy was in crisis and in trouble last fall.

If we really want to emerge from this recession stronger than ever, if we really want to be competitive in the global stage, if we really want to recognize the strength of this economy lying in the hundreds of thousands of 2- and 5- and 10- and 20-person businesses out there in each and every one of our districts, then we have got to fix our health care this year. And we can't just do it with a Band-Aid here or there, pardon the pun. We've got to do it with real reform that at the same time lowers the cost of care and expands access to more people. I happen to think that it should be a right as a matter of being a citizen of the United States that you should get health care, but I recognize that the only way that you do that is by lowering the cost of care across the board.

We spend twice as much as all of the other industrialized nations on health care, essentially, maybe a little bit less than twice as much, for a system that still leaves 50 million people uninsured. We can get access for everybody out there as long as we start spending less or, at the very least, that we start controlling the rate of growth.

So I think we are going to talk about all these things tonight as the 30-Somethings come to the floor. We are going to talk about health care, health care reform as a moral imperative, as a matter of conscience for this Nation. We're going to talk about it as an economic imperative, and we're going to talk about it both from the context and the perspective of getting care to people that don't have it today and trying to lower the cost of care so that all of us, whether or not we have it or don't have it, don't continue to pay for a system that far too often provides very expensive care without having accompanying results.

So I'm glad to be here on the floor today with a good friend who has joined here for a number of Special Order hours, Mr. ALTMIRE. Ms. BALDWIN has joined us as well.

I'm glad to yield the floor to Mr. ALTMIRE.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I cannot think of a bigger issue to be dealing with right now. We have so many issues that this Congress is dealing with. Certainly energy, education, this enormous mountain of debt which we have accumulated over the years, all of these issues are critically important, and all of them are issues that this Congress is going to deal with. The issue of health care is an issue that impacts our national debt. We cannot dig our way out of this hole. We cannot achieve structural surplus like we had in the 1990s. We can't ever even approach that until we deal with the skyrocketing cost of health care.

This is an issue that affects every American in this country very directly. It affects every family and it affects every small business in the country in ways that other issues that we deal with don't on a daily basis.

So what we are talking about here tonight and what this Congress is doing over the course of this summer as we put together this health care reform bill is the three legs of the stool, as the gentleman pointed out, making sure that we find a way for every American in this country to gain access to our system and get affordable health care, making sure that we bring down the costs for everyone. Because we talk about the 47 million Americans who don't have any health insurance right now. They get treated. They show up at the emergency room, and they get their health care. It's certainly not the most cost-effective way. It's probably not the most efficient way, and it's probably not the best way for them to get health care, but they'll end up in the system somewhere. And as the gentleman knows, those of us who have insurance pay for them. They get covered. They get their treatment. But the cost shift that takes place is the reason why an aspirin costs \$10 when you go to the hospital.

It's very easy to demagogue this issue if you're in it for political reasons, to say, well, here's what they want to do: They want to take your money and give it to those people who don't have health insurance because 87 percent of Americans in this country have health care. We spend a lot of time talking about those who don't, but 87 percent of Americans have health care. Now, they are in many cases one illness or injury away from losing everything, certainly one job loss away, and tens of millions of Americans that have coverage live in fear of losing it for those very reasons. Tens of millions more are underinsured. They have some coverage; they don't have what they need. And in many cases, the insurance companies have people, millions, approximately 2 million people, that are employed in this country specifically to find a way, if you are insured, to make sure that they can deny your claim, to redline you, to find a preexisting condition exclusion, to find a reason why they shouldn't have to pay your claim. Now,

that's another of the issues. Lastly is

quality. So you have cost, you have access, and you have quality.

We have in many ways the best health care system anywhere in the world, and the challenge that we have in putting this bill together is we want to preserve what works. We want to say to the 87 percent of Americans who have health care, if you like your plan, if you enjoy the health care plan that you have and you want to keep it, we're not going to touch it and you can keep it. But if you want another alternative, we're going to find you another alternative. And if you have too much out-of-pocket costs, you're not satisfied with the situation that you have, we're going to give you another alternative. But we want to preserve what works in the current system. We want those who have health care to be able to keep it. And we want to make sure that our medical innovation, our technology, our research, which far exceeds anything available anywhere else in the world, is preserved. We want to fix what doesn't work and we want to preserve what does work.

So we are going to increase quality. And we're going to talk about, tonight, ways we are going to do that, the approaches we are going to take. We are going to increase access, bringing everybody into the system, which helps us all. And we're going to do access, we're going to do cost, and we're going to do quality improvements in this bill, all the while preserving what works in the current system.

And the gentleman used an example of how we're already paying for health care, something I mentioned earlier. Those who are afraid to bring new people into the system because they fear that this is going to increase their own costs, well, what I talk about when I have town meetings about health care is, again, they're already paying for people who don't have health insurance in a variety of ways. When that individual shows up at the emergency room, the cost shift takes place because the person without insurance gets their treatment and somebody else pays for it. Those of us who have health insurance pay for it. That's why an aspirin costs \$10.

I had knee surgery many years ago, and to make sure that they operated on the right knee, they put a black magic marker that said "L" on my left knee. When we got the bill, I saw that that black magic marker to put that "L" on cost \$20. That's because of the cost shift that takes place. Now, that's one example. Every American who's had to deal with the health care system has a similar example. If everybody is covered and everybody is in the same risk pool, we're not going to have that type of cost shift that takes place. But that's only one example of how we are paying for it.

The gentleman talks about \$1,500 of the price of every car made in this country is due to health care costs because American manufacturers have to pay for health care for their employees

and other countries don't have that burden in the manufacturing sector.

□ 2015

So we're starting at a \$1,500 disadvantage for that one product. Think about the supply chain. Think about the way goods and services end up in a consumer's hands. Think about the distribution from the person who manufactures it—from the company that manufactures it—to the people who distribute it, to the people who stock the shelves, to the people who operate the stores, to the people who run the cash registers. At every segment of that supply chain, there is a health care component to that. That company, that business is paying, in many cases, health care for their employees. That is what we're paying for.

So, when you hear about people who don't have insurance and when you hear about the skyrocketing costs of health care, think about that part of it as well, not just what your copayment or your premium or your deductible is. Think about how every sector and every segment of our lives is impacted by that.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALTMIRE. I will.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. I want to just put an example to one of the points you made here, which is this cost shift that happens. You talk about the folks who don't have insurance or who are underinsured. They get it, right? We have universal health care in this country. You've just got to wait until you're so sick that you end up in the emergency room until you get it.

In fact, President Bush, while he stalled on health care for 8 years, famously remarked, you know, don't worry about the uninsured—I'm paraphrasing—because they'll get health care when they need it. They just have to show up to emergency rooms.

Well, I've told this story maybe even on this House floor before. I told it 100 times back in Connecticut. When we were debating health care reform in the State legislature, I'll never forget a woman who came and testified before us. She told this story:

She said, you know, I was working. I was employed, but my employer didn't provide health care, and I didn't make enough to go and get it on my own. I think she might have had some kids, and she had gotten them insured, but she hadn't had insurance herself. She started noticing over the course of a couple of weeks that she had a real pain in her foot. The pain would sort of get worse, and then it would get better. She knew that she should go see a doctor, but she knew that a couple of things were going to happen: one, she was going to be billed a pretty exorbitant amount for the visit; two, she was going to have to go into the pharmacy and have to probably pay for some antibiotic to treat it. She was savvy enough to understand that, when she did that, she was going to pay the high-

est cost in the whole system. If you were uninsured, you were going to pay top dollar for that visit, and you were going to pay top dollar for that drug. You don't get the benefit of the bulk purchasing that the Federal government gets through Medicaid or through Medicare or that the insurance companies get through similar programs.

So, one night, she finally decides the pain is just so unbelievable that she can't stand it anymore, and so she goes to the emergency room. She gets to the emergency room too late to save her foot. She has a foot infection that has gotten so bad that she has to have it amputated. For her, that is a life-changing event. Her life is never going to be the same. She is never going to be the same person or the same mother. She is going to have to deal with the disability for the rest of her life just because she didn't have the money or the coverage to get some simple antibiotics that would have treated that foot infection. That just doesn't make sense in the richest country in the world.

Think about it from just a cost perspective. I don't know how much that surgery cost, but it was in the thousands of dollars, I am sure. She didn't have the money to pay for it. Maybe she got billed for it, but probably, more than likely, it just sort of got sucked into the unreimbursable cost by that hospital and got picked up, essentially, by the taxpayers in subsidies for that hospital or by those people who had the insurance, through higher insurance rates, in order to help the hospital to compensate for the people like that woman who didn't have care.

So we paid for that surgery. You and I paid for a surgery that didn't have to happen. There is a woman walking around now with her life fundamentally altered simply because she didn't have access to insurance. Sometimes people need to hear these examples, Mr. ALTMIRE, of what it really means when somebody only has health care when they get so badly sick or ill that they show up in emergency rooms.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I thank the gentleman.

That is just one example, and we're going to deal with a lot of policy options over the next several months. To talk about just one related to what the gentleman is talking about, prevention and wellness is something that everyone can agree has to be an important component. We have to incentivize doctors and hospitals and our health care system more generally to keep people healthy and to keep people out of the system and not wait until the last minute when a situation develops like the one the gentleman talked about.

In western Pennsylvania, where I'm from, I'll just talk about one disease which is near epidemic proportion. That's diabetes. In some cases, it's preventable. In some cases, it's not. For every individual whom you can put on a program of wellness and can prevent diabetes from taking place or, at min-

imum, delay its onset, you're changing that person's life for the better. You're making a material difference in the life of that person and of his family. You're also, in a more global sense, saving money for the health care system. If you take that one person times the entire country and the entire group of people for whom you can delay the onset for not just diabetes but for any affliction which one may later get in life, you can prevent injuries if you keep people healthy. For the weekend warriors and so forth with joint injuries, with arthritis and its onset, these are very costly diseases to treat, and they can be debilitating in many cases, but they can be prevented or they can, at least, be made better in many cases.

So this is the type of thing that we want to incentivize in our health care system for which, right now, there is no incentive. Under our current reimbursement in health care, we reimburse based on the number of times one shows up to a doctor's office. Their incentive is also for you to be sick. They make more money the more often you go to see them. We want the reimbursement system to be based on keeping you healthy and on keeping you out of the system, reimbursing based on the quality of care provided, not on the volume of services provided. So this is one example of the policy option that we are considering.

I would be delighted to yield to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin at this time.

Ms. BALDWIN. Well, I thank the gentleman.

I also want to appreciate my friend and colleague, Congressman MURPHY, for bringing us together on this really critical issue.

You know, health care for all is the issue that brought me to politics in the first place, and it's certainly the issue that keeps me here. I join my colleagues tonight on the floor to affirm our fight that we must complete comprehensive health care, meaningful and affordable comprehensive health care reform, this year. We can no longer afford to wait for health care reform.

There was a recent report from the very respected Robert Wood Johnson Foundation that projects, if Federal reform efforts are not completed, that within 10 years the cost of health care for businesses could double, that the number of uninsured Americans could reach 65.7 million and that middle income families would really be the hardest hit. They would bear the brunt of our inaction.

I represent a district in south central Wisconsin. Last month, I had the opportunity to gather and to meet with a number of stakeholders in my community. I got a chance to hear from diverse perspectives—from public and private urban and rural health providers, from patient advocates, from insurers, from businesses, and from labor. I always find it extremely helpful to hear divergent viewpoints and to get new suggestions as we prepare to write this bold, new legislation.

No matter what their particular perspectives in this debate are, their main message was very clear, that the system is broken and that we have to fix it. Some would argue that we really don't even have a system intact anymore.

I want to share just three quick stories from constituents, from Wisconsinites, that really symbolize what is broken in our health care system, that being the unaffordability of individual markets, the insurance discrimination based on preexisting conditions, and the struggles of small businesses. I really think it's important that we, as Americans and as Members of Congress, hear these stories. Our constituents, using their own words and telling their powerful and compelling stories, make the best case for health care for all and for the actions that we must take. So I'm just going to share with you excerpts of three letters that I've received.

One is from Jean from Rio, Wisconsin. Jean writes, "My husband, Steve, has worked hard his whole life, but as of last year, he has not been able to find work because of the downturn in the economy. Neither of the jobs that I have held have offered me health insurance. We have relied on insurance that we purchased in the individual market, which costs nearly \$10,000 a year and has a \$5,000 deductible, meaning that we pay out of pocket for basic doctor visits, screenings and prescriptions.

"Twenty years ago," Jean writes, "Steve became very ill, and in the intervening years has developed multiple brain tumors that require extensive treatment and care. We eventually realized that he has recurring tumors due to a neurological disease and should be screened on an annual basis. Unfortunately, insurance does not cover these \$13,000 procedures, and we cannot afford to pay that on an annual basis. We can only hope and pray that more tumors are not developing. It is just so infuriating that, in this wonderful country, we cannot get wonderful medical care."

Lorraine from Port Washington, Wisconsin, writes, "When my husband filled out an insurance application in July of 2002, he was asked if he had ever been diagnosed or treated for cancer in the past 5 years. He replied, 'No.' He had never been diagnosed with cancer nor operated on nor treated for cancer. What he did have was basal cells—small carcinomas—which are never malignant and have to be removed from most blue-eyed blonds in the course of getting older.

"When my husband was diagnosed with bone marrow failure disease, the insurance company denied any coverage for his medical care, citing a pre-existing condition. We were left with over \$125,000 in medical bills. My husband has now passed away, and I am just thankful that I am not in complete financial ruin."

Sally, from Madison, Wisconsin, writes me to say, "I've had my own law

office for 29 years. I employ two full-time employees and one part-time employee. I provide health care benefits for our small firm, but I have faced an annual increase in premiums of 12 percent, forcing me to pass on higher cost-sharing to these three employees. One employee has diabetes and also extends coverage to her husband, who is a dairy farmer without health insurance coverage. Because of their high medical costs, it would have been very difficult for me to find new health insurance without facing even higher rates. Health insurance is becoming steadily less inclusive and more difficult to keep—and it's no wonder that, in today's economy, families count health care costs as one of their top pocket-book issues."

Madam Speaker and colleagues, these stories illustrate why affordable, quality health care for all is so important and is so necessary. Universal coverage is both a moral and an economic imperative if we are to succeed in the 21st century. For the first time, I firmly believe that health care for all is within our grasp. We must act now.

Again, I want to thank my colleagues, my friend Congressman MURPHY and my friend Congressman ALTMIRE, for taking this fight up and for bringing us together to address this important issue.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Thank you very much, Ms. BALDWIN. I'm always amazed at how articulate your constituents are. It really is amazing to hear the stories firsthand because, as Mr. ALTMIRE mentioned and as one of your constituents mentioned, there is an entire industry out there that is dedicated to trying to stop people from getting care. That's what you get when you build in the type of profit motivation that we have and the pressure on shareholder return. We treat health care and the economy around it just like we treat, basically, every other industry out there. I think there are a lot of us here who believe that there is something fundamentally different about health care than the auto industry or the cereal industry or the widget industry and that, when the consequences of somebody's not being able to get that product is life or death, maybe we should have some different rules that govern it. Maybe there is no problem with having some incentive built in for innovation, for success and for all the rest. Maybe there should be a limit to that, and there should be some constraints on the system.

□ 2030

So I thank you for joining us, and please stick around for a little while.

Mr. ALTMIRE, you are talking about the three pedestals here of access, cost and quality. I think it's just important for us to talk for a second about how we sort of have an assumption in this country that the more money you spend, the better care you're going to get, right? And what we have found, as we sort of surveyed one particular seg-

ment of the country to the next, is that isn't necessarily the case, that spending more money and just having more health care doesn't necessarily deliver better health care. There are great surveys from Dartmouth University and other places that show that, actually, if you can better coordinate care, if you can get physicians talking to each other, if you can get primary care doctors doing more work up front, you can spend more money on preventive health care, as you talked about, that you can get better health care out there. So one of the things when we talk about controlling cost is trying to actually get people to have a decrease rather than an increase in utilization. I think it will be a big central part of our discussion here about how we do that.

There are very interesting ideas about how you try to encourage providers to work together, about how you invest more in primary care. But a subject that we have talked about on this House floor, which is going to be fundamental to this discussion, is giving those physicians and hospitals the tools to do that. The only way that you can try to get doctors talking to each other about complicated patients, the only way that you can try to really empower the consumers themselves to take more ownership over their own health care is to make sure that they have the ability, as physicians or providers, to track those patients through the system or, as a consumer of health care yourself, to track your care as you move through the system. Technology is really the key to that, and we have already taken a great step forward on that issue through the stimulus bill. There is \$19 billion in the stimulus bill dedicated to building out the world's best, most connected, most highly technologically advanced health care information system so that as an individual walks into the emergency room, that that treating physician can immediately figure out what his medical history is, what tests he's already had, what's been ruled in, been ruled out relative to the illness that they present with. We can save billions of dollars just by having better information in the system. I am so glad that our President had the foresight to see those savings down the line by investing money in the stimulus bill to get that technology out as quickly as possible so that it can be a platform for those savings. There are going to be a thousand different ways that we talk about to save money in this system, and we know that that's how we get access. But I don't think any of it is going to be possible, Mr. ALTMIRE, without that investment in technology, something that you talk a lot about.

Mr. ALTMIRE. We have talked about that, and I do think that the money that was in the stimulus plan and then money in the succeeding budgets, which we're also going to make a priority, is going to make a big difference.

Health care is the only major industry in the country remaining that has not gone to an interconnected, interoperable computerized system. And I would ask my colleagues to think about the fact that—the gentleman's from Connecticut, and I'm from Pennsylvania—if we go to San Diego, and we put our bank card in the machine, we can pull up all of our financial records in a safe and secure way and never think about privacy or any type of intrusion. You just take for granted that that's going to work. But if you show up on that same trip at the emergency room in San Diego, well, they don't have any of your records. They don't have your history. They don't have your family medical history. They don't have your allergies. They don't have any of your imaging, your x rays and so forth. And they're going to ask you half a dozen times when you're there, what are you allergic to, and can you fill out these forms and, most importantly, how are you going to pay, what's your insurance? But if we were to go to a system, like every other industry in America has, where you have an electronic health record that goes with you everywhere you go and has your family history records, your personal medical history, your allergies, and yes, all your insurance information, then when you show up at the emergency room, they're not going to have to ask you half a dozen times. They're going to be able to get right down to the business of treating you for whatever the reason is you find yourself in that situation. We have to make sure that as we move forward as a country, we reward those who have already taken matters into their own hands. There are a lot of major health systems in this country from coast to coast that have spent hundreds of millions of dollars of their own money to make this a reality, to connect their own systems. The problem that we have in implementing this is, if you're a wealthy community and you have a system that's making a lot of money, a hospital system, you can afford to do that. But if you're a rural physician, a health care provider in central Pennsylvania or anywhere in this country 80 miles from the nearest hospital, you can't afford hundreds of thousands of dollars to upgrade your computerization to interconnect your records with the nearest hospital. It's just something you can't even consider, and that's where this money is going to go. We're going to move towards having an interconnected system in this country to resolve some of the issues that the gentleman has talked about. We're not going to allow it to get to the point—with the Department of Defense, for example, which has a wonderful health care information technology system, and the Department of Veterans Affairs, which also has a wonderful health care information technology system; but there's one problem. They literally cannot communicate with each other. What they do is, if you're one of the brave

servicemen or -women who are serving our country as part of the Department of Defense, you're a part of their program, and they have all of your medical records; but when you leave the military and become a veteran and enter the VA system, under the current system, the Department of Defense sends a PDF file by e-mail to the VA, and somebody has to open up that file. They can't manipulate it in any way. They have to type by hand your entire career's medical history—if you've been there for 30 years, think about what we're talking about—into the new system for the VA.

Now Secretary Shinseki and Secretary Gates have announced that moving forward, they're going to merge the systems for the new people who enter the military. So moving forward with the newer generation of our military men and women and our veterans, we're not going to have this problem. But for the millions who have served up to this point, it's not interoperable. They cannot communicate with one another.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. ALTMIRE, scale it down. There are thousands of hospitals, some of which are in the State of Connecticut, that have competing systems, even within their own hospitals, that don't talk to each other. There are hospitals that have one electronic records system for their emergency room and then one electronic medical records system for their in-patient unit. So the same thing that happens as you move from active service out to be part of the veterans health care system works within a matter of days in a hospital setting. When you come in and present to the ED, you then aren't on the same record system when you move over to the in-patient unit. Now that is because we do not have a sort of nationally agreed-upon platform for how systems communicate with each other. And a lot of hospitals say to themselves, well, I have got one really good system for emergency rooms, and then I want to buy this other really good system for in-patient care. We have got to have some national standards that basically say to any hospital or physician's office that's buying into a records system that you can be guaranteed that you are going to get a system that presents you with all the data and tools that you need and will be able to communicate with everybody else. In fact, there's no way that we're going to spend that stimulus money without some national standards to guarantee that that happens. But as a sort of preview as to how politicized and how politically charged this debate can become, when we were debating that portion of the stimulus bill, which really is a commonsense investment in information technology, something that there should be no reason why Republicans and Democrats should disagree. I don't want to put words in Mr. BURGESS mouth. He is a Republican Member from Texas. He comes down to the

floor very often to talk about the crisis in our health care system, and he talks in a very articulate way about the need to upgrade our information system. So there's a lot of potential agreement on this issue between Republicans and Democrats. But it didn't stop the sort of right wing in this country from going out and spreading lies that this investment in information technology was the Federal Government's attempt to have a Big Brother takeover of health care, and this was the Federal Government reaching in and controlling all of your health care information and knowing everything about every illness that you've had or prescription drug that you're on. It's the furthest thing from the truth. We're just simply trying to standardize private health care investments that have been made by hospitals and doctors across this country. But I think it speaks to how difficult this debate is going to become. There is a group of folks out there who are either just ideologically opposed to having the government have any role in health care, or folks who are part of the status quo who are making their fortunes off of health care today that don't want the rules of the game changed. Even when it comes to what should be fairly noncontroversial issues, like investments in information technology, I mean, my God, you know, it's boring to say, right, but it's so important. It's just not that controversial. We're still going to find a lot of people on the outside that are going to fight us on this issue, as they will on many others, Mr. ALTMIRE.

