

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5919.

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. ROYBAL-ALLARD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5919.

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.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5522, COMBUSTIBLE DUST EXPLOSION AND FIRE PREVENTION ACT OF 2008

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1157 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1157

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5522) to require the Secretary of Labor to issue interim and final occupational safety and health standards regarding worker exposure to combustible dust, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the

committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. During consideration in the House of H.R. 5522 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROSS). The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

I yield myself such time as I may consume. I also ask unanimous consent that all Members may be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 1157.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 1157 provides for the consideration of H.R. 5522, the Combustible Dust Explosion and Fire Prevention Act of 2008, under a structured rule. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate controlled by the Committee on Education and Labor, and makes in order the committee-reported substitute. It also makes in order two amendments printed in the Rules report, with a manager's amendment debatable for 10 minutes and the Wilson substitute debatable for 30 minutes.

Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying legislation, H.R. 5522, the Worker Protection Against Combustible Dust Explosion and Fire Act of 2008. It directs the Occupational Safety and Health Administration to issue rules regulating combustible industrial dust that can build up to hazardous levels and explode.

Combustible dust has caused deaths and injuries to workers in our Nation, deaths and injuries that could have been prevented. Most recently, everyone can recall the enormous explosion in February at the Imperial Sugar refinery in Savannah, Georgia, which claimed the lives of 13 workers and injured over 60. Many of these workers remain hospitalized today, receiving care for the severe burns they received on that awful day.

While OSHA has marginally improved dust inspection procedures, this legislation goes further to bring combustible dust emissions under control by establishing stronger standards. Included are engineering controls, hazardous inspection, security assessments, housekeeping and explosion protection standards.

□ 1415

Specifically, the Worker Protection Against Combustible Dust Explosion and Fire Act requires OSHA to issue an interim final standard to control the risk of combustible dust explosions. The standard would contain provisions for housekeeping, engineering controls, and worker training.

Mr. Speaker, in 2003, there was a series of similar explosions at various factories due to combustible dust. The U.S. government undertook a study carried out by the Chemical Safety Board to determine the causes and make recommendations to OSHA. That report came out 2 years ago in 2006. OSHA has yet to issue standards to control the risks to workers and companies on the hazards of combustible dust.

For this reason, the bill requires an interim standard to be issued. OSHA would then be required to issue a final standard within 18 months through its regular procedures. OSHA would be required to "include relevant and appropriate provisions of National Fire Protection Association combustible dust standards."

H.R. 5522 would also direct OSHA to explicitly list combustible dusts as a "physical hazard" in the Hazard Communication Standard, which requires employers to train workers about the chemical hazards that they are exposed to.

Mr. Speaker, every worker in this country deserves a safe and healthy work environment. The AFL-CIO, the UAW, the International Association of Firefighters, the American Industrial Hygiene Association, the SEIU, the Teamsters, and the United Food and Commercial Workers Union all strongly support this important legislation.

By establishing stronger protections and safer standards, this legislation better ensures thousands of workers in refineries, mills, and plants from risk of death or injury.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule, and I support the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

On February 7, 2008, a terrible explosion occurred at the Imperial Sugar Company refinery in the community of Port Wentworth, Georgia. The explosion killed 13 people, injured over 40 refinery workers. That explosion at the Imperial Sugar Company refinery pointed to the danger of combustible dust in the workplace. It's a very serious concern, and we must take every possible step to protect workers from those dangers.

The underlying legislation, the Combustible Dust Explosion and Fire Prevention Act, would require OSHA to issue an interim final combustible dust standard within 90 days and a permanent standard within 18 months. It also

lists a specific number of items that would be required under the Interim Final Standard including a written dust control program, hazard assessment, worker training and employee participation in the development and conduct of the dust control program. OSHA would also be required to include combustible dust in the definition of physical hazards in OSHA's Hazard Communication Standard.

It is quite disconcerting, Mr. Speaker, that on an issue as important as workplace safety, the majority is only allowing the House of Representatives to consider one amendment by the minority, one Republican