Mr. ALTMIRE. There are many issues that are just like that, as the gentleman knows; and this gets to the complexity of the bill that we are going to be bringing to this floor and to the other body over the course of the next several weeks. If you look at what we expect, at minimum, the outcome to be on the insurance side, I think everyone would agree that a very likely outcome is going to be the insurance industry will not be able to redline you. They're not going to be able to use pre-existing conditions to exclude you from care. They're not going to be able to do the lifetime limits for people with chronic diseases. Basically, they're going to have to take all comers, and they're not going to be able to set your rates based on your individual health status. I think we would all agree that is a likely outcome to this debate.

Now the insurance industry makes a compelling case, and I think an actuary would tell you that the only way that works is if we find a way to make sure everybody is included in our health care system. You can't just have the sick people or the people who are about to become sick part of the risk pool. You have to have everybody. That's why it's so important that we expand access to the entire Nation, include these 47 million Americans who don't have health coverage, the tens of millions of more that are underinsured

because the only way the risk pool works is if you have the young and the healthy, people who aren't going to use the services right now today to offset the risk for those who are. But as the gentleman indicates, there is still going to be opposition to this concept when we move forward and when we talk about ways to move people into the system that currently don't have access.

One of the ideas that we talk about, which the gentleman from Connecticut is very involved in, is the idea of having a choice for people to join a plan that would compete with the private insurance industry. We hear a lot of talk about how the private sector always does it better than government. They're more efficient. They're more cost effective. The government is too bloated. So I would say to those who make that case, well, then, what are you worried about? What are you worried about the competition from the government if the private sector always does it better than government? The difference in this case, if we do it right—and certainly there are ways you can structure it that wouldn't be the correct way—but if we establish a level playing field for the competition, you are going to have a situation where there's not going to be a profit motive, and there's not going to be any reason for someone to choose that plan who's involved in shareholding and so forth. You're not going to have that. You're not going to have people who are employed to try to deny claims. That might be a difference in the way these plans compete. But if we do it right, it would be a level playing field.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. The gentleman knows that I think this is, for me, critical to reform going forward. I really do think that if you empower consumers to have real choice, that that is one of the ways in which we're going to control cost. Right now when you decide you want health care insurance, if you are a business or an individual, it's a real cloudy picture out there. You don't know exactly what you're buying. You don't know the combination of deductibles and premiums that are going to force costs on you. You can't ever be sure exactly what the benefit plan is, whether pre-existing conditions are covered here and not here. So one of the things that we're talking about that is fundamental to this reform is really trying to standardize the market, creating some national standards for health insurance; that you've got to have this basic benefit package that covers preventive services and real catastrophic care; that you can't discriminate against people that have pre-existing conditions; that you can't have lifetime limits; to basically give people some certainty that when they go out and purchase insurance, that they're going to get insurance, that they're going to get something they can actually use.

□ 2045

So, a lot of us say, well, you know, why not give people the option, if they don't like the private insurers who are inevitably going to take a piece of their premium and pay the CEO a big salary or pay back shareholders or turn it into profit, why not give them the option to purchase a nonprofit, government-issued plan?

Now, Mr. ALTMIRE, you are right, that that only works if that government option, that government health care option, has to finance itself; that it doesn't get a subsidy from the Federal Government to help it compete with the private plans. But if that public insurance option has to pay for itself, just like every private insurance company has to, they collect premiums, pay for care and it all has to be self-financing, then you are exactly right, what is the problem?

If the government is so inefficient, then they will end up having an insurance plan that costs more than the private insurers, and nobody is going to buy that. But if our theory is correct, that by not having the profit motivation that the private insurers have, that they can run a more cost-effective product, then why shouldn't consumers have that choice?

The people in this Chamber who are going to say there can be no public insurance option available to individuals are taking choice away from consumers. I would rather have my 700,000 constituents be able to have as many choices as possible. I want them to decide whether they think that private insurance or public insurance is better for them.

Everybody will answer that question differently. But I think that those of us that are going to be favoring a publicly sponsored health care plan as one of the options for individuals and businesses out there are going to be on the side of consumer choice, and I think if we give consumers that choice, it is going to create a really competitive structure that will end up with some people having public insurance, some people having private insurance, but a real competition by which we lower health care costs, Mr. ALTMIRE.

Listen, I get it. The devil is in the details of making sure that you don't give a little competitive advantage to that public option, but I think that it is really a linchpin of health care reform going forward, if we can get it right.

Mr. ALTMIRE. Think about the competitive advantage that businesses have in this country. Some are able to offer health insurance, some are not. Less than half of small businesses in this country are able to afford to offer health care to their employees.

What we want to create is a system where everyone in America will be covered and every business that chooses to do so will be able to afford to offer that benefit to their employees and to their potential employees to be able to recruit and retain the highest quality

worker. That might be a benefit that small businesses would like to offer. We want to give them the opportunity to afford that benefit if they so choose.

But, again, we want to preserve what is working in our current system. We want those who have coverage and like it to not be touched in this. And that has to be a part of this. But for those that want to have another option, those who want to make a change, maybe the family status has changed over time, the plan that you are in doesn't work for you any more, we want to give them as many options as possible, and we want to give them the ability, as the gentleman indicates, to do some comparative shopping, to compare apples to apples, to look at what the costs are for the family situation across the different plans. Right now you are unable to do that.

If you are a Federal employee and you have the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program, it is a little bit easier. That is a plan where you are able to look at some of the paperwork and get on the computer and do comparison shopping. We want every American to have the same ability that Federal employees have today.

I would say to the gentleman, when we talk about this idea of the employers being required in some way to either offer health insurance to their employees or to pay into the system so that those employees will have the ability to make that choice, we don't want to do that in a way, and I want to be very clear about this, we don't want to do that in a way that is going to incentivize employers to say, well, you know what? I will just stop offering health care coverage and all of my employees can go into the plan. That is not what this is about.

We don't want to add one more financial burden to half of the small businesses in the country, the ones I am talking about that are already unable to afford health care. We don't want to add to their financial burden. We recognize that this is a very complicated issue and it is going to be very difficult to achieve these goals.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. ALTMIRE, we spend so much time with our business community, our chambers of commerce, when we are back home and when they come visit us down here, that we know what the reality is out there.

These folks that right now can't afford to give health care to their employees desperately want to do that. They want to do it first because it is just the right thing. They are members of their community like anybody else is, and they want to be able to provide health care to their employees, whether they have two employees or 40 employees. That is just the kind of people that are out there running small businesses by the skin of their teeth across this country.

But they also need to do it from an economic standpoint. They know that to the extent that they can't offer

health care or can't offer the kind of generous plan that they would like to, they are at a disadvantage against their competitors who can offer that type of health care. They are at a disadvantage against the big employers who can steal their employees away.

So this is really an issue that our small businessmen are waiting to be a part of the solution, and if we can offer them, whether it is through a public option or through lower rates on private plans, a more affordable health insurance option, they are going to take it. They are going to grab it.

You are right, we don't want to set up any incentives where they are going to push people off to the public plan. But we know the majority of folks are going to want to be part of the solution out there, just for reasons of conscience, but also for reasons of their own salvation as a particular business.

Mr. ALTMIRE. And the gentleman hits the nail right on the head, talking about bringing down the costs. That is where we started this discussion. We are going to pass a health care reform bill this year. I am confident in saying that. The public support is there, the support in this Congress is there. We need to certainly finalize the details, and that is going to take some work. But this issue is too important, it is too important to this country, it is too important to families, it is too important to businesses, and it is too important to every individual in this country for this not to become law this year. I am confident that will happen.

We have to bring down the costs of health care. That is why this is so important. We have to bring down the costs for our families, we have to bring down costs for our businesses, and we certainly have to bring down the costs for our government.

As I started our remarks tonight by saying what this is about is the structural deficit over the long term that we have in our budget, and addressing the issues like energy and like education that have led to the skyrocketing deficit and debt that we have over the long term, and the only way you can begin to bring that under control is by bringing down the cost of health care for everyone in this country at every level, both in the private and the public sector. That is what this bill is going to do, that is what this discussion is about.

So, to close it out, I would yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. I thank Mr. ALTMIRE and Ms. BALDWIN for joining us tonight.

Let's make no mistake about this. This is going to be a fight. This is going to be a fight, because to do this right, you are going to have to take on some folks who have gotten real fat over this health care system. You are going to have to take on some ideologues that just don't believe that the government has any role in trying to get health care to people.

There is a polling memo going around Washington written by Newt

Gingrich's pollster essentially outlining in 28 pages how you stop health care reform from happening. That is the agenda of a lot of people in this town, a lot of folks on the other side of the aisle, that they do not want health care reform to happen.

Now, some of it is for good, honest policy reasons. I believe it is an incredibly mistaken belief that the private sector can just fix this on their own. They haven't done it for the last 50 years. How can we expect they are going to do it overnight?

Some of it though is very cynical politics. Some of it is due to people that look back to 1994 and the failure of the Clinton health care plan in the 2 years prior, and believe that if folks can stand in the way of President Obama or this Democratic House passing health care reform, that they will gain some electoral advantage out of that.

Now, I hope that is the minority of people that are standing in the way of this bill. But make no mistake, there are people out there who simply see political advantage against Democrats in general or against the President of the United States in stopping health care reform from happening.

Now, they may have succeeded back in 1993. I wasn't here, Mr. ALTMIRE wasn't here, so we can't speak to all the reasons that happened. But that is not going to happen this time. Not because you have got smarter people in the House of Representatives or you got necessarily a better strategy moving forward, but because the American people are not going to stand for the status quo.

They know this economy is tough and they feel more conscious than ever of the fact that they are just one paycheck away from losing their health care and becoming one of the tens of thousands of individuals out there who have been forced into bankruptcy because of health care costs.

The status quo is not good enough for people out there, and despite 28 pages of polling telling the folks on the other side of the aisle how to stop this from happening, I believe that the will of the majority of Americans is going to bring us together to get a good bill passed.

We are here as 30-somethings in the Democratic Caucus talking about that tonight, but I believe that there is going to be a groundswell of public support that is going to force us, both parties, to come to the table and do something, not small, not minor, not temporary, but something big and permanent to fix all of the underlying problems in this health care system, to make sure that more people have it and less businesses are burdened by it.

So, again I would like to thank Speaker PELOSI for once again giving us the opportunity as the 30-something Working Group to come down here tonight, and remind folks that they can e-mail us at 30somethingdems@mail.house.gov. If you have any questions for us, any

feedback on what you have heard this evening, www.speaker.gov/30something is where you find us on the Web.

NOT LEARNING FROM HISTORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. AKIN. Madam Speaker, there was a cynical comment that was made by people who take a look at history. They say that one of the things we learn from history is that we learn nothing from history. I don't know that that is universally true, but certainly for our subject for this evening, that will certainly be the theme, that we are not learning very much from history.

We are going to be taking a look at the fruit of fiscal mismanagement, and particularly what is going on in our country in terms of a very, very important number, and that is unemployment. The unemployment numbers have continued to rise, in spite all kinds of assurances that by spending tons and tons of money, that we can turn those numbers around.

The historic connector here that is I think quite interesting is a fellow by the name of Henry Morgenthau. Probably you have not heard of Henry Morgenthau, but he was an important figure in his own day. And here in this Chamber, in this House, Henry Morgenthau met with the Ways and Means Committee in 1939.

Henry Morgenthau was FDR's Secretary of the Treasury and he had 8 years working on a theory that is known as Keynesian economics. He was one of the main architects of Keynesian economics, whose idea was that what the government needs to do is to stimulate the economy. You have heard that phrase over and over, stimulate the economy, and the purpose of stimulating the economy is, of course, to create more jobs.

That is a little bit like grabbing the straps on your boots and lifting up and trying to fly around the room. It doesn't work. And after 8 years of failed experience, these were the words, the very quote of Henry Morgenthau here in this building before the Ways and Means Committee.

He said, "We have tried spending money. We are spending more than we have ever spent before, and it does not work." His words are echoing down through history. "It does not work, I say. After 8 years of the administration, we have just as much unemployment as when we started, and an enormous debt to boot."

These are the words coming to us, floating down through history by Henry Morgenthau, the main architect of Keynesian economics. Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the master of the policy of stimulating the economy with big spending.

Maybe we haven't been doing a good enough job on stimulating the economy with big spending, so let's just take a look and see what we have come up here in just the last year or so.

I am joined by a number of my good friends and colleagues who are going to help us in unpacking some of what is in this spending that we have and also going to help talk about this incredible statement that was made by the President last week that, somehow or another, that his administration had created 100,000 to 150,000 new jobs. It is kind of amazing, because all of the actual numbers from the government show that that is not true at all.

□ 2100

So we have quite an interesting evening together. And I'm joined by a good friend of mine from Iowa, Congressman KING, who is here to join us in our conversation tonight. I hope that everybody else will feel comfortable to just tune right in and join us. We're going to have a little bit of fun and take a look at some of the economics. It's a serious picture, but it's an example to us that we must learn from history. It's also an example of the fact that America is on the wrong track.

As we take a look at what's going on with job losses, I think many Americans, Congressman KING, understand the fact that all is not right and that unemployment number jumping up as high as 9-something percent is not acceptable.

I would yield time to my good friend from Iowa, Congressman KING.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN) for pulling this hour together. And I listened to the first flash of illumination of common sense here coming from deep within history of Franklin Delano Roosevelt's administration, his Treasurer, Henry Morgenthau, saying that Keynesian economics does not work.

And so I wanted to add to this, John Maynard Keynes' philosophy that he spoke about during that period of time of the implementation of the New Deal that was presented by FDR, and historians have taught for years that FDR's New Deal saved us from the Great Depression, although there isn't any evidence of that, especially, FDR's Secretary of the Treasury making the statement that Keynesian economics does not work.

Now, Henry Morgenthau was a contemporary of John Maynard Keynes, and Keynes became prominent in the twenties and throughout the thirties and kind of wrapped up his career in the forties. But Keynes described how Keynesian economics worked. He did this himself, and his description was this. He said, I can solve all the unemployment in the United States. All we need to do is go find an abandoned coal mine and go out in that abandoned coal mine and drill a whole group of holes out there, and then take American cash, tamp it down into those holes,

and then fill the abandoned coal mine up with garbage and turn the entrepreneurs loose to dig up the money. That would solve all the unemployment in the United States of America.

Now, that doesn't sound very rational when I say this on the floor of the House of Representatives, but that came out the mouth of John Maynard Keynes, who inspired this Keynesian economics and Morgenthau's response.

I yield back.

Mr. AKIN. I just have to kind of wonder what he was drinking when he came up with a theory like that. That's an interesting tidbit of history.

Mr. KING of Iowa. And we didn't have EPA approval either.

Mr. AKIN. He didn't have EPA to put the garbage in the mine. I'm sure he would have gotten in trouble with that.

It's just a treat to have, also, my good friend Congressman LAMBORN who's joining us tonight as well. And we're just getting started now, talking a little bit about this idea that somehow all of this spending that we've been seeing in this last year that we've been here together, this incredible level of spending, is supposed to help with this unemployment problem. And yet, just as Morgenthau would have predicted, we're seeing unemployment going up and the spending just totally out of control.

I yield time to my good friend, Congressman LAMBORN.

Mr. LAMBORN. Well, I thank the gentleman from Missouri for letting me have this time. It's good to join you for a few minutes with this time that you've put together to speak and present to the American people and to have a dialogue between each other what the spending is really costing us. And so far it's not producing jobs. I think we hit 9.4 percent, if I have that correct, of what the latest unemployment figures are.

Mr. AKIN. Just affirming that, reclaiming my time and affirming that number, yes, it is now 9.4 percent. You recall that there was a promise when we got to this great big—they call it a stimulus bill. We call it the porkulus bill. When we got to this porkulus bill, they said, If you don't pass this bill, if you don't do that, why we may have unemployment at 8 percent. And here we are at 9.7 percent, and we did pass the bill. And so the excuse is, well, this thing is really helping us a lot. Well, I sure hope it doesn't help us in that direction too much longer because that was what was supposed to be. But I think you're right. Your number is 9.7.

I yield.

Mr. LAMBORN. Thank you. With that amount, 9.4 percent, which I think is the high point for 25 years, unfortunately it's the high point in unemployment in our country for two and a half decades.

And I just wanted to mention, it's so inconsistent or even hypocritical for the press to say that this is not anything other than an unmitigated disaster. They're falling all over them-

selves trying to put a spin on this thing saying, Oh, it's really not as bad as it seems. The rate of growth of unemployed people has slowed down, or it's less than we thought it was going to be.

Can you imagine if we were 12 months ago, 24 months ago, when George Bush was President, what the press would have said? They would have said, It's horrible, and the policies are doing this and driving unemployment up.

Mr. AKIN. Just reclaiming my time a minute. What would the press have said if, under the Bush administration, they claimed that they created 100,000 to 150,000 jobs and they didn't have any documentation for that? Say, Where in the world did you get that number, because the numbers that have just come out show that we've lost jobs. It's gone the other direction.

If you had a track record like that—this is just the year, this year. This is starting in February, March, April, this is another March, 14, 28, April, April, May and May, this is just a few months here. And this is what's going on with unemployment. And you're out here and you claim, Hey, we just created a whole lot of jobs. People would kind of wonder, I would think the press corps would say, Wait a minute. Where'd you come up with this 100,000 to 150,000 jobs that he claimed last week that they created? I supposed he'd say, Well, if we hadn't passed this great big porkulus bill, why, by golly, it would be worse. Of course he hasn't learned from Henry Morgenthau.

I yield back.

Mr. LAMBORN. The gentleman from Missouri is correct. It's so inconsistent. If this was the previous President, the press would just be laying right into him. Right now they're giving the President a pass. And it's inconsistent, and I think the American people can see through that.

And Congressman, you also mentioned, what are these phantom jobs out there that were saved? Anyone can claim, well, there's one or two or 300,000 jobs that were saved. I can't document it, but just take my word for it, and the press isn't looking at that either. I just wish the press would do their job of being an honest, objective observer and reporter of what the facts are. And until the press does that, the American people are really not being served well.

Mr. AKIN. Well, reclaiming my time, I think you're right. And I'd like to just take a moment and get into—these numbers are easy for us to rattle off, just off the tip of our tongue, but let's take a look.

First of all, you've got \$700 billion in this Wall Street bailout. Now, some of this came under President Bush, and I think the people in this room voted against this thing because it didn't make a lot of sense. Half of it, though, is the beginning of this year, and we keep dumping all this money out, and it's not quite clear what we got for it.

And then we get to this thing here, this economic stimulus which is supposed to be fixing this unemployment problem. And what's going on in this bill?

I've got a few, just choice examples I'll share, but I know others of you here have some examples. We're joined by a number of fantastic Congresspeople, and here's one. This is one here, this is you can't afford a bicycle after purchasing a \$1 million home. Okay. This is money for Washington, D.C., part of the stimulus money that's supposed to be helping us with jobs.

Washington, D.C., Department of Transportation will spend \$3 million in stimulus money to expand its Smart Bike program. The money will increase the program by five times, from 10 bike racks to 50 bike racks, and from 100 bikes to 500 bikes. Neighborhoods expected to get the new bike racks include Adams Morgan, Columbia Heights, Capitol Hill, Anacostia and Georgetown, where the average single-family home runs at \$1.2 million. Boy, now there is an interesting use of money. May be a wonderful thing to do, but I'm not sure what we should be taxing everybody to try to create jobs.

And we've got a lot of other fun examples. I'm joined by my good friend Congresswoman BACHMANN, and Congresswoman BACHMANN is articulate and a good friend to people who care about jobs and care about fiscal sanity.

I yield time.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman from Missouri for calling this together so that we could call attention to the job losses that are happening all across the United States. It's in your district. It's in my district. It's every one of our districts here that are represented this evening.

And I was absolutely shocked, as I've been watching this play out, of the Federal Government jumping in and taking over private businesses, beginning with Chrysler and then now with General Motors. We're seeing something that we haven't seen. I don't know if we ever have seen anything like this in the history of our country, and I am still livid over the conversation I had today.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time just a minute, what you just said is so important for people to understand, and that's because we don't have quite the sense of history. We've just heard from one of our other guests just a minute ago that this is a 25-year high in unemployment.

But what you've just talked about is, when the President goes in and fires the president of General Motors and appoints the people a board and decides to rewrite the bankruptcy laws, this is unprecedented. And I think, my good friend, you have a specific example from your district about what this could mean to Main Street America. I wish you'd saw share that with us tonight.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I do. I had met with dealers in my district before from

Chrysler, and they looked me in the eye and they said they were just flabbergasted. They couldn't believe that they got a pink slip that they were going to be out of business by the end of the month. All the cars that they had on their lot they'd have to sell. They were going to have to wrap up and go out of business by the end of the month. And they told me that they were one of the most successful Chrysler dealerships, not just in Minnesota, but in the Nation. They performed 160 percent better than the top performers in the country. They met all the criteria for staying open for Chrysler, and still they were pink-slipped. No one could understand.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, I'm just trying put myself in the shoes of the family who owned that dealership that you're talking about.

Mrs. BACHMANN. This particular family, Congressman, had put \$5 million into this dealership just prior to receiving this notice. They were slated to adding another Jeep dealership to the Chrysler business that they already had. Significant amount of money, and they produced tax revenue to the amount of \$3 million every year on that 5-acre parcel that they utilized.

Mr. AKIN. Just reclaiming my time, so you have a dealer who's been in business in your town for what, 90 years or something I think you were saying?

Mrs. BACHMANN. This particular dealer had been in the business since the early 1920s. The one that I spoke with today had been in business for 90 years. They were a General Motors dealership.

Mr. AKIN. Ninety years, and their dealership was assessed at, what was the value of it?

Mrs. BACHMANN. There's a recent appraisal done on this dealership, very successful dealership. They have all the debts paid. They own everything outright and clear, and the appraiser said this dealership is worth \$15 million.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, so \$15 million, and then you wake up one morning and you get this thing in the mail and it says your \$15 million just basically vaporized, didn't it?

Mrs. BACHMANN. Was worthless. Now the only thing that their dealership is worth today is the underlying property that the building sits on. They put all sorts of money into building their building, which is now free and clear. They worked hard to make sure they could pay for it, and now it's a dealership building. And as most Americans know who are listening to us speak this evening, if you have a dealership building, you can't use it for much else other than a dealership. And trust me, there's no one out there right now who's too interested in buying an old used dealership building because there's not new car dealers going up out there.

Mr. AKIN. So once again we have another projection of this example of Washington thinking they know how

to do everything, deciding who's going to be the president of General Motors. All of this money that belongs to our constituents, we're going to dump this money into various companies, and then we're going to try and manage. We can't manage D.C. What makes us think we can manage car companies?

What an example of—and I think there are some other examples of what's going on with some of this spending.

And I see that we're also joined by Congresswoman LUMMIS from Wyoming, I believe. So we've got the West pretty much covered. We've got Iowa covered. We're going to have Georgia in just a minute.

Please join us.

Mrs. LUMMIS. I thank the gentleman from Missouri for pulling us together this evening for this discussion.

In Wyoming, our economy is very much based in the energy industry because we have coal, oil, gas, uranium, wind, solar, biomass, and that is the mainstay of our economy by far.

□ 2115

So as we watch the 350 to 375 very small businesses that are drilling for oil and gas and see the legislation that is coming before this Congress at the behest of the Democratic Party, it will devastate our businesses.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, so you're talking about the tax that they're proposing to pay for some of the spending that is that cap-and-tax situation which is going to devastate small business, and small business, of course, is where these jobs are created; is that correct?

Mrs. LUMMIS. Absolutely. I think the Americans have the perception that Big Oil is who is recovering these natural resources; but even those firms hire very small, literally mom-and-pop operations, five and six employees to go out and drill the drilling, to do some environmental compliance, to do the surveying, and to complete those wells, and do the fracturing of the deep seams that are required to cause the gas to flow into a natural gas well. These are very small operators. As I said, in Wyoming alone, over 350 businesses.

Yet what we see on the horizon taxwise through the national energy tax that's being called cap-and-trade would be utterly devastating to those businesses.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, what you're doing is making a tremendously important connection. And I think a lot of people do get that impression that all of the jobs in America are General Motors or General Electric or Mobile Oil or whatever it happens to be. But in reality, as one of the most ranking members in small business, what you find is you define small business as about 500 employees or less. Small businesses create almost 80 percent of the new jobs in America.

So what you're saying is exactly spot on to what all of our data shows, and if you're looking at 80 percent of the new

jobs and you're looking here at an increasing level of unemployment, what you should be paying attention to is what are you doing for small business. And what you're talking about is we're doing something that we haven't learned from history. You're going to slap a great big tax on them to cover up all of this spending. And what's going to happen is you're going to dry up the potential of those new jobs that could come from small business.

I appreciate you making that connection.

And I'm going to just jump over to my good friend from Georgia, a medical doctor, but also somebody who has quite a fair amount of passion about freedom and about some of these economic issues as well, my good friend Dr. BROUN from—is it the Atlanta area?

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. No, sir. I live near Watkinsville, Georgia, south of Athens, and I represent northeast Georgia. And I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The chart that you have down there on the floor. If you put the date of this week on the next bar, going back to what Mrs. BACHMANN was just talking about, these dealerships are shutting the doors. Dealerships may have 20 employees, they may have 30 or 40 employees. I've met with a number of them. There is a dealer in my district in Clayton, Georgia, in Rabun County, right up on the North Carolina line, called me this week and he got one of those pink slips. He is a customer of the automaker, and that's what all of these dealers are, they're actually customers. And what is happening is this administration is forcing the Big Three automakers to fire their customers, and that makes absolutely no economic sense.

But this dealer doesn't do any floor planning. In other words, he doesn't have to borrow money from the automaker to put the cars on his lot. He owns them all. He's paid for them all. He owns his dealership. He doesn't owe anything to the carmaker. But they have fired him. And in doing so, this administration has fired all their employees.

So the next bar for all of these dealerships I think is 780-some-odd just this week that are going to be fired—the dealership's going to be fired, thus all of their employees are going to be fired. And that's going to put that bar even higher. And it's just not right.

This is an unprecedented takeover from the private sector by this administration—by the car czar that has been set up by this President—and it is totally unconstitutional, it's totally against freedom, it's totally unprecedented. And it's exactly the same thing that Hugo Chavez is doing down in Venezuela.

So if we could imagine that next bar on that graph, it's going to be even higher than it is.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, what I'm hearing you say is—you're a med-

ical doctor. You're not claiming to be some economic expert. You're saying common sense says that this 9.7 percent unemployment that we got right now is not the end of this problem and that the idea of the tremendous level of spending that we're seeing is not going to help. You're agreeing with Henry Morgenthau from 1939 that all of this spending is not going to make this any better. And what's more, a lot of that spending is going to result in more unemployment rather than less.

Is that the bottom line of what you're getting at?

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. If the gentleman will yield, absolutely. That's what's going to happen. You cannot borrow and spend yourself to economic prosperity. And that's what's going on here. We're borrowing too much, we're spending too much, taxing too much, and it's going to cost jobs.

I'm sure we'll come back to discussing what the gentlelady from Wyoming was talking about because there is somebody else that's going to talk a lot of jobs across this country. But we're going down a road that is going to hurt our economy. It's going to cost jobs, as we see an increasing number of jobs on your chart there that are being lost. And unemployment claims, we're going to have more and more of those. And it's really taking away from the future of our children and your grandchildren.

Mr. AKIN. That's the bottom line. I think that's what's gotten us staying here this evening talking about this subject. This is critical. This is a very significant problem.

I would like to jump back to my friend from Iowa, Congressman KING, a gentleman who has run his own private business for many years before he came to Congress, knows a little bit about small business, knows a little bit about taxation and red tape. And he also understands what some of these massive government spending programs in the last year, what these are liable to do in terms of effects on our economy.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Missouri. I started business in 1975, a capital-intensive business with a negative net worth so I had to actually make everything work or it would have collapsed around myself. And I remember prior to that looking for a job. I applied for a good number of jobs. Worked for other people. They worked for me. I had to build a business up a piece at a time, a component at a time.

One of the points that I think would illuminate this when I look at the numbers that are there on the chart: \$700 billion on the Wall Street bailout, \$787 billion in the stimulus plan. That was going to—and I remind everybody here and including Madam Speaker—if she were paying attention—I would be reminding her that President Obama said that his stimulus plan was going to save or create 3.5 million jobs—and that was just back a couple of months ago right there on the time line where

a \$787 billion, 3.5 million jobs saved or created. And I thought at the time, How do you measure a saved job? It was there when you started, it was there when you're done the. It's one that your economic plan didn't destroy, but it isn't necessarily one your economic plan saved.

So now we have the White House saying they've saved or created a dinky little 100,000–150,000 little jobs when their endeavor is 3.5 million jobs. And by the way, that number is not out of thin air. That is off of the White House's Web site, WhiteHouse.gov/economy. So those numbers are real.

Another image that flashes to my mind when I hear the gentleman from Georgia talk about Hugo Chavez, I had a flashback about the visitation that took place between our Commander in Chief, leader of the free world, President Obama and Hugo Chavez down in Central America. And I recall that we needed to have a strong message from the President of the United States that would embrace Colombia and ask for a vote on the floor of this House as was agreed to under those terms. We didn't get that meeting, but we got a glad-handed, big smiley happy face meeting between Hugo Chavez and President Obama.

And I remember the image that flashed in my mind. One of them is Hugo Chavez could declare our President to be El Diablo at the podium of the United Nations and say, The smell of sulfur still lingers from yesterday. And those anti-American people laughed and cashed our checks. And just a few months later we have President Obama glad-handing with Hugo Chavez. And when I saw that image, I realized that the great nationalizer of the industries in Venezuela who had just nationalized a rice plant that belongs to a good Minnesota company named Cargill was standing there smiling next to President Obama who was the greatest nationalizer of all, who has since nationalized two of the three largest carmakers in the world—General Motors and Chrysler—and we've watched the nationalization of our financial institutions, our insurance industry. The list goes on and on.

The free market system from top-down is being swallowed up and nationalized instead of privatized.

And I would also make this point that our President today was elected at least in part because he challenged President Bush and criticized President Bush for going into Iraq without an exit strategy. This President has declared that he doesn't want to own or manage Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, the financial institutions, the insurance agencies, or the automakers of America. But he has engaged in all of that without an exit strategy.

I call upon President Obama to come up with an exit strategy to divest the Federal government and the taxpayers from this private sector industry that have been so nationalized that he makes Chavez look like a piker.

And I yield back.

Mr. AKIN. That's really quite a summary of where we are. What we're getting at is this disease that struck the Washington area just one year or two ago. It's bailout fever, you know. And we got into this idea that we're going to bail everybody out—at least if you're big and important. If you're a small business, you're going to go bankrupt. If you're a car dealership, you go bankrupt and you lose \$15 million in one day. But we're going to bail out all of these, and in the process, what's going on in unemployment? Is this nationalizing of businesses such a good idea? I think there are a lot of people having some very extreme second thoughts.

This was not going to happen if we voted for that great big porkulus bill. I'm on the Armed Service Committee. When you say \$787 billion, that's more than my paycheck. I tried to figure out how much money is that. And the biggest thing we deal with in any committee is aircraft carriers. These are big things. If you ever get on an aircraft carrier, you could play a game of football on the deck of one. They're really big, and they cost a ton of money. We have 11 in our total fleet. They cost about \$3 billion a piece.

So if you take a look at what happened to us in the first 5 weeks after we've been told that President Bush is spending way too much money, we put this bill in place—this was the trimmed-down version—on this floor we voted for \$870-something billion. That would be over 250 aircraft carriers anchored end-to-end. I couldn't even imagine. You could make a highway across them. That's how much money that's in this package alone.

That's not the Wall Street bailout, and that's not this appropriations bill that's full of goods. That's not this international monetary bailout that they're talking about doing where we're going to take defense money and give it to foreign countries, put it in a fund so that Chavez and the Iranians and other people can take defense money out of the United States away from our taxpayers so that they can fund their governments, and we're talking about doing that. We're wondering why in the world do we have this unemployment. I think we're making some big mistakes economically.

I would like to jump back over to my very good friend Congresswoman BACHMANN who, by the way, is a great articulator of free enterprise principles and does a wonderful credit to Minnesota.

We're delighted that you're here, and please chip in and join in.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman from Missouri.

And I'm very concerned again about these motor takeovers from the Federal Government. One thing that I am very concerned about, a story came out today where there's been approximately 1,500 letters that have gone out to GM dealerships.

One story that came out today, there is a dealership that I know of that applied to their Democrat Senator to appeal for help so that they could stay open. That Senator was able to arrange a meeting between the dealer and the officials at GM. We all know GM is now Government Motors because it's owned by the American people. It's been nationalized. There is no private corporations the way we used to think of GM. Now, the main stockholder is the American Government. So this Democrat Senator who was applied to for help was able to secure a meeting with General Motors and a car dealership, and they were able to get their dealership back.

□ 2130

Well, that's great, that's wonderful.

There is also another article I saw today where a constituent had contacted one of the representatives, a Democrat representative here in this Chamber, Representative BARNEY FRANK. BARNEY FRANK was able to go and talk to the right people and get this dealership back open. Is that what we have come to in this country, that rather than a private business with a private contract with another private corporation, they're no longer able to work out their agreements because, as columnist Michael Barone has called, he said, Now we've moved into the realm of gangster government. We have gangster government when the Federal Government has set up a new cartel and private businesses now have to go begging with their hand out to their local—hopefully well politically connected—Congressman or their Senator so they can buy a peace offering for that local business. Is that the kind of country we are going to have in the future?

When I was on the phone today for over an hour with one of my local dealers, the very first thing out of her mouth was this, she said, This is the most un-American thing I have ever seen in my life. I can't believe that I lived to see the day that my country would come to this point where, having my dealership for 90 years, I get a letter FedExed to me that tells me I have until Friday to sign this document to not only give up my company that was made worthless—worth \$15 million, made worthless overnight—now GM is demanding that she hand over her customer list, her service customer list to GM. Why? GM most likely will use those customer lists, they will give it to her former competitors. What is she getting for this? What is her remuneration? She had the rug pulled out from her and from her husband. They virtually lost everything overnight to what? To what Michael Barone calls a gangster government.

We need to call this for what this is, my colleagues. We need to call this for what this is. Call it out. The American people need to get outraged and figure out that it could be them next. No business is safe when you see the ad-

ministration appoint czars—car czars, wage czars—there's over 20 czars that have been appointed. And what do those czars do? They bypass the Congress. We are the people's elected representatives; we have been bypassed.

We now have an imperial presidency where the President has appointed various czars reporting directly to him. And now he is reaching into the confines of private businesses and overnight rendering them virtually worthless—unless, unless they have a special tug, a political tie to a local Democrat Congressman. Is that what we've come to? And I yield back.

Mr. AKIN. Well, I just appreciate the lady's passion and strong support for the concept of freedom.

You know, what we're really talking about here is, what is the job of the government? And we have come to a point where we have actually elected people who have forgotten this basic concept, and that is, the government that can give you anything you want can also take away everything from you, including your freedom.

And that is the great danger of this insidious creeping bureaucracy where the Government inserts itself into all kinds of different businesses. The Founders would have been outraged at what you've just described. And even people from not so many generations before us would say, that is impossible, that could never happen in America.

Mrs. BACHMANN. If the gentleman would yield, the Founders went so far as they began a revolution over a stamp tax, over a stamp tax. This is the actual outright taking of someone's personal property. And the Founders were unwilling to pass the Constitution without the Bill of Rights. And as the gentleman knows, the Bill of Rights was to protect individuals, people, not to protect government, but to protect people from the encroachment of big government upon their leaders. And the Fifth Amendment guarantees the right of your personal property. Big government cannot come in, they are prohibited from coming in and taking your personal property without just compensation. Here is a perfect example of violation of these citizens' Fifth Amendment rights.

Mr. AKIN. You are absolutely right. And we have seen other examples of it; the decision in Connecticut where some local municipality decided to trample the Fifth Amendment, just walk right in and take somebody's private home in order to make a strip mall so they could tax the strip mall. And the Supreme Court jumped to the defense of the local government saying, that's just fine. And they just ignored the Fifth Amendment.

And so we see this continuously growing government. And if you take a look at where we are spending money, it is just absolutely amazing. And here is an example. This is a town that is supposedly almost bankrupt—I think it's Pawtucket, Rhode Island, if I remember right. The city on the verge of

bankruptcy spends \$550,000 in stimulus money for a skateboard park. Now, what in the world is the Federal Government doing with bicycle racks in D.C. in million-dollar neighborhoods, skateboard parks somewhere else. We're putting it all in here and claiming somehow it's going to make unemployment better, and yet the numbers are going nuts. The President, it seems—what's going on with the White House Press Corps? He claims they've just created 150,000 jobs, and yet you see the data going, we're already at 9.7 percent.

And it's my understanding, when you jump to the next big tax we're talking about, they want to be like Spain. And Spain has the enviable 17.5 percent unemployment. Is that where we're going? How long is this going to go before the American public says enough already; it's time to change this big spending?

If you want to see this thing graphically, this is a little bit chilling. This is historic budget imbalance. These are the different years of the Presidents. These years over here are President Bush. And those of us here that are Republicans, we didn't like the fact that President Bush was spending too much money. This is deficit spending. This is a budget imbalance. But take a look. When we were kids, didn't you have to go—what was it, first grade, what thing doesn't fit the pattern? Take a look at this year. Take a look at this budget imbalance that we're talking about. You think that's not going to affect jobs? You don't think that means the government is going to get its nose into all kinds of people's business? That's what we're concerned about.

I would like to go to my good friend, Congresswoman LUMMIS from Wyoming. You know, the thing I like about Wyoming and the Western States? You have a sense of freedom and a little bit of a sense of property ownership and you have a sense of small business. And I appreciate that perspective. Please join our conversation.

Mrs. LUMMIS. I thank the gentleman.

In Wyoming, we have had surpluses in our budget for the last 7 years, and it is because of the explosive growth in the production of energy. It has made our unemployment among the lowest in the Nation. In fact, there were times during the last 7 years that we have had, statistically, zero unemployment. Incredible. While I was running for this position, I stopped at a fast-food place to get an iced tea late at night, and they offered me a job and my daughter a job at this fast-food place because they are so much in need of employees.

Wyoming is unique in that regard, and it is because we are producing domestic energy. And there are new discoveries of domestic natural gas all over the United States. The Balkan in North Dakota is fantastic. It is producing wealth for people who have been farming at that very narrow margin of profitability, 0 to 4 percent, for years.

Mr. AKIN. Well, wait just a minute. You're talking about we're creating jobs and wealth and all this, and the government is not doing it? Oh, my goodness. That's a novel idea; the government is not coming in and telling you how to run everything.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Not only are we producing the cleanest burning hydrocarbon that there is, natural gas, but we are doing it in a way that makes us less dependent on foreign energy. And what we are seeing in this Congress are policies that will actually make us more dependent on foreign energy at a time—

Mr. AKIN. Let me just stop you there because what you said is very, very important. You are finding sources of natural gas—one of the cleanest burning fuels that we know, in terms of hydrocarbon-type fuels anyway—and you are finding that, which is making it so that you have plenty of jobs in Wyoming, you are not doing it with a lot of government help, and yet the government is going to try to create policies to make us more dependent on foreign energy. What would that be? I would suppose that one way to do that would be to tax your natural gas, because if that's taxed, then the foreigners have a better chance of getting business here. Is that where you're going?

Mrs. LUMMIS. And to the gentleman from Missouri, we are also proposing in this Congress to tax drilling costs, to raise the taxes on the brackets, to do away with the death tax, to put the recovery of natural gas under the Safe Drinking Water Act. Virtually every time I turn around, almost every day here, we are doing something that will impair our ability to produce our own natural resources.

And it's not just in Wyoming, there have been these fabulous new finds of natural gas that run up both sides of the Appalachian Mountains all the way from Pennsylvania clear to the Southern States. All of those States could have new natural gas production, the cleanest burning hydrocarbon, that reduces our need for foreign energy, that reduces the out-migration of jobs, it keeps them here, it grows them here. It grows revenue for those States.

I can tell you, as our State treasurer in Wyoming for 8 years, we had, just off interest income off State investments, the largest source of income for our State's general fund from one source, interest income off State investments. And all of those State investments, every one of them, came from severance taxes on oil, gas, coal, uranium.

Mr. AKIN. Isn't that something? Well, you are an energetic Congresswoman from an energetic State. And it's encouraging to hear that we do have those supplies of energy here.

It is ironic, I think, that when you take a look back at the history of the Department of Energy, it was created so that America could be energy independent. And they have added many, many jobs to the Department of Energy, and yet we have become more and

more dependent on foreign energy. And if we had more people like you in this Congress, I think that would change, and we would see that we would be getting back to good old American energy of a lot of different types. And we would let the marketplace, and not the government, make the choices as to which type you are going to use in each State.

My good friend from Georgia, Congressman BROUN.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Congressman AKIN, I appreciate you yielding.

I wanted to come back to something that you said that I think the American people need to understand very clearly. The President has talked about looking to Spain as being the model of this energy tax—I call it tax-and-cap because it's about taxes, it's about revenue for the Federal Government, it's about getting more revenue to socialize medicine and other things to nationalize, all of the business and industry that is already being nationalized, and even more. But in Spain, I would like to confirm something. It is my understanding, if you would, please, sir, it's my understanding in Spain, when they put on their tax-and-cap or cap-and-trade policy a number of years ago, they touted it as creating green jobs.

Mr. AKIN. I think they call them subprime jobs now, but go ahead, Congressman.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Well, the point is, they talked about creating green jobs. Just recently, one of their—I think it's members of Parliament—was over here talking to the Conservative Opportunity Society. And he told us—I don't recall if you were there, Mr. AKIN, or not—but he said for every single green job that was produced in Spain they lost 2.2 jobs. The green jobs that were created were temporary jobs; the jobs that were lost were permanent jobs, industrial jobs. And that's what I kind of recall. Is that correct?

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, that was exactly what he said. And actually, that made common sense to me because when you go back to this Keynesian economic scheme, what they would argue would be, Hey, we just took all this tax money and we hired these people; so when we hired somebody, we created a job; so, therefore, we had a net. We just hired someone to increase the job by one.

And what the economist found was, when you take that tax money out of things, what happens is, when you took the tax money away to hire the one person, you lost 2.2 jobs over in the private side. So that ratio seems to kind of follow the economic principle that when the Federal Government—yes, you can have the Federal Government take a whole lot of money and hire a lot of people to dig holes in the ground, or whatever, but when you do it by taking that money away from the private sector, you are killing those small businesses, which is a source of where you're generating a lot of these jobs. So I think that is where he was going.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. If the gentleman would yield back just a half second. I want to go back to the outrage that my dear friend, MICHELE BACHMANN from Minnesota, was showing us. The American people should be outraged. And the American people can call a stop to this. We can't. We, as Republicans, have offered alternative after alternative. Wall Street bailout; we offered an alternative, and President Bush, Henry Paulson, the leadership in the House and Senate wouldn't accept it. The nonstimulus—as you call it porkulus bill; I call it the nonstimulus stimulus bill—we offered alternatives. The leadership in this House were obstructionists and wouldn't allow us to have an open hearing and discuss it.

□ 2145

The omnibus appropriations, we had alternatives. We have had alternatives for all this. They call us the Party of No, n-o, but really we are the Party of Know, k-n-o-w, because we know how to help stimulate the economy. We know how to create jobs, and you do that through small business and give the money back in ways to create an environment where small business can create jobs. As the gentleman from Missouri so aptly told us just a few minutes ago, small businesses is where those jobs are created. It's about 85 percent of them. But we have offered alternative after alternative. And this what I call "tax-and-cap" legislation has been estimated it's going to cost America, that somewhere between 1.7 to 8 million jobs are going to be lost. In my district in northeast Georgia, we have got in multiple counties right at 14 percent unemployment.

Mr. AKIN. You're talking about millions of job loss as a result of this new tax that's being concocted here.

I would like to recognize another doctor who has joined us. We have got some doctors out tonight, and my good friend Dr. BURGESS, I want to recognize him. What we have been talking about is this incredible trend in unemployment and also the trend of excessive spending.

I would be happy to have your perspective, Doctor.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I was watching in my office and heard this discussion, and I did want to come over and say just a few words.

Of course, you're correct. We had a report in our Joint Economic Committee last Friday about the current unemployment rate in excess of 9 percent. Of course, we spent \$878 billion in February of this year. The President told us that was what we had to spend in order to prevent the unemployment rate from going in excess of 8 percent. Clearly we have seen that number already exceeded. And then we heard at the beginning of this week that because of those numbers, the President was going to accelerate the pace of spending, accelerate the pace of dis-

tributing the stimulus money. We weren't spending fast enough was our problem.

Now, of course, Mr. Speaker, I know the comments need to be directed to the Speaker's chair, but I would remind the Speaker that none of us in this room, in fact, no Republican, voted for in favor of that stimulus bill last February.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time for a moment, in a way that's a little bit unusual, isn't it? There are usually a few Democrats who will vote differently than their party or a few Republicans who will vote differently. In this case, though, on this great big porkulus bill, every single Republican voted "no."

Mr. BURGESS. You're absolutely right. Every single one of us did a gut check and said this is not what I came to Washington, DC, to do. It's not what I came to accomplish.

One of the things I wanted to share with the gentleman and share with the House tonight, my hometown newspaper, the Dallas Morning News, runs a column every Sunday by a columnist named Scott Burns, a respected economist. Scott Burns this Sunday was quoting an economist in Austin, Texas, Lacy Hunt. Lacy Hunt, going back to the Great Depression, said, and I am quoting here: "Irving Fisher saw it first. The man who may have been the greatest American economist wrote about the debt-deflation theory of the Great Depression in 1933. He saw that excess debt controls nearly all the economic variables." He went on to say: "Think about it for a minute. It's a very powerful statement. Excess debt controls nearly all of the economic variables."

What does that mean? That means we cannot control the unemployment rate. That means almost everything is out of our grasp because of the massive amount of debt that we have accumulated. And on Monday of this week, the President said he wanted to accelerate the pace of spending because we weren't getting that money out the door fast enough. Again let me reiterate, excess debt controls every other economic variable. It was true in 1933. I suspect the same is true today.

He goes on to say, Scott Burns, "It means that the government stimulus won't do much. Basically you can't borrow your way out of excess debt." I think every Member on the floor here tonight has recognized that at one time or another.

And then the final point that he made: "The only thing that will allow recovery is the passage of time."

Fortunately, Congress is not in control of that, and time will pass at a set rate regardless of what we think that it will or won't do.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, I want to get what you're saying because I think this is important. You're saying there is a relationship between this tremendous level of debt that we are building and the unemployment numbers. In other words, when you have a

whole lot more debt, particularly debt with spending, and, of course, spending is causing the debt, you're going to have bad trouble with unemployment. Is that what this economist is saying, gentleman?

Mr. BURGESS. Precisely correct. And I thank the gentleman for yielding back.

We are in a period of prolonged economic underperformance is the other statement they go on to make. It will essentially be a lost decade. We will recover, but the operative factor will be time and not actions. That is something that most people do not want to hear.

Again, excess debt controls almost every other economic facet. You cannot spend your way out of this problem. The unemployment rate went up. The correct response is to not shove more money out the door. The correct response is do what you can to get control of that spending and begin to erode the debt, begin to put the debt on a glide path to reduction. That's where the recovery will come, and that will take time. There is no other way around that.

But, again, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I think this is a wonderful discussion that you've had tonight. I thank you for bringing this to the attention of the American people.

Mr. AKIN. I appreciate the doctor from Texas bringing some wisdom here and some economic common sense. And certainly I think most people know intuitively these things are connected. If you spend a whole lot, eventually you're going to go into debt and then the debt is going to influence things. And in this case, I am an engineer by training, not a medical doctor, but it's almost like drawing a vacuum economically in the economy. So those small businesses that we are just hearing about like out in Wyoming, those small businesses don't have the money they need to invest to drill a well or whatever it is; so the main engine of job creation just dries up. So what you are doing is almost like either starving or dehydrating your economy because the government is just becoming so oppressive and expansive in everything that it is trying to do. And as we heard eloquently expressed from the gentlewoman from Minnesota, the story about what happens when the Federal Government starts to get into the business of running car things. I am picturing there is going to be somebody possibly listening into our discussion that's going to be a cartoonist, and they are going to think about the automobile that is going to be designed by the U.S. Congress, and they are going to have an interesting caricature of what the engine and the wheels look like and how big it is and all kinds of things. There is probably already a YouTube being created or something along those lines. But it's not a pretty picture of having the Federal Government running our business in our private sector. And the genius of our

country is to make that distinction, and we are blurring it badly and it's going to cause a lot of trouble.

I am going to yield to my good friend Congressman KING from Iowa. Please join us.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Missouri for yielding.

There are a couple of points that linger in my mind. One of them is to add to the points that the gentlemen from Georgia and Missouri were making about Spain, and I concur. For every green job created, it cost 2.2 jobs in the private sector because it starved capital, but also each of those green jobs created cost \$770,000 to generate that job. So it was a massive cost in capital.

I want to throw another point into this in a brief way, a teaser in a way. The cap-and-trade component of this legislation that's impending to be driven through this House floor yet this month of June, we have experience with that here in the House of Representatives. When Speaker PELOSI was elected and received the gavel, she declared that this Capitol complex would be carbon neutral. So she ordered that the generating plant that provides the electricity that illuminates this room when she allows the lights to be on would be changed from coal generation over to natural gas under the auspices of this idea that natural gas isn't a hydrocarbon, which we know can't be upheld by an engineer or a doctor or a layperson. But in any case, she ordered the switch over to natural gas, doubled the cost of the electricity, and still found out we were not carbon neutral but we're still emitting a surplus of CO₂ into the atmosphere, so went on the Board of Trade and purchased \$89,000 worth of carbon credits, the very central commodity that is at the middle of the cap-and-trade discussion that's going to be presented on the floor of this House, \$89,000 for carbon credits to offset the CO₂ emissions that are going off into the atmosphere so we can light this Capitol complex. And I chased that back down and found out that some of that money went to no-till farmers in South Dakota. Presumably they had still been farming in South Dakota. It didn't change their behavior. And some of that money also went to a coal-fired generating plant at Chillicothe, Iowa, that had received a government grant to burn switchgrass. I went there and looked at that. They hadn't burned any switchgrass in 2 years and got a check anyway. That's how cap-and-trade will work in the United States of America. If we can't get it right in Congress, we are not going to get it right in America.

Mr. AKIN. I appreciate that vivid example of more wasted time. I am going to yield again to my good friend Congresswoman BACHMANN from Minnesota.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Last weekend my family sat down and we were watching the commercial movie "Titanic." And as I was listening to Dr. BURGESS from Texas talk about the debt and the bur-

geoning debt load that the United States takes, once the ice gash came in the side of the Titanic, which we all remember was called the "unsinkable Titanic," we think of the United States. Nothing can possibly sink the United States. We will always be a superpower. But one thing that has kept us a superpower has been freedom, free market economists. We are in the process of watching the deconstruction of free market economists before our very eyes, something we have never seen. But as the ice ripped that hole in the Titanic, water started being taken on, and the engineer came out and brought the blueprint of the Titanic. Water came into the first chamber, spilled over to the second, spilled over to the third, and by the time it filled up so many chambers, it was over. It was impossible to resurrect that ship.

That's, I think, Mr. AKIN, what you have been bringing before this body this evening. You've been showing to the American people that at a certain point when we have such excessive levels of spending that in turn leads to such excessive level of taxation that in turn leads us to excessive levels of borrowing that at a certain point we wonder what that tipping point will be if the United States will not be able to recover.

We do have an alternative, as Dr. BROWN said. We have a positive alternative that next quarter we could already see growth in our economy. But this plan that President Obama has put forward is the kind of plan that we could watch last night, or last weekend on TNT in the movie "Titanic." If we follow that plan that President Obama has put before us, we know what that outcome will be and a lot of very innocent people may go down with that ship.

Mr. AKIN. I very much thank Congresswoman BACHMANN and the other great guests that we have had tonight. I thank you for this little symposium on freedom and the need to have the Federal Government restrained to its proper limits.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Madam Speaker, for the next hour, I am going to be joined by a number of my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle, and most of them are members of the GOP Doctors Caucus, and we are going to spend time, Madam Speaker, talking about health care reform. Certainly that is the number one thing that's on our plate as we go through these next 6 weeks leading up to the August recess. And, of course, as the President has outlined his desire to have a health reform bill on his desk for signature sometime in mid October of this year, whether or not that can be

done remains to be seen. There are a lot of thoughts out there as to how to approach this, but we feel that it's very important as physician Members. I think there is something like 339 years of clinical experience combined in this GOP Doctors Caucus. About 15 of us are health care professionals who have actually practiced in the field, if you will, most of us involved just in clinical medicine, what I like to refer to, Madam Speaker, as meat-and-potatoes medicine. Not research at some high academic institutions but actually seeing patients every day in the office, in the operating room, in the delivery room. And so I think we have a perspective that we would like to share with Members on both sides of the aisle.

Earlier in the evening, Madam Speaker, we heard from the 30-Something Group on the Democratic majority side. They were very articulate, very well spoken, but I think very wrong in some of the ideas that they have in regard to a government default plan, and we will talk about this during the hour.

□ 2200

I have been joined by a couple of my colleagues, Dr. John Freeman, the doctor from Louisiana; and Dr. PAUL BROWN from Georgia.

I would like to yield time to my colleague from Louisiana at this point.

Mr. FLEMING. I thank my friend and fellow physician and colleague, Dr. GINGREY.

You made reference to the 30-Something Democrats, and I watched that debate, that discussion with great interest because, to be honest with you, with 32 years of medical practice and also owning businesses for nearly as long, when I hear this discussion about how a public plan can work, I really try to view that and try to understand that; but I always come out totally mystified with how this sort of thing could ever work.

And to clarify the debate, basically Congress right now is looking at three different options. One is a total single payer nationalized health care system, Medicare for all. One would be a private system for all, which is what we, on the Republican side, back. And then the other is a public and private system that are competing with one another. So I really watch with great interest our colleagues on the other side—none of whom are physicians, I might add—talk about how this could be a great deal, a great success, where you have a public system that's competing with a private system, somehow that's going to drive cost and prices down, and we're going to get a dividend from that.

Well, what I would do is point out to my colleagues, let's look at Medicare today and Medicaid as well, both government-run systems. Both of them are running out of money rapidly, the budgets are exploding and expanding, and they are living off the fat of the

private system. Today we know—in fact, a recent survey, a study came out showing that the average subscriber to private insurance spends an extra \$1,000 a year to support the Medicare and Medicaid system. We also know that a lot of that support comes by way of the uninsured who are routed through the emergency room, who don't have any coverage; and if you think that the Medicare recipients pay for that, forget it. That's not happening. Who is paying for that is the taxpayer and those who subscribe to private plans.

So right now the systems that exist, Medicare and Medicaid, are, for the most part, supported not by premiums and not even fully by the taxpayers, but are supported by those who pay premiums into private plans. So if you expand Medicare to where everyone is eligible for a Medicare-type plan, who in their right mind is going to stay on private insurance when they know that they're going to have to pay increasing size premiums in order to get the same level of care that those on Medicare, who are largely supported by taxes, are going to get?

What ends up happening is you lose that critical mass of those under private insurance, and so private insurance then becomes only an afterthought, a sliver of the economy. So what you're left with is a giant public system, a Medicare that's much bigger than what we have today. Incidentally, I will remind those that today, as it stands, Medicare will run out of money within 10 years, as it is. It's unsustainable as it is. Now if we grow it into a much bigger system, where are those cost savings going to come from?

I will yield back in a moment, but I just want to bring out the fact that no one has ever been able to show that a government-run system, particularly a health care system, but any government-run system in which the economy is being controlled in some way has ever controlled cost. And even today we know that health care costs are going up twice the rate of inflation.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I want to apologize to the gentleman. I referred to him as Dr. John Freeman. Actually, it's Dr. JOHN FLEMING, a family practitioner from the great State of Louisiana. And it reminds me, the reason I did that, Madam Speaker, is because Dr. John Freeman was one of my classmates in medical school and also one of my co-residents in my OB/GYN training back in Georgia. I think Dr. John Freeman practiced his entire career in Boone, North Carolina; and I hope Dr. John, wherever he is, is doing well, if he happens to be tuning into C-SPAN tonight.

I wanted to say before yielding time to my colleague, Dr. PAUL BROUN, a fellow physician and family practitioner from the Athens and Augusta areas of Georgia, there was a letter sent from the National Coalition on Benefits within the last couple of days, addressed to the leadership of the House

and Senate, House Speaker NANCY PELOSI, House Minority Leader JOHN BOEHNER, Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID, and Senate Minority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL, talking about the strong opposition to a public plan. I don't have time to stand here and read the names of all of these firms, but just to mention a few: Wal-Mart Stores, Xerox Corporation, Wellpoint Incorporated, Weyerhaeuser Company, National Restaurant Association, Bank of America, National Association of Health Underwriters, CIGNA Corporation, Chrysler LLC, Nike. I could go on and on. That's just maybe 5 percent of the number of companies that are a part of this National Coalition on Benefits that are so opposed to this idea of a public plan, which our colleagues, the 30-Something group, just an hour ago touted so strongly.

At this point, I would like to yield to my good friend and colleague from Georgia, Dr. PAUL BROUN.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Thank you, Dr. GINGREY, for yielding.

I think the American people need to look at what President Obama said as a candidate and go back to what Dr. FLEMING was talking about just a few moments ago about the options. Republicans are offering options because certainly we need to do something about health care financing. People are hurting. Health care expenses have gotten too high. Medicines are too high in the drugstore. Doctor bills are too high. Doctors are actually earning less money today. When I was practicing full time prior to coming to Congress, I was making in real dollars less money than I did 20 years ago and seeing as many or more patients. We see the whole health care system being strained tremendously. But candidate Obama talked about giving the American public options, a public versus private option. He said, if you like your current insurance, fine. Stay there. But as Dr. FLEMING was talking about just a few minutes ago, what President Obama is actually offering us is a reduced-price health care financing system that's going to take away people's choices. It's going to take away their ability to choose their doctors. It's going to take away their ability to choose the hospital, what medicines that they have. It's going to delay them being able to get needed procedures, surgeries, delayed in getting x rays that are needed, ordered by their doctor. It's going to take the choices away from the patient, and it's going to put those choices in the hands of a Washington bureaucrat. I don't think the American people want that. I'm not sure that they understand yet what we're talking about tonight in our second opinion, that government-run health care is not going to give them the choices that they're used to today. They're not going to be able to stay in their private plans because they're going to be priced out of the market. They're going to have to go to that

government-sponsored plan that is going to markedly narrow their choices.

What it's going to do is it's going to kill people because, as we saw in the stimulus bill, there is a new program set up in the Federal Government to look at cost effectiveness and comparative effectiveness, comparing the effectiveness of health care decisions. Age is going to be one of the measures of how those decisions are going to be made.

□ 2210

We already see this happening in Canada. We already see it happening in all the socialized health care systems around the world. When people have celebrated a few birthdays and are getting what growing up down in Georgia folks talked about being "long in the tooth," a little white haired, as I am turning to be, then what happens in those government-run health care systems is they just deny the procedures, deny the tests, deny the care that the people need to stay alive, and people just die.

Now, in Canada, a system that many tout, many on the other side in the Democratic Party tout the Canadian system and others, if you are a certain age and need a kidney transplant, you just don't get it. If you need bypass surgery, if you are a certain age, they will put you on the list, but you never get off the list. You just die. If you need medications, you are denied those. If you have cancer treatment that is needed, you just don't get those.

We in this country, with the health care that we as physicians can give, we have made marked strides since I graduated from the Medical College of Georgia in how people survive various forms of cancers.

I think Dr. ROE is probably going to talk about breast cancer, because he very eloquently talks about that frequently, but our breast cancer survival rates in this country are extremely good. In other countries, where they have socialized medicine, people die, and there is very poor long-term survivability of that disease. Heart disease, diabetes, you can go down the list of all these chronic diseases.

In socialized health care systems, as this administration and the leadership in this House and the Senate across the way want to take us, it is going to take away people's choices. They are not going to be able to get the care that they desperately need to stay alive, and it is just the wrong thing to do.

Dr. GINGREY, I just congratulate your efforts in trying to bring these things out to the American public, and I appreciate your being one of the cochairman of the Doctors Caucus and helping the American people to understand the direction that we are being led by this leadership, the liberal leadership in this House and the Senate, because it is not going to be in the best interests of the American public, and it is actually going to create a financial collapse, as Dr. FLEMING was talking

about, that is going to be exacerbated, and people are going to be exasperated because of this rationing of care, taking away their choices, and some Federal Government bureaucrat in Washington, DC is going to make those health decisions for them. It is not going to be their doctor, it is not going to be their family and it is not going to be the patient, and it is the wrong thing to do.

I thank you for yielding.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman.

Before yielding to our colleague from Tennessee, Dr. ROE, a fellow OB-GYN physician, I just want to say to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, Madam Speaker, that what we are about is trying to work in a cooperative way on both sides of the aisle and offer our expertise, to say to our colleagues, and there are some health care practitioners on the majority side as well, and we have reached out to them and made ourselves available, we want to be at the table.

Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, we are not at the table. We haven't been enjoined, if you will. But we still hope, we still have hope that that can occur, because we do have some ideas, I think some very good ideas, in regard to bringing down the cost of health care, making it more accessible, making it more portable, making it available to everybody, and that would include people who are currently considered high risk, maybe even considered uninsurable, or if they can get insurance it is because they can afford to pay three or four times the normal standard rate, which many, many cannot.

So we want to talk about some of those things tonight, and we will get back to that.

At this point I yield to my colleague from Tennessee, Representative ROE.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Thank you. Dr. GINGREY and also Madam Speaker. It is good to be here tonight to discuss a very important, and I believe, Dr. GINGREY and Madam Speaker, probably from a social standpoint, the most important issue that we will discuss, and probably this health care debate is the most important one since the mid-sixties when Medicare was voted on.

Just to give you a little background, I am a native Tennessean, practiced medicine in Johnson City, Tennessee, in that region for 31 years, and really saw a tremendous change in the health care delivery system from 1970 when I graduated from medical school until the current. I really marvel myself at the miracles that occurred.

I recall when I was in medical school when St. Jude's Children's Hospital had just opened, it hadn't been there long, and the death rate among childhood cancers was 80-plus percent. Today, over 80 percent of those children survive and live and thrive.

We are having a debate on what kind of system best fits America and its personality, and I will share with you some things we have learned in Ten-

nessee about a public and a private system.

What I hear when I am out talking to people is that, number one, they are worried about the cost of care. They are worried about the availability of it. And there is another whole discussion that we haven't had, which is accessibility.

As we age, as the medical population and caregivers age, there is going to be a huge problem of accessibility in this country. We are already seeing it in our own communities, where in the next 7 years we will need 1 million more registered nurses in America. In the next 8 to 10 years there will be more physicians retiring and dying than we are producing in this country.

Well, you know, that is not sustainable. You cannot maintain the quality of care that we have grown to expect and the medical advances we have grown to expect without practitioners. That is an entirely different issue, not part of this debate, but indeed very much a part of this debate.

In Tennessee, about 14 or 15 years ago we had Medicaid. We got a waiver to try a managed care system. Back in the eighties and nineties, managed care was going to be how we were going to control the ever-escalating health care costs. So it was a wonderful idea to try to provide care to as many Tennesseans as we could at as low a cost as we could.

What we did was we hastily put a plan together, as we are doing right here in this Congress right now. The most astounding thing I have ever heard in my life is in 60 days, or less than that, we are going to vote on a health care plan that affects every American citizen, 300 million of us. And your health care choices, as you know, are very personal choices. They are between you and your physician and your family.

So the plan was a managed care plan, and it was a very rich plan. It provided a lot of care for not much money, and for some people no money. What happened was that people made very logical choices. About 45 percent of the people who ended up on TennCare actually had private health insurance, but dropped it. Why did they drop their care? Well, you had a plan, this TennCare plan, which was cheaper, but provided more coverage, so therefore people made again a very conscious decision.

The problem with the plan is, as with every public plan so far, is it does not pay the cost of the care. That cost has been shifted over to the private sector. So when you look at your health insurance costs going up each year, you are paying or supplementing, a tax really, on your private health insurance premiums caused by the increased usage of the public plan.

In Tennessee, for instance, the TennCare plan covered about 60 percent of the cost of actually providing the care. If everyone in Tennessee had the TennCare plan, most providers

would lock the door, throw the key away and walk away because they couldn't pay their bills. Medicare, another plan that we have, pays about 90 percent of the cost, and our uninsured pay somewhere in between.

Now, what I think will happen with this public plan is that once again, because politicians are involved in designing the plan, what will happen is more and more and more things will be promised about what will be covered in the plan, but when it comes to paying for it, and if we have time we can get in and discuss the Massachusetts plan a little bit, what will happen is you will have a Medicaid plan that doesn't pay the cost, you will have a Medicare plan that doesn't pay the cost, and you will have a public funded "competitive" plan that is subsidized by government but doesn't pay the full cost of the care, meaning more and more costs will be shifted on to the private payers.

□ 2220

Well, what will happen over time, I think, is that, again, individuals first, small businesses, 20, 30, 40, 50 in the business will say, We just can't afford this private continually escalating cost of private health insurance. And what will happen then is more will be shifted to the public plan, and over time you'll end up with a single-payer system. And a lot would say, and I've heard it argued here on the House floor, Well, so what? What's wrong with that? We have a government-run, one-payer health care system. What's the problem with that? Everybody has coverage. Well, everybody has a health insurance card, but that doesn't necessarily mean you can get health care. Don't confuse a plastic card that says you have coverage with actually getting care.

Well, what do I mean by that? Well, let me give you an example.

When President Clinton had his heart attack, he went to the hospital, had a heart attack. He was operated on several days later, I think 3 or 4 days, and probably the reason, in my opinion, he probably got a blood thinner that took a few days to get out of his system. And he was operated on and went home.

Had he had that heart attack in Canada, they would have said, Mr. Clinton, you can go home and in 117 days, that's the average amount of time it takes to get a bypass operation in Canada, you can come back and get your bypass operation.

Two weeks ago, I was in Morristown, Tennessee, talking to a physician there who is Canadian. His father began to have chest pain. I won't go through all the details about how long it took him to get a treadmill, how long it took him to see a cardiologist. Anyway, 11 months later, the man got—his left anterior descending coronary artery was 90 percent blocked, and he finally survived and got a bypass operation. I do not believe the American people are going to put up with that type of health care system. We are not.

The other thing that I think that's been so astonishing to me, and I know Dr. GINGREY and Dr. FLEMING, you have seen this, and Dr. BROUN also, are the medical advances. When I graduated from medical school, we had one cephalosporin antibiotic, one. That's a type of antibiotic we use in infection. There probably are 50 today.

There were about five antihypertensives, high blood pressure medicines, three of which caused severe side effects. I mean, it was almost better to have the high blood pressure than take this medicine. Today there are over 50, and the side effects have been reduced dramatically. People do so much better.

So there are a lot of reasons, and we can go to it, and I'm going to yield back some time now, Dr. GINGREY and Dr. FLEMING, for comments. And I have some other comments about a single-payer system. It's a good idea, as you pointed out a moment ago, to try to cover as many people as we can in this Nation as inexpensively as we can, and I agree with that.

I yield back.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Well, I thank the gentleman. And before yielding back to Dr. FLEMING, I wanted to say to my colleagues, Madam Speaker, that we are the party of a second opinion. And, of course, tonight we are talking about health care reform, but it could be an energy bill, a comprehensive, all-of-the-above approach to solving our energy problems and any other issue. But none really at this point in time is more important than solving this health care problem.

And the bottom line is to, again, to lower the cost of health care, to make it accessible to everyone within their financial reach. And there are so many things that we can do short of, Madam Speaker, turning this over to the Federal Government to run what may be like they run Amtrak or the post office or, indeed, the Medicare program. And I don't think that that's what people really want and expect. We can do better than that. And there are a number of issues in particular that we could talk about in detail if we had more than just an hour, Madam Speaker.

But clearly, this idea of electronic medical records, I think, is a way eventually to save money. I think the money that we put in the stimulus package, \$19 billion to provide grants, I've got a piece of legislation that would help physicians purchase hardware and software and a maintenance program that's specialty specific, whether it was my specialty of OB/GYN or Dr. FLEMING's specialty of family practice or a general surgery specialty program produced by a company in my district called Greenway where you have, as part of that electronic medical record program, you have algorithms set up of best practices that are developed not by a government bureaucrat, Madam Speaker, but by that very specialty group, those men and women, those leaders of that specialty society

that want to do what is best and they want the best outcome at the lowest possible cost. They want to get paid a fair amount for their services, of course.

And, in fact, with an electronic medical records system, they're more likely, Madam Speaker, especially under the Medicare program where you have something called evaluation and management code and intensity of care that you bring, doctors, I think, tend to undercode because, Madam Speaker, they're petrified that some inspector general is going to come along and demand to see 10 charts out of their 10,000 and nitpick and find some few, two out of 10,000 where they overcoded, and first thing you know they're not participating in the Medicare program and maybe even they're facing a jail sentence.

So electronic medical records would—I don't know how much money, my colleagues, it would save, but I know that it would lead to a better practice of medicine based on best principles. We wouldn't need to have some comparative effectiveness institute, kind of like the Federal Reserve Board, telling doctors what they should do and not do, when it's time to operate, what medication to prescribe. We would have those best practices as part of an electronic medical records system. We could cut down on duplication of testing.

People could be in Timbuktu, and with that little card smaller than our voting card, they, Madam Speaker, they could take that card, even in a country where they don't speak the language, or maybe they come to the emergency department comatose and can't speak any language, you reach in their pocket, pull out that card, swipe it, just like we would our voting card, and there's the entire record. We know what they're allergic to. We know what medications they're on. We know their past medical history, and we give them the best and most effective, cost effective, safest medical care.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I'll be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Just a point right here. You were making an excellent point, Dr. GINGREY, about why you don't want the Federal Government to come between a patient and a doctor.

A veteran can go to an emergency room, have an electronic medical record at the VA, can show up somewhere in an emergency room, let's say, in our area we have a VA Hospital in Johnson City, and let's say he lives in Mountain City, Tennessee. He shows up there and the doctor in the emergency room at Mountain City does not have access to his VA record, to his electronic record that they have at the VA. Now, I think we can do better than that, and that's going on right now.

So that veteran who's up there with, maybe he's an elderly veteran, a World War II veteran with a very complicated

medical history, that emergency room doctor is flying by the seat of his or her pants, and I think we can do better.

And again, the health care decisions should be made between a patient and a doctor. And I don't want to let the private insurers off the hook here. You and I know this, and Dr. FLEMING, also.

I remember one of the last cases I did in practice before I retired to run for Congress, I spent almost as much time on the phone with a private insurer trying to get the case approved as I did actually doing a major surgical procedure. Now, that's the ridiculous item of the day when you do that, when you're not providing care to someone, you're arguing with a bureaucrat at the private health insurer.

I yield back.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Reclaiming my time, those stories are just all too familiar, and it's a shame that that time is wasted when it can be better spent with the patient.

I wanted to mention too, Madam Speaker, the issue of medical liability reform. Now, for a number of years—I've been here 7, this is my fourth term, and every year I have introduced medical liability or tort reform modeled after the system that was adopted back in the late seventies in California. The acronym for that bill is MICRA, but it has worked. It has stabilized the malpractice insurance premiums in that State. Yes, they've gone up somewhat because of inflation, but compared to other States that don't have that reform where there is a limitation on a claim, a judgment for pain and suffering, noneconomic, and where there is the elimination of this joint and several liability and there is collateral source disclosure—and I could go into some of the weeds of it.

□ 2230

But, obviously, we have not been able to pass that. When we Republicans had the majority in this House, we would pass it every year, Madam Speaker, in the House; but so many attorneys who are Members of the United States Senate would block that.

Well, why can't we come together again in a bipartisan way and say, look, we can agree that part of the cost of medicine, cost of health insurance is the fact that medical practitioners order so many unnecessary—and in some cases, Madam Speaker, harmful—tests, draw too much blood, get an MRI one day and a CAT scan the next day and a standard x ray the next day because they're trying to cover the possibility that someone would say, Why didn't you order this, or why didn't you order that?

Lord knows we've gotten to the point now where everybody who shows up in the emergency department anywhere across these great 50 States with a headache is going to get a \$1,200 CAT scan instead of a blood pressure check and an aspirin and a "come back to my office in the morning."

So this is an area in which we could clearly come together in a bipartisan

way and hash out. Well, if the California version of tort reform is not acceptable, how about a medical tribunal, a group of independent people looking at the claim and saying whether or not it has merit?

There are so many things that we could do. And I've got a few more ideas, Madam Speaker, that I want to talk on, but I do want to refer back to Dr. FLEMING and hear from him because I know he's got a lot of things he wants to share with us.

I yield to Dr. FLEMING.

Mr. FLEMING. I wanted to tone down on the debate a little bit more.

Again, we heard the 30-something Group Democrats talking about the debate earlier, and one said something very interesting. It really caught my ear. He said that the debate is basically Democrats want health care reform, Republicans do not want health care reform.

Now, I have spoken on this floor, as you know, Dr. GINGREY and Dr. ROE as well, and I've heard you speak many times; many Members of our conference have spoken; I've spoken a number of times throughout the district. I've listened to everyone from Speaker Gingrich to many others. I have yet to hear one Republican say that he is against health care reform.

So I want to remind my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that the only way we're ever going to solve our health care problems—which make up about 20 percent of our economy—we must have an honest debate. And framing the other side into a position that really doesn't exist is not going to get us there. In fact, I would say that we really agree, from what I can understand, on 90 percent of the discussion.

We all agree that we should do away with pre-existing illness; we all agree that we should have portability; we all agree there should be a hundred percent access to care; we all agree that we should lower the cost of care. I can draw you a great list. There is really, when you get down to it, only one thing we disagree with, and that is we feel that a private system, private industry—even if it's paid for by the Federal Government—in many cases does a much better job in terms of quality of care and customer service and a much better job of controlling costs.

This is proven time after time.

Compare our economy with a socialistic economy and you see every time that we provide much better products and services and at a much better price than those countries do.

So, really, the only disagreement is who is actually controlling the care. And, of course, I submit to you that a government-run system is a real problem. And I will tell you where I learned this.

When I was in the Navy as a physician, I noticed in the first year that the commanding officer of the hospital sent out a call and said if there is—this is budget time of the year—and if there is anything that you think we could

ever want in this hospital, wink wink—meaning, think of something; dream of things—put it on a list, because if we don't preserve that budget the way it is, then our budget will be cut next year. And that, my friend, is the way government works. If you don't force it into the budget, if you don't make sure and protect your territory, it won't be there next year. Somebody will cut into it. And that's really the way government works.

And I will give you an example, a real-life example of how we will never be able to get rid of waste, fraud, and abuse from our health care system if it's run by the government.

Think about this: we have to throw out a wide net, which is very expensive. We may capture a few offenders out there. Because it would have to be a criminal act, we would have to prove that they really did it on purpose; and then at the end of the day we would have to prosecute them with a lot of dollars; and then we may get one person, and we may get a few dollars. That's the way you get rid of fraud and abuse in a government system.

In a private system, much different. You have a physician or some other provider in a health care organization that's privately run, and if his practices are not the best practice and he's not practicing in a cost-effective way, that shows up on a graph; and often, of course, you go to that provider and you reeducate, and you have him work with colleagues, and you get him back to the protocols. And if that doesn't work, then you fire him. Easy problem to solve. It doesn't require all of that—there is no crime involved. So you can work in the most effective way possible.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Reclaiming my time, I think that the gentleman has certainly hit the nail right on the head in regard to this, and we could go back to what we talked about earlier in regard to electronic medical records, which would be specialty specific—the information, of course, would be available for any provider who is seeing the patient.

But in regards to best practices, as the gentleman was talking about, and these algorithms, I mean, doctors, let's face it, they're busy. They're operating; they're delivering babies. They don't have time, nor can they afford every 4 months going to a continuing medical education course. A lot of times they have to do that online. And it is hard to keep up.

But with electronic medical records, this would help them keep up. It would absolutely help them order the right tests, give the best outcomes. And as Dr. FLEMING pointed out, if they're in a single specialty group of eight surgeons and one in the group is not getting the information the others are getting, that information is available internally and externally. And you kind of police your own.

I want to give—I think he just asked for 1 minute—my good friend, DANA

ROHRABACHER, is going to be on the floor in the next hour. He asked for a minute, and I yield to him.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. As we are making fundamental decisions about things such as health care, which is so important to our country and important to each and every citizen, we should keep in mind the fundamental differences that you are bringing up tonight between a government-controlled health care system and an individual-controlled health care system, where the individual basically controls a great deal of the resources that he or she depends upon for his or her health or the health of their family as compared to having those resources totally at the command of the government. And the one word that comes to mind is politicalization of what's happening and what could that possibly mean in health care.

Let me give a little suggestion that if we have government-controlled health care, we're going to have illegal immigrants involved in the system. Our Democratic colleagues, as good-hearted as they are, cannot get themselves to say "no" to providing health care benefits to illegal immigrants. If we provide the type of operations that we want for our own people—heart operations and various things that are very expensive operations for health care—to be granted to illegal aliens, you can expect that it will, number one, bankrupt the system; but, number two, we will have illegal aliens coming here from every part of the world. And, in fact, one of the problems right now is that we already provide too much health care for illegal immigrants.

□ 2240

That issue alone should be a red bell for everyone out there saying, Do I really want the government to control health care and make the decision and give part of the money to an illegal immigrant?

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Well, reclaiming my time, and I thank the gentleman for his contribution in regard to that.

When you look at that number of 47 million who do not have health insurance, according to the Census Bureau, Madam Speaker, probably as many as 10 million of them are illegal immigrants. Now, they're not entitled, so to speak, to health insurance. That's not to say that you might not have a situation of extreme compassion if an illegal immigrant is admitted through one of our emergency departments and they are absolutely in the throws of a fatal illness, maybe it's a young, otherwise healthy person with congestive heart failure or congenital malformation that is resulting in an inability to sustain their blood pressure and they are on the verge of death, they would get the care in that hospital—in any hospital I think across the United States.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. And no one argues with that.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Yes. Of course not. They would get that care to save a life, of course we would. But the gentleman brings up a good point. And I did want to point out the segue into that number of 47 million.

It is estimated that maybe 18 million of those 47 million are making more than \$50,000 a year, and many of them just choose, of their own volition—maybe they're 10 feet tall and bullet proof, 20-somethings, 30-somethings, have the Methuselah gene, they think, and don't spend much money on health care, and they just elect not to put the \$200 a month payroll deduction or whatever it is. And maybe they have their own escrow account or their own health savings account. I think it's a bad decision, I think it's a bad bet, but a lot of people do that.

And you can't really force them, I don't think, unfortunately, in this Democratic plan, Madam Speaker. What the President is talking about is to have a mandate on the employer. If they are above a certain number of employees and if they don't provide health insurance for their employees, then they have to pay a tax or pay a percentage of their payroll into this connector; and individuals are absolutely required to sign up for health insurance, or if not, they have to pay a tax. I mean, that is not the American system. We want to encourage young healthy people to get health insurance.

And I want to make one point before I yield back to either one of my two colleagues. The insurance industry can help in a great way by looking at this. Let's say, take an example, a 22-year-old young man, newly married, newly employed, is not really convinced that paying for health insurance on a monthly basis is to his advantage, but he does it anyway. And he puts in whatever the cost is for a family premium and his portion of that payment month after month, year after year, with the same company maybe 15 or 20 years. During the course of that time, Madam Speaker, envision this, that individual develops high blood pressure, or maybe in addition to that high blood pressure develops type 2 diabetes—maybe the diabetes comes first, and then the high blood pressure—and then after that develops coronary artery disease. And then all of a sudden the company goes out of business and that individual is out of work, out of insurance, and desperately needs it. But because of these preexisting conditions, once COBRA runs out, how are they going to get health insurance? How are they going to afford—struggling maybe to find a new job, but how are they going to be able to go out with no tax deductibility and purchase a health insurance plan that is three and four times the amount of a standard plan for everybody else?

What I would say, Madam Speaker, to the Association of Health Insurance Plans, why don't you grant those individuals credible coverage, just like we did in Medicare part D, the prescrip-

tion drug benefit? If you have a credible insurance plan that covers prescription drugs, say, on a supplemental plan, and then you lose that after 4 or 5 years, then you shouldn't be penalized when you get into part D—and, indeed, the law says you won't be penalized. But why should the insurance company penalize these people who, in good faith, all those years have put that money, that premium—the insurance industry had it invested and had a good return on their investment—when these people all of a sudden are in a high-risk situation, I think they should get a community rating.

I would be very curious to know how my colleagues feel about that, and I will yield to Dr. FLEMING.

Mr. FLEMING. I appreciate your yielding. I just wanted to take a moment to follow up on what you said and Mr. ROHRABACHER.

We have 47 million uninsured, 10 million of course are illegal aliens. And of course that is a solvable problem by only allowing legal aliens and requiring them to pay taxes and insurance like anyone else, and those who are here illegally should not be here. So that's not really a health care problem, at least primarily, that is an immigration problem.

We also have, as you point out, at least half that 47 million who are insurable people, and very cost effectively, but they choose not to. That really hurts the risk pool, and we should do things to incentivize them.

The real problem is the 10 or 15 million people who are either business owners or they work for small businesses and they can't get cost-effective insurance. And they're the ones that delay care, they're the ones that don't go to their primary doctor, they're the ones that end up going to the emergency room, getting care at a time when the outcomes are the worst and the cost is the highest.

So when you think about it—and polls show that 75 percent of people are happy with what they have, whether it's Medicare or Medicaid, private insurance—it's that 25 percent that can't get affordable care. That's where the problem is, and that's where the focus needs to be. And if we do that, we get cost-effective coverage for them—and there are many ways of doing this, and we would have to get into ways to determine that—we would really have this problem under much better control. But if we, on the other hand, blow this thing out with a single-payer system, we are going to have exploding budgets as far as the eye can see, and I don't see any end to that. I thank you, and I yield back.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank the gentleman, and I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Just a couple of comments.

Our colleague from California made great points. And I am going to ask the two of you who have been here for a while to discuss this Medicare part D

discussion in just a moment. But he is correct. What happened was, when we created the TennCare plan in Tennessee, we are surrounded by eight States in the State of Tennessee, and we had a plan much richer than the surrounding States. So guess what happened? People came into the State. First of all, when we first put the plan out, all you had to have was a post office box. Well, there were a lot of post offices boxes that occurred, and a lot of people came into the State of Tennessee to get care.

The way the Governor handled that—and remember that government-run plans—and I want people to understand, this is a very important point—in Tennessee, when it was about to break the State, our Governor, along with the legislature, made some very tough decisions. They cut the rolls. They limited the number of people that were on the TennCare plan. In a plan in England or in Canada or other single-payer systems, what happens is you ration care, you create waits. For example, in Canada—and this is the head of the Canadian Medical Association, not PHIL ROE saying this—but he said you could get your dog's hip replaced in a week in Canada, but it takes 2 to 3 years for a person to get their hip replaced in Canada. And I think you made that point this morning during 1 minutes.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Reclaiming my time, we did talk about it this morning, and it was a Canadian testimony, was it not? And I yield back to you.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. It was. And I think the discussion, as I recall—and Dr. FLEMING is absolutely right, there are not that many disagreements, it's who is controlling these health care decisions; is it a bureaucrat or is it the patient and a doctor? And I think that is where the big discussion is.

Now, as I recall, when the Medicare part D discussion came up, the problem was going to be—the argument I heard the other side make was that without this public option there wouldn't be enough competition, and therefore prices would go up. But was what happened in part D—and I'm not saying part D certainly is perfect, it's not—but what happened was, with a competitive market out there, that actually came in lower without the public option when you had the private option competing in the open market. And I believe the discussion among the Democrats was that without this public option, that wouldn't happen. Well, just the opposite happened.

And again, we have seen what happened in Tennessee, I don't want to go over it again. But I can assure you that it will be a plan that promises more than it can deliver for the funds that are available, and there will be two options. And you know what those options are, and that's long waits—and I just don't think the American people are interested, I know I'm not interested in that.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Well, reclaiming my time, and I think you're absolutely right, that the only way to solve the cost overruns, which would no doubt occur—and I do believe, as our friend from California suggested, that if the government was running the whole show, and eventually if we approve this government default plan, that's just a giant step, and it's just a baby step toward a single-payer system. And when you get into that situation, I can almost assure you, Madam Speaker, that under current leadership, you would have any and all, come one come all, just like they did in Tennessee. And Dr. ROE was describing the TennCare program and the problems they ran into.

□ 2250

And then the only way you could pay for it, as he points out, would be to start cutting reimbursement to the providers, to the health care providers, to the physicians, to those primary care docs that we so desperately need to be focusing and to be running our medical homes and to make sure that people are taking their medication, that there's an emphasis on wellness and keeping people healthy, keeping them out of the doctor's office, keeping them out of the emergency room, out of the hospital, and toward the end of life hopefully out of the nursing homes and in their own homes. That's why I think it's a mistake to even go in that direction of government-run health care.

I clearly feel, and I know my colleagues on the floor tonight agree with me, Madam Speaker, that the private marketplace works. And my two colleagues that are with me tonight weren't in the House back in 2003, but I know they were following the debate very carefully and very closely and maybe even felt that Medicare part D was something that we couldn't afford. Certainly it added cost, if you crunch the numbers statically, to the Medicare annual payments, Medicare part D did. But in the long run, in the long run, because of that program, if they can afford to take their medications for some of these diseases that I mentioned earlier, high blood pressure, high cholesterol, diabetes, and keep these things under control, then clearly what happens is you shift costs from part A, the hospital part of Medicare, and from part B, the doctor part, the surgeon part, the amputation part, the renal transplant part, and then also in part D keeping folks from having a massive stroke hopefully by controlling their blood pressure and you spend less on the skilled nursing home part. So I think that's a pretty good bargain and a pretty compassionate way of approaching things.

But our Democrat colleagues, Madam Speaker, who were in the minority at the time, stood up here and they symbolically, some of them, tore up their AARP cards because that senior organization had the audacity to support a

Republican bill. And then, of course, they said, well, why can't we have a government default plan and why can't the government come in and set the price and say, okay, this is the price, this is the monthly premium for part D, the prescription drug part, and these free market thieves will not be able to run up the price? And they even suggested, Madam Speaker, that we set that monthly premium at \$42 a month. Fortunately, my colleagues, that amendment was defeated. And when the premiums first came in from the prescription drug plans, the private plans competing with one another for this business, they came in at an average of \$24 a month. Now, 3 years later, that has gone up a little bit because of inflation, but it's nowhere near \$42 a month.

So if we don't learn from our history, we are going to repeat those same old mistakes. And it looks like the Democrats, with this idea of letting the government come in and run everything and saying that we can't trust the free market, I guess that's what they want to do with General Motors as well, and I'm very anxious to see how that one turns out.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Good points about the private versus the public sector. The private sector will always be more efficient and more responsive. And you have heard this story before, but when I began practice and when you did, Dr. GINGREY and Dr. FLEMING also, when a patient came to me, and I took care of nothing but women, and when they came to me with breast cancer—which I unfortunately saw way too much of and our practice diagnosed about a case a week. It was that common or is that common.

And we just had a relay this weekend. In 1977 or so, the 5-year survival rate was about 50 percent, maybe a little bit better, but about 50 percent. And the big argument came: Do you do a disfiguring operation of a radical mastectomy or a lumpectomy? Because the survival rates were the same. So what has happened over that time is that now a patient can come to you or me or any of our colleagues and we can tell them that because of early detection, because of education, because of mammography, you're going to have a 98 percent survival rate in new medications. That is a wonderful story to tell. And I know no matter how tough the times are for that patient, you can look at them and say, You're going to be okay.

In the English system, they quit doing routine mammography. And why did they quit doing that? Screening mammograms aren't done anymore. Why? Well, because it costs more than the biopsies. Sometimes a test will tell us we have something when we don't have it. That's called a false positive. And the phone call that I love to make

is to my patients to say, You do not have cancer. So this is one where they quit doing that because the cost of the biopsies was more than the screening. The best rates they had were 78 percent survivals, and those are going to go down if you use that technique.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. If the gentleman will allow me, as we get very close to that bewitching hour of 11 o'clock, my southern drawl had better get a little faster than a drawl. But my mom, Helen Gingrey, who lives in Aiken, South Carolina, in a retirement community, a great community, Kalmia Landing, my mom had her 91st birthday on February 8 of this year. Well, when she was 90, about 5 or 6 months ago, 6 or 8 months ago, she had a knee replacement. And Mom had gotten to the point, Madam Speaker, where she could barely walk, in constant pain, on the verge of falling and breaking her hip at any moment. And now she is enjoying life and enjoying being with her friends, and maybe she's going to live another 10 or 15 years. I don't know. She seems to have the Methuselah gene. But do you think in Canada or the U.K. or one of these countries where they ration care that she would have had an opportunity to have that knee replacement? The answer we all know, Madam Speaker, is absolutely not.

I would say in closing, the one thing I would like to see is the equal tax treatment of the health care benefit for individuals who have to go out and buy them in the market on their own. They don't get it from their employer. Why should they not get a tax advantage health care plan just like everybody else? And you know what, Madam Speaker? I have not heard the Democrats in the House, the Democrats in the Senate, or President Obama talk about that. And talk about fairness and wanting to be equitable, let's hear some more about that. We will talk about it in future Special Orders.

I want to thank my colleagues Dr. ROE, Dr. FLEMING, and my good friend from California, Representative DANA ROHRABACHER, for being with me during this hour.

□ 2300

THE BIGGEST POWER GRAB IN HISTORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. KILROY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker, a thought came across me about 2 days ago. I was out on the water, surfing off of San Clemente, California. I was sitting there on my surfboard. The pelicans and the birds were jumping into the water and carrying fish out of the water, and the dolphins were swimming by. It was just a beautiful day. I

couldn't help but remember that many years ago when I was a young reporter, one of my first assignments was to cover a speech being given by Jacques Cousteau. He was a hero to me at that time, and I really relished the idea of going out and being able to interview him after a speech he was giving at UCLA. I got to the speech, and I found that Mr. Cousteau was being very pessimistic about the future of the oceans, and he was telling the kids there was no future in the ocean, that 10 years from now—this was in the early 1970s he was saying this—there would be no life in the ocean. "The oceans will be black, lifeless masses, black goo." I felt that it was a bit pessimistic; and when I had my chance to interview him afterwards, I turned on my tape recorder and introduced myself. He was ready for the interview. I said, Aren't there also some optimistic sides about the ocean, that perhaps we will someday be able to farm them, like with shellfish and regular fish perhaps, being able to ranch them, you might say, in the ocean? And that might be a great source of protein for the whole world that we would then have under better control. He came right up to me, and all these students were watching, and he put his face right up next to my nose, and he said, Didn't you hear me? The oceans will be dead in 10 years. Black goo. Dead.

I'll never forget that. I mean, that was something that was really pounded right into my memory because his nose was almost touching my nose. I could smell the garlic on his French breath, and I will tell you that it was an experience. I thought about that just 2 days ago while I was surfing. The fish were jumping, and the porpoises were swimming, and the pelicans were landing and picking up the fish in the water, the oceans totally alive, and I am totally alive and very grateful to have the oceans that we have. Obviously Mr. Cousteau was wrong. I can't tell you today whether he was lying or intentionally misinforming those students, but he was dead wrong.

Now students come to visit me a lot. I've been in Congress now over 20 years, and I try to see every student that comes from my district. I try to see them; and I talk to them, giving them a chance to ask me questions. But I always ask them a question too. So my students from Southern California, young high school students, I always ask them, Is the air in our congressional district, in our area of Southern California, is it cleaner or dirtier than it was 45 years ago when I went to high school in this very same area? And almost 90 percent of the students adamantly insist that the air back then was so much cleaner: Oh, you're so lucky to have lived in an age in Southern California where the air was so clean, and now it's so dirty and all of us are destined to die and to be infected with this pollution in our lungs.

Well, the fact is, that is dead wrong as well. Someone continues to mis-

inform our young people, perhaps for political reasons, whatever. But the fact is, when I tell them that they are 180 degrees wrong, that, in fact, the air is so much cleaner now that there's almost no comparison to what it was when I was a young person in high school, they are incredulous. Many of them don't believe me when I say that. But they know afterwards when they check up on it that they have been lied to.

Well, whatever the reason, whatever the motive behind this misinformation that's being provided to young people, whether it was Jacques Cousteau or whether it's the educational establishment or if it is any of the other people we're talking about who have ties to the radical environmental movement, whatever the reason they are misinforming our students, it's not just the students. It's our general population as well.

For decades, phony, frightening predictions, false climate assumptions and inaccurate information fed into computer climate models have been foisted on the American people, including our young people, and people throughout the world. Even worse, honest discussion on these issues of climate have been stifled, and critics have been silenced in order to create an illusion of a consensus that the climate is going haywire and that we're in for a global warming calamity. So why is this? Why do we have this specter of man-made global warming being portrayed as a global calamity in the making? Well, it's being used to stampede the public and, yes, stampede officials into accepting what appears to be the biggest power grab in history. One doesn't have to be a conspiracy nut to realize there are a significant number of people who really believe in centralizing the power of government into the hands of elected and even unelected officials, centralizing that power in Washington and elsewhere. And these unelected officials, who now will be given so much power, are expected to be competent and expected to be well motivated. They are expected to prove that by doing the things that are consistent with the goals and the values of the people who are pushing to centralize power in their hands.

That we have a group of leftists who believe in centralizing power should not surprise anyone. But what we have here is the leftist politicos in this country who believe in centralizing power anyway have been willing to go along and exaggerate and, yes, play fast and loose with the facts in order to promote this notion of man-made global warming. But we didn't expect these people who have a motive of trying to centralize power, or whatever the motive is of these alarmists in the radical environmental movement, we didn't expect them to act any other way. But we need to ask ourselves, why did it take prominent members of the science community so long to step forward to be counted in the face of this massive, heavy-handed campaign of deceit?

Well, I trace the reluctance of our scientists to step up back to the abrupt dismissal of Dr. William Happer, who was then the top scientist at the Department of Energy back in 1993. Happer was too professional, too objective for what Vice President Gore had in mind. So off with his head. Immediately that was one of the first actions taken when the Clinton administration took power. Out the door with Dr. Happer. This man, this prominent and very well-respected Ph.D., his dismissal in that way was a message to the science community: If you want a grant, you toe the line. And what followed was a one-sided drum beat, one-sided promotions, one-sided research grants, and one-sided thinking. Those were the order of the day for the 8 years of the Clinton presidency. The media bias, which of course went along with that, played hand in glove, has never let up with that bias. We just had a major conference here in Washington with hundreds of prominent individuals, many of whom are great scientists, Ph.D.'s, and heads of major university science departments. Yet that conference, which was skeptical of man-made global warming, didn't get any publicity. Very, very few news articles came out of this. Yet these were very prominent and important people.

This kind of repressive atmosphere where the press doesn't report that and that we had years and years where people were not being able to get grants unless they toed the line that Vice President Gore wanted, in this repressive atmosphere, many leaders of the scientific community just remained silent. They sort of became turtles. They tucked their heads in and figured they'd hunker down and live through it. But the ignoring of a campaign of deceit that was utilizing the prestige of the science community has taken its toll, and it's taken a long time to get these scientists out of their shell and to step forward with integrity, as is expected of the men and women of science.

So here we are on the edge—laws, taxation, controls, regulation, mandates are about to be enacted; and we've had 15 years of stifled debate. Even my GOP colleagues are afraid to take on the phony science that is at the heart of the man-made global warming juggernaut. Again, these people in the GOP, they oppose this theory; but they just want to say that what is being proposed by the Democrats will cost too much and will have too little impact on climate or temperature for it to justify this huge cost. Well, they're right. What's being proposed will have a huge cost and very little impact; but if, indeed, we are facing a global warming calamity that's being caused by human activity, the costs shouldn't matter.

□ 2310

So I have to argue that principle and basic science is the important element of the discussion of the manmade global warming theory and the laws and

regulations and controls and taxation that we are now on the verge of passing here in Washington, D.C.

The bottom line is that the science behind the manmade global warming proposals in Congress and the draconian laws which will follow are based on faulty science. The science is wrong. What has been presented to us by Vice President Gore and the radical environmental community and liberal leftists who want to centralize power in government, the facts that they have presented us have not been accurate. This has either been an intent to deceive, or perhaps just a benevolent intent to save the world.

So it is not just a cost analysis of current legislative proposals that show that the proposals claiming to thwart manmade global warming would obliterate jobs. We know that.

All these proposals that say, well, we are going to try to thwart global warming that way or this way, or this regulation, this taxation, this requirement of cap-and-trade, we have had major economists warn these things will destroy the American economy. But if they claim it is about saving the planet, people are going to listen to them.

But it will destroy the economy, and the irony of it is, this will have nothing to do with saving the planet, but will in fact perhaps make the environment of our planet worse, rather than better. That is why they have tried to stifle the debate.

The real scientific justification for their power grab is science, and an honest discussion of that science will show that the science being presented to justify this power grab is at best inaccurate, and, at worst, a total lie.

You have all heard it, and everyone knows about this. People in Washington, we don't need to be told that there has been an attempt to stifle debate. But I would ask that the American people think about what they have heard about the manmade global warming theory over these 15 years, but especially over these last 4 years.

How many have heard the words "case closed?" Isn't it ironic that all of a sudden everybody started using the words "case closed?" What does that mean? That means no more debate. The words "case closed" was a clumsy, and, I might add, a heavyhanded attempt to shut off discussion even before we had a chance to have an honest discussion of the issues. Because, as I said, the scientists in the 8 years beforehand had been denied research grants unless they were wanting to toe the line on global warming. How many have heard "case closed?" We all have.

When Mr. Gore speaks about global warming, he never takes questions. Why would it be that someone who believes in something so adamantly refuses to debate the issue on TV and refuses to take questions? I have certainly a lot less invested in this issue than Vice President Gore. I give speeches and always take questions,

and I have certainly been willing to debate this issue in public and on television.

So why do we hear the words "cased closed," stifling debate, and Mr. Gore, one of the prime advocates of this issue, not willing to take questions? Why is it that people who have, you know, skepticism about manmade global warming, why is it that they complain, like Robert Gray, former chairman of the American Meteorological Association? Why do we hear from them that they were turned down for grant applications so many times? Why do we hear that from a man who mentioned that he had received 13 such research grants prior, prior, to the Clinton administration, and then been totally cut off?

Doesn't that say something, when someone of that caliber, a Ph.D., the president of the Meteorological Association, can't get a grant to study the frequencies of hurricanes? And even today this man points out contradictory information. His view is—a man with decades of experience and credentials, Ph.D.'s and credentials in meteorology, says no, the idea that mankind's human actions is causing hurricanes is false, and there is no evidence of that.

Well, and then what else do we hear? We hear name-calling. I was on a television show recently where they called me a troglodyte, I guess troglodyte, that is the word, that I am anti-science, and I am bigoted in some way. I kept presenting scientific arguments about manmade global warming, but all I got back was name-calling.

Case closed. We are not going to answer any questions. No grants for skeptics. And, yes, anybody who disagrees with us is a low-life who doesn't believe in science. Yes, you don't believe in science.

Can you imagine moving forward to have an honest discussion about manmade global warming and being dismissed before you get to the discussion as being anti-science, and then after insisting on four or five issues on science, not having those arguments even answered, but instead having my religion questioned?

Well, dismissing rather than answering legitimate challenges to the manmade global warming theory is par for the course. This is standard operating procedure. Case closed, standard operating procedure. No questions, standard operating procedure. No grants for skeptics, standard operating procedure.

These people have been trying their best to basically steamroll over anyone who would get in their way without having to have the honest discussion of an issue of this magnitude. All of it is simply a Herculean effort not to discuss the scientific assumptions that are at the basis of the manmade global warming concept.

So what is that all about? Why are they not willing to discuss the science? All it is about is not discussing the science, shutting down anybody else

with any other ideas without combating the ideas.

Well, the reason why they have tried so hard to have "case closed" and all of these things that I have just mentioned, it is because their basic theory, the science theory behind manmade global warming is wrong. It is dead wrong, and that is why they won't discuss it. And if they won't discuss it, we can discuss it.

I would suggest that if there is anyone in this Congress who would like to debate me on this issue for an hour sometime between now and the time this Congress has to vote on cap-and-trade legislation, I will gladly meet them for an hour and discuss this issue.

So let's start discussing it tonight, and then maybe sometime in the next few weeks someone from the other side will take advantage of that offer to have an honest discussion with me and with the public about this issue. If it is so important, let's have an open and honest discussion. So let's look at some of the real science-based challenges to the predictions of an oncoming manmade global warming calamity.

Okay. In briefing after briefing—I am a senior member of the Science Committee—and over the years in briefing after briefing on global warming, I couldn't help but notice that the charts that showed that we have increased the temperature of the planet by 1 degree, here is the chart, it is going up like this, I couldn't help but notice where they started, down here. And down there was 1850.

1850 is actually the line, the baseline that is used for temperature comparisons by the global warming community, by the people who believe in manmade global warming. But 1850 has some significance. 1850, in that era, those few years there, that was the end of the little ice age. That was the end of a 500-year decline in world temperatures.

Okay, so why is it that people who want us to be concerned about a 1 degree temperature increase are making the baseline of comparison the bottom of a 500-year decline? Well, if it is at the bottom of a 500-year decline, if it is that low point they are comparing it to, what is all the hysteria about if we are talking about a 1 degree rise in temperature? What is that all about, or even a 2 degree rise in temperature?

The fact is we know that there have been weather cycles and climate cycles throughout the history of the world. They are now trying to use a low point of a cooling cycle to compare it to say we should be upset when there is even a 1 degree change.

What about those other weather cycles? Number one, let's ask, how can you use that as a baseline? Number two, what about the other weather cycles and that weather cycle? How about the weather cycle that went down for 500 years?

The fact is that over 500 years ago, actually 1,000 years ago, the weather

was very warm. It was a lot warmer than it is today, a lot warmer than the 1 degree that we have.

□ 2320

The fact is, there were big areas of Greenland that were green. They actually had agriculture and a green part of that area. Iceland was an area that had plants and crops. Vineland, which the Vikings said, people thought, well, they were claiming that there were vines there but there really weren't. No, the temperature was different. It was warmer 1,000 years ago.

So there have been numerous weather cycles that have had nothing to do with human activity, unless you believe that the Vikings, of course, there was something that they were doing that was changing the weather. And, if there was a warming cycle, and again, if we've had a warming cycle since that time, it's only been 1 degree.

But these past climate cycles, there's one thing that we have to try to pick up. Why is it then that we've had these cycles? Why is it then, and why is this cycle we are claiming which is a 1 degree rise in temperature from a 500-year low, why is this different? Why are we trying to change the rules of the game and centralize power and look at this as some sort of crisis when it's just another cycle? And why, what is causing the cycle then?

Well, it seems that cycles of climate follow solar activity. The cycles we've had before mankind even emerged can be traced back through ice cores to solar activity. Now, we've seen it here on Earth and we've seen it on other planets.

Let's note this. When I was in this debate the other night, a Member of Congress, a good friend, went on about how horrible it was, of course we're having manmade global warming. Look what's happening in the Arctic. In the Arctic, the polar bears are being destroyed. Well, of course that's not true. There's a polar bear explosion in terms of their population. There are two types of polar bears that are losing, that are not able to keep up with the changes in the climate there. But most other polar bears, because it's warmer, actually are living better than they were before, and the population of polar bears is going up. How ironic that we end up putting them on an endangered species list at a time when their numbers are increasing.

But let's get back to the central point. Something's going on in the Arctic. And my friend and colleague is saying, oh, how horrible it is and going into great detail to touch people's hearts about a polar bear on a piece of ice. And then I said, you're saying that this is caused by human activity and, thus, we have to have all these taxes and controls and things to save the planet from this?

Well, yes, that's what he's saying. Well, I said exactly what I've said to Arnold Schwarzenegger. I said this to myself on the program. Yes, the ice cap

is retreating. There's no doubt about that. But when I say that, I'm not talking about our ice cap. That's clear to us. But what about the ice cap on Mars? There is an ice cap on Mars, and just by coincidence, it is retreating at exactly the same time as our ice cap is retreating. Doesn't that indicate that it might be the sun and not us driving SUVs or modern technology that's creating these many, many cycles that we've had, including the one that we are already in?

Yes, an ice cap is retreating on Mars and it's retreating in the world. Is that just a coincidence? Well, that's a scientific challenge. Let's have an answer to that. So, we have polar ice caps melting on Mars, and it's not just a coincidence, I believe. So tell me why this doesn't indicate to us that what we're really talking about is solar, what we are facing today in the climate changes that have taken place today, just as it has in the past is that it has to do with solar activity.

So now remember, by the way, ice caps may have been melting in the Arctic, but one thing people miss, the ice caps are not melting everywhere, just the northern ice cap. In Antarctica, to the south, ice is actually accumulating. And so in the north, yeah, there is a polar bear population, I think two species of polar bears are suffering. Most every one, the rest of them are expanding their population.

And by the way, I understand now, even in that area, the ice is beginning to return. But the ice has always been accumulating in the Antarctic over these years. That's never told to us. It's as if the whole world is increasing in temperature, but they don't bother to mention the areas where the ice is actually accumulating.

Well, the manmade global warming theory has been focused on CO₂. This is, of course, and again, let's talk about the science of these issues. CO₂ is a minuscule part, a minuscule part of our atmosphere, and if you ask the ordinary person, they think it's 20 percent of the atmosphere. Well, actually it's .023 percent, I believe, so that's less than 1 quarter of 1. It's less than 1 quarter of 1 percent of the atmosphere is CO₂. And of that, at least 90 percent of the CO₂ in the atmosphere is not traced to human activity.

I've been in hearings where most people claim it's more like 5 percent of the CO₂ in the atmosphere is traced to human activity. You know, and by the way, one huge volcano or even massive fire like they've had in various countries would dwarf everything that we're trying to do to reduce CO₂ into the amount of CO₂ that that would put into the atmosphere, because CO₂ is not a significant part of the atmosphere. It's a minuscule—it's like a thread being put across the line on a football field, and that's what you're changing by focusing not just on the CO₂, which is .023 percent, but it's also, of that, 90 percent of that is not manmade. It's made by nature.

So the most important discussion in terms of manmade CO₂, which, as I say, the manmade part of it is just a small contributor, it's a small contributor to a very tiny element in the atmosphere, and suggesting that that is changing our climate is ludicrous. In fact, it is warming and has released CO₂ and there have been—it is warming a little bit. There has been, over the years, until recently, and over the years, there has been times when CO₂ was going up dramatically and down dramatically but had nothing to do with the climate of the planet. For example, manmade—if manmade—here's a basic can question. Here's another science challenge. If manmade CO₂ causes warming, why, as CO₂ levels were rising dramatically in the 1940s, fifties, sixties and seventies, why, if the CO₂ was rising in those decades, why was there actually a cooling of our climate in those decades?

Okay. Let's hear the science. Come on. I just had a science. I've had five or six points now. Why is everyone afraid to take on these scientific answers? If indeed CO₂ causes it to warm, well, then how come, when we had massive increases in CO₂ in the forties, fifties, sixties and seventies that it got cooler and not warmer? Well, the calculations on global warming have been based on fraudulent numbers.

And here's another scientific challenge. A recent study shows that over 80 percent of America's temperature and weather stations which have been the source of temperature readings that supposedly indicate a warming trend, supposedly, these very same monitoring facilities have been compromised and are faulty in the information they're providing.

□ 2330

The numbers have been skewed. They are suspect because the monitors that have been relied upon do not meet the basic scientific standards that are required of them for us to believe in the numbers that they're giving us. In other words, the equipment is compromised; the figures coming out of the equipment cannot be relied upon. And our system, with 80 percent of our monitors who do not meet the standards, the scientific standards for us to rely on their numbers—our system has been heralded as the best in the world. So think about that. What's going on in the rest of the world when we're talking about one little rise, a one-degree rise in temperature since the end of the little ice age which was a 500-year low of temperature?

So even that we can't figure out—even with that one degree we don't know, because the monitors have been placed in faulty ways or have not been kept and maintained in the right way.

And so what we have had is a lot of people who have been making predictions over the last 20 years, especially Vice President Gore. But if the science community had been given these grants—but only if they're going

to come to the conclusion about global warming that we want you to—these people in the science community and these other political people who have got their own motives behind this bulldozer approach and this steamroller approach to accomplishing what they're out to accomplish, those people have been telling us that we're facing a man-made global warming climate calamity and it was in the making. And we were told that the temperatures were either going to continue to go up and up and it would reach a certain point and then there would be some sort of tipping point and then it would jump up by a number of temperature points. So it would be five or six points, or whatever they were predicting. It was a huge jump in temperature at some point.

Well, that's not what's happened. I heard that for 10 years, 10 years for the people who were giving out all of the grants, 10 years from all of the people who were shutting out any type of real debate, 10 years of "don't ask any questions, case closed." And those people are on the record, and they have been warning us of man-made global warming that was about to get out of hand. But for over a decade, it has not gotten any warmer.

Yes, 11 years ago in 1998 it was a very hot year, and that was the year—since then, every year has been cooler. It has not gotten warmer since then. And they say, Well, that was a very hot year. Well, so was 1931 was a very hot year, and it was followed by decades, I might add, of cooling. So that doesn't mean anything. That was just an anomaly that we had a hot year in 1998, because ever since then the temperature has not been going up.

The global warming alarmists' predictions were wrong, all right? Come and debate that. There is a scientific challenge. I keep giving scientific challenges, and what I get back in this debate is, You're a bigot; you're anti-science; you're stupid. Name-calling. I mean, the people on the other side who always are willing to call people names rather than confront their arguments are very easy to spot. You just take a look. You listen to what's being said. Who is offering an argument that needs to be discussed? Who's calling names? They have been trying to shut down this debate by calling anybody who disagrees with them horrible personal names.

Well, let me repeat this one point: it has not gotten any warmer for over a decade and we're still—it looks like we're even still getting cooler. That is totally contradictory to the predictions that were aggressively made to us, as they only gave their grants to the people who would agree with that over the years.

This is why global warming alarmists have now, en masse, changed the wording that they use. They were wrong, so let us just change the way we talk about things. Now it's climate change, okay? Everybody think about it. All of

these same people were talking about global warming 20 years ago, spending billions of dollars on research that was bogus research, you know. It was intended to come out with what they were buying from the scientists. They were telling us it was going to get warmer, and they kept using the term "man-made global warming." And now they call it "climate change," and all of a sudden, they all change and it all became climate change.

Well, every time you hear that word used by an environmental radical, by one of these alarmists, it is an admission that they were wrong and that they refuse to admit that they were wrong. Refusing to admit you're wrong after you've been so aggressive in promoting something is certainly not an honest debate and an honest discussion.

If I am proven wrong on a point, I will apologize and change my position. I won't try to change my wording so it sounds like I was never wrong in the first place.

These people were wrong. Remember it. Every time the word climate change is used, remember these were the same people who were talking about global warming, and they want to have it both ways. No matter if it gets warmer or colder, they want to blame it on human activity when, in fact, all of the evidence suggests that cycles come from solar activity.

Expert after expert is now pointing to the flaws in the central argument.

And the other thing you hear is, of course, that all of the scientists agree. There is your other way of shutting down debate. All of the scientists, all of the prestigious Ph.D.s and scientists agree. That is not true. And it hasn't been true for years.

So Al Gore's scientific mumbo-jumbo was wrong, all of the scientists agreeing with him is wrong, the temperature predictions have been wrong, and the man-made CO₂ premise is wrong.

Now we find out that the monitors used to collect the data were placed next to air-conditioning exhaust vents—which made the temperature higher—and in parking lots, and on top of buildings, and near other heat sources which, of course, made all of their statistics totally unreliable. We hear that.

We also know the methodology of using computer models has been questionable from the very beginning. We all know the saying: garbage in, garbage out. But no one was permitted to hear the questions; no one was permitted to ask follow-up questions as to—no one has been permitted to totally understand the software that went into that questionable computer modeling.

The observations have been wrong. The attempt to stifle debate and shut up those people who disagree by calling them names, denying grants, and making personal attacks has been wrong. Thus, I would suggest the biggest power grab in our history is wrong, and

the public should wake up. The public should understand that what we are seeing is a brazen power grab that is wrong.

So, let's review the scientific challenges to the man-made global warming theory. See if anybody ever tries to come and have an argument about the science.

Baseline comparison is at the bottom of a 500-year decline in temperature. That is not the scientific way of determining whether a slight rise in temperature is significant. The science measurements were partly or severely flawed by a monitoring system that was—did not meet the standards necessary to have accurate information. Past climate cycles were frequent even before the emergence of mankind. Cycles like the retreating polar ice caps are parallel to similar cycles on Mars suggesting solar activity, rather than human activity, is the culprit. Increasing CO₂ levels did not cause warming, which can be shown in the 1940s, 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s where there was an increasing level of CO₂, but yet it was getting cooler.

So let's have an honest debate. Let's quit calling names. Let's quit dismissing legitimate science-based questions.

□ 2340

Address the scientific issues being raised rather than sloganizing about a consensus of scientists that does not exist. Again, the so-called "consensus," case closed—that consensus does not exist. More and more, thousands of scientists are signing on as skeptics to this manmade global warming theory.

This leads to an important point that needs to be made. Perhaps the biggest lie the public must deal with is that all the prominent scientists in the world totally agree with the manmade global warming theory. That's probably the biggest lie, as I mentioned. Instead of answering scientific questions, alarmists have simply claimed all the scientists agree. I've been interviewed on this at least half a dozen times, and every interview begins with, well, all of the scientists agree that manmade global warming is a reality, how can you disagree with all of them? It is just another tactic aimed at repressing an honest discussion of something that should be a scientific issue and discussed with all sincerity.

I will now submit the names of 10 prominent scientists, 10 of the thousands of scientists who have signed on to suggest that manmade global warming is far from accepted by all scientists. These are the heads of science departments, the presidents of scientific and academic associations, people with doctorates in the areas of study, and they are coming forward at last, they're coming out of their shell at last after all of these years of intimidation. This is only a list of 10, but there are thousands more who are stepping forward to voice honest skepticism, if not total rejection, to the

claim that human activity is creating a global warming climate catastrophe.

The first one is Dr. Richard Lindzen, top scientist from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Dr. William Gray, Colorado State University, former president of the American Meteorological Association. Dr. David Nowell, former chairman and NATO meteorologist from Canada. Dr. Gerhard Kramm, University of Alaska in Fairbanks. Dr. Yury Izrael of the Russian Academy of Sciences, a senior member of the Russian Academy of Sciences whom I met and spoke to, and also a member of the IPCC United Nations report, who now makes it very clear that he does not believe in that report or manmade global warming. Dr. Ian Pilmer of the University of Melbourne. Dr. Diane Douglas, climatologist and paleoclimatologist. Dr. Harry Lins, cochairman of the IPCC Hydrology and Water Resources Working Group. Dr. Antonio Zichichi, president of the World Federation of Scientists. Dr. Ivar Giaever, Nobel Laureate and physicist.

So this idea that all the scientists are lockstep in favor of the theory of manmade global warming is a lie, not just a lie, a damnable lie aimed at cutting off honest communication. And who's doing that? Who's making this adamant statement that all the scientists are in agreement with this? Well, we've had people who say these things and said things all along. There's the global warming alarmists now who are making these statements. But let us just remember, these scares have happened in the past. I remember when my mother wouldn't serve cranberries at Thanksgiving because they caused cancer. I remember when Professor Meryl Streep warned us of alarm-causing cancer, which just about ruined the apple industry for 2 years. That also was wrong.

We heard about cyclamates causing cancer, which cost the industry billions of dollars and disrupted very healthy patterns of nutrition that could have been based on cyclamates rather than high fructose corn syrup. That, too, was wrong.

We remember the nuclear power catastrophe at Three Mile Island, when Dr. Jane Fonda, that Ph.D. genius, taught us that nuclear power was so dangerous, that what we have done instead of using nuclear power, we began relying on overseas oil and gas and burning coal. Then remember the acid rain? That was as near a high pitch as what we hear about global warming. Ronald Reagan stood up, put his hand up and said, no, we are going to have scientific research on this acid rain issue before we commit to all sorts of regulations and taxes that will destroy our economy. Luckily, Reagan did that, and when a \$500 million study was complete, it verified the fact that acid rain was a minimal problem, not a major problem, a minimal problem that didn't justify any of the draconian raises in taxes and controls that were

being suggested by those environmental alarmists.

Then of course the granddaddy of them all was, many of the same people who now talk about global warming were then talking about global cooling back in the early 1970s, some of the very same people. Yes. And what happened to global cooling? The cycle started going in another direction. Then it became, Oh, my God, it's global warming. Well, now it's back to global cooling. So is this all caused by us driving SUVs? No. Maybe it's caused by the sun. Maybe there are natural reasons for the cycles of climate on this planet.

The so-called "experts" were wrong when they told us about all of these things. All of these were exaggerated problems, exaggerated threats to our well-being. And the American people were deceived in many of these cases, whether it was about nuclear energy or whether it was about cranberries. And we had fanatics who were fast and loose with the truth and fast and loose with facts. Well, that's exactly what's going on today.

And what's the problem with that? Well, the problem is there are serious side effects when one gets you focused on something that's not true, like cranberries causing cancer or nuclear energy being such a threat. You end up doing things that are actually harmful to you that you wouldn't do otherwise. When you have CO₂ being called the primary pollutant for concern, you are doing a horrendous disservice to the people of this country. By focusing on CO₂, which is not harmful to human beings at all and in fact is a plant food—CO₂ makes plants grow better, it does not harm human beings. And if our job is just to try to reduce the amount of CO₂ in the world, we will actually be doing a grave disservice because we won't be concentrating on the pollution, like NO₂ and other things that are very harmful, the particulates out of diesel trucks that are particularly—again, no pun intended—but particular particulates that are very harmful to people. I have three children. I have my baby Anika and Tristan and Christian. I love those babies, and I do not want them to breathe in dirty air. And if we focus on CO₂, we are doing a disservice to them and their generation and we are doing a disservice to the older people of this country who will also breathe in the dirty air. And focusing on CO₂ to save the planet. That's because what's happening here is these people are out to save the planet, but they are not out to save the people of the planet.

I remember one solution to a nonexistent threat, which also caused a huge destruction of people, was, of course, the eliminating of DDT. Now, DDT, we were told, was destructive to the environment, especially to bird egg shells. Well, then, DDT is banned. And what is the result of DDT being banned? Malaria out of control in Third World countries where before it

had been nearly eliminated. DDT was eliminated and malaria made a comeback, and millions of children in the Third World have died because of this nonsense.

I can't tell you if pelican egg shells are less fragile because of DDT, but I can tell you the tradeoff with millions of young children dying in Third World countries isn't worth that tradeoff about how fragile and building up the shell of a pelican.

Unfortunately, the people driving policy here are out to save our planet; they're not out to save our children or our seniors or any other people on the planet. That is the same mindset that would dramatically damage our economy in order to save the planet, with no consideration of the hardship and deprivation to ordinary people that would result from the draconian controls and taxation that is being proposed here in Washington right now as an answer to the global warming threat, the manmade global warming threat.

Now that manmade global warming has been driven into the public consciousness, the alarmists have the leverage right here in Washington. What should we expect unless the public changes its perception? There is a price to pay, just like those millions of little kids dying in Africa of malaria, and there is a price to pay for listening to irrational alarmists.

Excessive taxation regulation mandates are now being proposed in Washington, and they will reduce our gross domestic product by over \$7 trillion, destroying nearly 2 million jobs by 2012, at a time when we really need jobs. It will raise electricity rates by 90 percent above inflation, incur \$33,000 worth of additional Federal debt for every man, woman and child in America. And it will help the Chinese and other people steal our businesses from us. And this is only step one.

And even with this monstrous cost, little progress is expected. Here's back to the central point most Republicans want to make: That that cost isn't worth what we're going to get out of it. Well, no, there won't be any change in the temperature, and little change in the amount of CO₂ in the atmosphere. And CO₂ isn't harmful to people or this world.

The real calamity brought on by global warming will be the economy-killing taxes and regulations that are put in place to solve a nonexistent problem. That economic decline that we're talking about is just Round one, however. Round two is easy to predict.

□ 2350

Global and international bodies and our own government and our own Congress will be given the right and power to intervene in our lives to prevent manmade global warming. That's what it's all about, globalism. If man makes it, man must then be controlled. That's why it was so important for them to

steamroll over anybody who is in opposition and wanted to ask some questions. They want nobody to ask questions about their theory about man-made global warming because they believe men and women, people, need to be controlled. That is part of their theory of government. It will make it a whole new, more benevolent world. Unfortunately, a lot of the government they are talking about is not the American Government. We are talking about international mandates from unelected bodies that we will then pass on power and authority to, which is supported by many of the people right here in this Congress.

For example, in the future, we are going to face all kinds of mandates and controls from the Federal Government and the international. Some of these would be, for example, mandated increases in parking fees. Do they tell you that now? All your local communities are going to have to raise your parking fees. And there will be major impediments to the private use of automobiles. And then, of course, they've got to end frequent flyer miles and they've got to end discount air travel because, believe it or not, and nobody has ever been telling you this, they believe that airplanes are the biggest CO₂ footprint of all. That's right. Your frequent flyer miles and your discount tickets have got to go. Of course, the elite will be able to fly around in their private planes giving a donation by supposedly planting trees somewhere and thus they can fly in their private planes. But the rest of us cannot go to see our sick relatives on a discounted ticket. No one has heard about this. Nobody has heard about these types of controls that are going to be mandated on our own people by the United Nations perhaps. What has been the purview of local government will be transferred to much higher authorities. Local government will be required to follow international guidelines, climate guidelines, when it comes to building, zoning, even local planning.

This is part of our liberty. Where we live, what we eat, how we run our lives, this is what is at stake. It's called liberty. This is a fight between the globalists, who found a vehicle to try to gain power and grab power, and those people who do believe in liberty and justice. We call them patriots. We call them people around the world who do believe in these Western values of dignity for the individual and freedom and justice.

Yes, even our diet has been targeted by those claiming that animal flatulence and deforestation make meat the enemy of climate. We aren't even going to be able to have barbecues in our backyard, much less have hamburgers. Now, these are one of those things that people will laugh that no one could ever go that far. What is going on here is laying the foundation for extensive controls that now are up to the individual or up to the local government being given to a central government.

If you aren't frightened by this, you should be. We have a fanatical movement of steely-eyed zealots who cannot admit they made a mistake, who always attack the other person rather than trying to have honest discussions of issues. Couple that with self-serving interests, and there are many self-serving interests who are involved in this. They now have joined in a political coalition that believes they have the right to run the economy, run business, run local schools, and run our lives. They have been looking for an excuse to assume power.

Now, the left has always wanted to have power. Leftists have always wanted it. They believe that they can do better and make humankind over and make it a better world by having absolute power over the choices of the people who live in this world. Well, they have found a calamity. They can threaten the people of the world with a calamity in order to stampede them into a monstrously horrific policy, and that's what we are on the edge of here in Washington.

In this last 8 months here in Washington, hundreds of billions, even trillions of dollars have been shoveled into the coffers, and no one knows where the heck this money has gone to. There have been looters from all over the world in our financial system and everyone who has benefited from that. The American people know that this Congress was stampeded into giving away trillions of dollars because we were told there was going to be an economic calamity. I'm very proud I never succumbed to that hysteria that was perhaps the greatest rip-off in history. Well, the global warming stampede is designed to cover up the biggest power grab in history, and it too will be costly.

Wake up, America. Wake up, America. We should not be giving our power and our liberty, not to the central government in Washington, D.C., certainly not to the United Nations, which is composed of countries who are governed by crooks and kooks. And the United Nations having power to set regulations over our lives in the name of saving this world from a climate catastrophe would itself be a catastrophe to the freedom of liberty and justice in this country and to the freedom-loving people of the world.

Well, even Al Gore must be a bit embarrassed now that he has to use the words "climate change" rather than "global warming." It's an inconvenient truth for him. The fact is it's no longer warming. He must think that we are stupid if he thinks that we have not noticed that it's now "climate change" instead of "global warming" and that we haven't noticed that there are large numbers of scientists that are opposing what is being proposed. And he must think we are stupid if he thinks that these taxes and regulations and draconian laws that are being proposed are things that we will just accept because we have been frightened into submission.

Wake up, America. We need to save our country and future generations and we need to save the world from this incredible power grab, the greatest power grab and worst power grab in history.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. RICHARDSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, June 16.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, June 16.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, June 16.

Mr. OLSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK, for 5 minutes, June 10.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah, for 5 minutes, June 10.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 256. An act to enhance the ability to combat methamphetamine; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce; in addition, to the Committee on the Judiciary for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House reports that on June 9, 2009 she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills.

H.R. 1595. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3245 Latta Road in Rochester, New York, as the "Brian K. Schramm Post Office Building".

H.R. 1284. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 103 West Main Street in McLain, Mississippi, as the "Major Ed W. Freeman Post Office".

H.R. 663. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 12877 Broad Street in Sparta, Georgia, as the "Yvonne Ingram-Ephraim Post Office Building".

H.R. 918. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 300 East 3rd Street in Jamestown, New York, as the "Stan Lundine Post Office Building".

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 10, 2009, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2078. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Longan From Taiwan [Docket No.: APHIS-2007-0161] (RIN: 0579-AC89) received May 20, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2079. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Etoxazole; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0554; FRL-8413-5] received May 27, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2080. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Exemptions from the Requirement of a Tolerance; Technical Amendments [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0923; FRL-8417-9] received May 27, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2081. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's fiscal year 2008 Performance Report for the Animal Drug User Fee Act, enacted on November 18, 2003 (Pub. L. 108-130); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2082. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Mgmt. Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision of the Requirements for Publication of License Revocation [Docket No.: FDA-2009-N-0100] received May 29, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2083. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans: South Carolina; Approval of Section 110(a)(1) Maintenance Plan for the 1997 8-hour ozone standard for Cherokee County [EPA-R04-OAR-2008-0797-200824(a); FRL-8911-5] received May 27, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2084. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Florida; Removal of Gasoline Vapor Recovery from the Southeast Florida Area. [EPA-R04-OAR-2007-0836-200739(f); FRL-8911-6] received May 27, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2085. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Implementation of the New Source Review Program for Particulate Matter Less Than 2.5 Micrometers (PM2.5) [EPA-

HQ-OAR-2003-0062; FRL-8910-6] (RIN: 2060-AN86) received May 27, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2086. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Update of Continuous Instrumental Test Methods; Correction [EPA-HQ-OAR-2002-0071; FRL-8910-5] (RIN: 2060-AP13) received May 27, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2087. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — In the Matter of Amendment of Section 73.622(i), FinalDTV Table of Allotments, Television Broadcast Stations (Derby, Kansas) [MB Docket No.: 09-33 RN-11521] received May 18, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2088. A letter from the Acting Assoc. Gen.

Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, National Protection and Programs Directorate, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2089. A letter from the Staff Director, United States Commission On Civil Rights, transmitting notification that the Commission recently appointed members to the Connecticut Advisory Committee, pursuant to 41 CFR 102-3.70; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2090. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — REGULATIONS GOVERNING FEES FOR SERVICES PERFORMED IN CONNECTION WITH LICENSING AND RELATED SERVICES-2009 UPDATE [STB Ex Parte No. 542 (Sub-No. 16)] received May 29, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Committee on Rules. House Resolution 522. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1886) to authorize democratic, economic, and social development assistance for Pakistan, to authorize security assistance for Pakistan, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2410) to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and the Peace Corps for fiscal years 2010 and 2011, to modernize the Foreign Service, and for other purposes. (Rept. 111-143). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. ISSA, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. POE of Texas):

H.R. 2765. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to prohibit recognition and enforcement of foreign defamation judgments and certain foreign judgments against the providers of interactive computer services; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself, Mr. Hinchey, and Mr. POLIS of Colorado):

H.R. 2766. A bill to repeal the exemption for hydraulic fracturing in the Safe Drinking Water Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GRAVES:

H.R. 2767. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to extend and improve the Small Business Innovation Research Program and the Small Business Technology Transfer Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business, and in addition to the Committee on Science and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WAMP:

H.R. 2768. A bill to declare nuclear energy to be clean energy, for purposes of Federal law; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BRIGHT:

H.R. 2769. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to promote the commercialization of certain small business research and development projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business, and in addition to the Committee on Science and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FILNER (for himself and Mr. BUYER):

H.R. 2770. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to modify and update provisions of law relating to nonprofit research and education corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER (for herself, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MASSA, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah):

H.R. 2771. A bill to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to provide a more equitable process by which the military departments may recover overpayments of military pay and allowances erroneously paid to a member of the Armed Forces when the overpayment is due to no fault of the member, to expand Department discretion regarding remission or cancellation of indebtedness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SCHOCK:

H.R. 2772. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to enhance the Small Business Innovation Research Program and the Small Business Technology Transfer Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business, and in addition to the Committee on Science and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. MASSA):

H.R. 2773. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to cover transitional care services to improve the quality and cost effectiveness of care under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. HALVORSON:

H.R. 2774. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to make permanent the extension of the duration of Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance coverage for totally

disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HIGGINS (for himself, Mr. HINCHY, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Ms. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 2775. A bill to prohibit, as a banned hazardous substance, certain household dish-washing detergent containing phosphorus; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HINOJOSA (for himself, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. EHLERS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ORTIZ, and Mr. SESTAK):

H.R. 2776. A bill to amend the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 and title 5, United States Code, to allow leave for individuals who provide living organ donations; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, and House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HOLT (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. WELCH, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. HINCHY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. QUIGLEY):

H.R. 2777. A bill to include costs incurred by the Indian Health Service, a federally qualified health center, an AIDS drug assistance program, certain hospitals, or a pharmaceutical manufacturer patient assistance program in providing prescription drugs toward the annual out of pocket threshold under part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act and to provide a safe harbor for assistance provided under a pharmaceutical manufacturer patient assistance program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JACKSON of Illinois (for himself and Mr. CUMMINGS):

H.R. 2778. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to redesignate the National Center on Minority Health and Health Disparities as the National Institute for Minority Health and Health Disparities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CROWLEY, and Ms. SCHWARTZ):

H.R. 2779. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide transparency with respect to fees and expenses charged to participant-directed defined contribution plans, and to improve participant communication; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H.R. 2780. A bill to correct and simplify the drafting of section 1752 (relating to restricted buildings or grounds) of title 18, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.R. 2781. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of the Molalla River in Oregon, as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. WALZ (for himself, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. PERRIELLO, Mr. ROSS,

Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. SPACE, Mr. WELCH, Mr. MINNICK, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. SHULER, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. BOSWELL, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. HINOJOSA):

H.R. 2782. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to incorporate regional transportation planning organizations into statewide transportation planning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. WEINER:

H.R. 2783. A bill to amend part D of title IV of the Social Security Act to repeal a fee imposed by States on certain child support collections; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. GOODLATTE, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. COHEN, Mr. FORBES, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. PIERLUISI, and Mr. GONZALEZ):

H. Res. 520. A resolution impeaching Samuel B. Kent, judge of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, for high crimes and misdemeanors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENT (for himself, Ms. ROLEHTINEN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Ms. NORTON, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CAO, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. McHENRY, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. PETRI, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. HONDA, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. KANJORSKI):

H. Res. 521. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the importance of having a census that is complete and accurate; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ROONEY (for himself, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mr. PAUL):

H. Res. 523. A resolution congratulating the Lambda Chi Alpha Fraternity on the occasion of its 100th Anniversary; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. TITUS (for herself, Mr. PLATTS, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. LATTOURETTE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. McGOVERN, Mrs. McCARTHY of New York, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H. Res. 524. A resolution recognizing and supporting the National Day on Writing; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

dustry plays in the American economy and requesting that the United States Congress support legislative efforts to invest in the manufacturing sector, including the domestic auto industry; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

68. Also, a memorial of the State General Assembly of Rhode Island, relative to H. 6026 URGING THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS TO SUPPORT FEDERAL LEGISLATION TO PROTECT AMERICAN HORSES FROM SLAUGHTER FOR HUMAN CONSUMPTION; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

69. Also, a memorial of the State Senate and House of Representatives of Washington, relative to HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 4000 respectfully praying that the United States Congress pass H.R. 5968, the Restoring Partnership for County Health Care Costs Act of 2008; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

70. Also, a memorial of the State Senate and House of Representatives of Washington, relative to SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 8013 respectfully urging the United States Congress to enact legislation to eliminate the 24 month Medicare waiting period for participants in Social Security Disability Insurance; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 22: Mr. REYES, Mr. PAULSEN, and Mrs. MC MORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 28: Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 43: Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 162: Mr. McCOTTER.

H.R. 197: Mr. MATHESON, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, and Mr. RADANOVICH.

H.R. 205: Mr. HOEKSTRA.

H.R. 333: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 393: Mr. MANZULLO.

H.R. 403: Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. SABLON, Ms. LEE of California, and Ms. HIRONO.

H.R. 413: Mr. WELCH, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. ROSKAM, and Mr. DAVIS of Alabama.

H.R. 426: Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 433: Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 442: Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. PENCE, and Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 484: Mr. TERRY, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.

H.R. 503: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina.

H.R. 571: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H.R. 653: Mr. MASSA.

H.R. 658: Mr. ALTMIRE.

H.R. 676: Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 678: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 745: Mr. HIMES and Ms. KOSMAS.

H.R. 816: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 840: Mr. DELAHUNT.

H.R. 878: Mr. CHAFFETZ.

H.R. 930: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.

H.R. 952: Mr. STUPAK, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, and Mr. REYES.

H.R. 997: Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 1016: Mr. SNYDER, Mr. PERRIELLO, and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 1021: Ms. KOSMAS.

H.R. 1064: Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. BACA, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 1067: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 1074: Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 1080: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. SESTAK.

H.R. 1082: Mr. McGOVERN.

- H.R. 1103: Mr. HERGER and Mr. WITTMAN.
 H.R. 1115: Mr. TERRY.
 H.R. 1142: Mr. RAHALL.
 H.R. 1144: Mr. HOLT.
 H.R. 1146: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.R. 1158: Mr. ROSS.
 H.R. 1193: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mrs. CAPPS.
 H.R. 1203: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. NYE, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. CONAWAY.
 H.R. 1204: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
 H.R. 1207: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BONNER, Mr. TONKO, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CHILDEERS, and Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 1221: Mr. OLSON.
 H.R. 1229: Mr. HELLER.
 H.R. 1255: Ms. TSONGAS.
 H.R. 1283: Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. MCMAHON, and Mr. YARMUTH.
 H.R. 1308: Mr. DELAHUNT.
 H.R. 1310: Mr. HARE.
 H.R. 1327: Mr. LATTA and Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.
 H.R. 1346: Mrs. LOWEY.
 H.R. 1362: Mr. INGLESE, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. SNYDER, and Mr. REHBERG.
 H.R. 1392: Mr. ALTMIRE.
 H.R. 1398: Mr. MELANCON, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. FLEMING, and Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN.
 H.R. 1405: Mr. SESTAK and Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 1425: Mr. FARR.
 H.R. 1428: Mr. NYE, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. WOLF.
 H.R. 1441: Mr. GALLEGLY.
 H.R. 1452: Mr. BOSWELL.
 H.R. 1454: Mrs. BACHMANN.
 H.R. 1505: Mr. DRIEHAUS, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. KUCINICH.
 H.R. 1508: Mr. BOUCHER.
 H.R. 1509: Mr. TONKO and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona.
 H.R. 1520: Mr. STARK.
 H.R. 1523: Mr. HODES, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. DELAHUNT.
 H.R. 1528: Mr. MORAN of Virginia and Ms. ESHOO.
 H.R. 1530: Mr. MORAN of Virginia and Ms. ESHOO.
 H.R. 1531: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. MANZULLO.
 H.R. 1548: Mr. PIERLUISI.
 H.R. 1552: Mr. TONKO and Mr. RUSH.
 H.R. 1587: Mr. TERRY.
 H.R. 1600: Mr. SESSIONS and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
 H.R. 1608: Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
 H.R. 1612: Mr. McDERMOTT and Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 1616: Mr. PLATTS, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 1670: Mr. DENT and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.
 H.R. 1685: Mr. SESTAK.
 H.R. 1688: Mr. BOCCIERI and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
 H.R. 1691: Mr. CAO and Mr. SABLAR.
 H.R. 1708: Mr. SPACE and Mr. DELAHUNT.
 H.R. 1724: Mr. TONKO.
 H.R. 1740: Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COLE, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. FORBES, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HERGER, Mr. INGLIS, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. MICA, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. PENCE, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. WATT, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.
 H.R. 1751: Mr. SCHIFF.
 H.R. 1799: Mr. PETERSON.
 H.R. 1826: Mr. FOSTER and Mr. DOGGETT.
 H.R. 1894: Mr. REHBERG and Ms. DELAURO.
 H.R. 1898: Mr. WU and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
 H.R. 1912: Mr. HEINRICH.
 H.R. 1924: Mr. LUJÁN.
 H.R. 1925: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. COHEN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. SPEIER, and Ms. TSONGAS.
 H.R. 1944: Ms. SCHWARTZ.
 H.R. 1956: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
 H.R. 1963: Mr. STARK.
 H.R. 1977: Ms. KOSMAS and Mr. PUTNAM.
 H.R. 1984: Mr. HONDA.
 H.R. 1989: Mr. HINOJOSA.
 H.R. 1993: Mr. HIMES.
 H.R. 2001: Mr. SESTAK.
 H.R. 2004: Mr. DINGELL, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. McCOTTER, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. PETERS, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. SCHAUER, Mr. STUPAK, and Mr. UPTON.
 H.R. 2006: Mr. CROWLEY and Mr. DELAHUNT.
 H.R. 2014: Ms. JENKINS and Mr. WALDEN.
 H.R. 2017: Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
 H.R. 2035: Mr. OLSON.
 H.R. 2058: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida and Mr. LATHAM.
 H.R. 2060: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H.R. 2072: Mr. MANZULLO.
 H.R. 2076: Mr. SABLAR and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
 H.R. 2084: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.R. 2097: Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. MASSA.
 H.R. 2109: Mr. LATHAM, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. ADLER of New Jersey.
 H.R. 2116: Mr. FATTAH.
 H.R. 2123: Mr. COHEN, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. SESTAK, and Mr. PITTS.
 H.R. 2129: Mr. KAGEN.
 H.R. 2149: Mr. LANGEVIN and Mr. TOWNS.
 H.R. 2156: Mr. COHEN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. WU, and Mr. ROSS.
 H.R. 2178: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. STARK.
 H.R. 2195: Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. SESTAK.
 H.R. 2196: Mr. PIERLUISI.
 H.R. 2222: Mr. SESTAK.
 H.R. 2245: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MASSA, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. ALLEXANDER, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. ISSA, Mr. HILL, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. TANNER, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 2254: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. CAO, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
 H.R. 2256: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. BOCCIERI, Mr. ROTHRMAN of New Jersey, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. KIND, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 2269: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 2296: Mr. BOCCIERI, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. MINNICK, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. CHAFFETZ.
 H.R. 2304: Mr. COURTNEY.
 H.R. 2324: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
 H.R. 2329: Mr. SESTAK and Mr. ELLSWORTH.
 H.R. 2332: Mr. MEEKS of New York.
 H.R. 2339: Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. STARK.
 H.R. 2360: Mr. ARCURI.
 H.R. 2373: Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
 H.R. 2390: Mr. SESTAK.
- H.R. 2403: Mr. BOUCHER.
 H.R. 2404: Mr. STARK.
 H.R. 2414: Mr. WELCH, Mr. LATOURRETTE, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
 H.R. 2421: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. INGLIS, Ms. KOSMAS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mrs. LUMMIS, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. PERRIELLO, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. SABLAR, Mr. SCHAUER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Ms. TITUS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. EHLDERS, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. FORBES, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. OLSON, Mr. CULBERSON, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
 H.R. 2452: Mr. PAUL, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, and Mr. BOCCIERI.
 H.R. 2478: Mrs. DAVIS of California and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.R. 2497: Mr. RODRIGUEZ.
 H.R. 2499: Mr. SPRATT, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. FALLIN, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
 H.R. 2502: Mr. HOLT and Mr. MEEK of Florida.
 H.R. 2520: Mr. McCLINTOCK.
 H.R. 2525: Mr. LOEBSACK.
 H.R. 2553: Mr. ROONEY.
 H.R. 2555: Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. HILL, Mr. SIRES, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. DEGETTE.
 H.R. 2560: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
 H.R. 2561: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SESTAK, and Mr. PAULSEN.
 H.R. 2562: Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. GALLEGLY.
 H.R. 2568: Mr. RUSH.
 H.R. 2584: Ms. JENKINS.
 H.R. 2593: Mr. SARBANES, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. FORBES.
 H.R. 2607: Mr. SOUDER and Mr. MANZULLO.
 H.R. 2648: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. LEWIS of California, and Mr. RANGEL.
 H.R. 2662: Mr. BOREN, Mr. HOLT, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. PIERLUISI, and Mr. ISRAEL.
 H.R. 2669: Mr. SIRES and Mr. POLIS of Colorado.
 H.R. 2670: Mr. REHBERG.
 H.R. 2672: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. MINNICK, and Mr. MANZULLO.
 H.R. 2681: Mr. POLIS of Colorado.
 H.R. 2743: Ms. KOSMAS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HARE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. MASSA, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 2750: Mr. LOBIONDO and Mr. GERLACH.
 H.R. 2751: Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. TURNER, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. WELCH, Ms. KOSMAS, Mr. MAFFEI, and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.
 H.R. 2760: Mr. BACA, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GALLEGLY, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ISSA, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS of California, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. McCLINTOCK, Mr. McNERNEY, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. ROHRABACHER,

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. ROYCE, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WAXMAN, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.J. Res. 26: Mr. CONYERS.

H.J. Res. 37: Mr. CALVERT.

H.J. Res. 47: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey and Mr. FORBES.

H.J. Res. 50: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.J. Res. 54: Mr. JORDAN of Ohio, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, and Mr. CHAFFETZ.

H. Con. Res. 49: Mr. PUTNAM, Ms. TITUS, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. KRATOVLIS, Ms. KILROY, Mr. REICHERT, and Mr. FOSTER.

H. Con. Res. 59: Mr. DELAHUNT.

H. Con. Res. 121: Mr. MCINTYRE and Mr. WOLF.

H. Con. Res. 131: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. McKEON, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. WAMP, Mr. McCaul, Mr. CAMP, Mr. PENCE, Mr. LANCE, Mr. OLSON, Mr. BACHUS, and Mr. SIMPSON.

H. Con. Res. 132: Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H. Con. Res. 142: Mr. FREILINGHUYSEN, Mr. SARBAKES, and Mr. HINCHAY.

H. Con. Res. 144: Ms. SUTTON, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. OLVER, Mr. NUNES, and Ms. CLARKE.

H. Con. Res. 145: Mr. RANGEL.

H. Res. 6: Mr. KAGEN, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. SESTAK.

H. Res. 69: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida and Ms. DEGETTE.

H. Res. 89: Mr. SESTAK.

H. Res. 90: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H. Res. 111: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut and Mr. CALVERT.

H. Res. 150: Mr. SESTAK.

H. Res. 156: Mr. CALVERT.

H. Res. 260: Mr. SESTAK, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, and Mr. SPACE.

H. Res. 278: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H. Res. 318: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. TERRY.

H. Res. 346: Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. DOGETT, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. SIRES.

H. Res. 350: Mr. EHLERS, Mr. PLATTS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. McGOVERN.

H. Res. 351: Mr. PERRIELLO, Mr. BOCCERI, and Mr. SHULER.

H. Res. 390: Mr. LAMBORN.

H. Res. 409: Mr. PETERS and Mrs. CAPITO.

H. Res. 411: Mr. McHUGH and Mr. GALLEGLY.

H. Res. 454: Mr. VISCHOSKY.

H. Res. 475: Ms. HIRONO.

H. Res. 476: Mr. CAO, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. PIERLUISI.

H. Res. 479: Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. Sabian, Mr. McKEON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. REYES, Ms. SUTTON, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. DREIER, Mr. BACHUS, Mr.

BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. FORBES.

H. Res. 480: Mr. SESTAK.

H. Res. 482: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. SHULER.

H. Res. 498: Ms. GRANGER, Mr. LUJÁN, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H. Res. 502: Ms. WATERS.

H. Res. 503: Mrs. DAHLKEMPER.

H. Res. 505: Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. HOLT, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. Massa, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H. Res. 507: Mr. SESTAK, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Mr. MURPHY of New York.

H. Res. 515: Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H. Res. 518: Mr. ABERCROMBIE and Mr. MORAN of Kansas.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII.

47. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the American Bar Association, relative to a resolution approving the 2008 Amendments to the Uniform Interstate Family Support Act, promulgated by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws in 2008, as an appropriate Act for those states desiring to adopt the specific substantive law suggested therin; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.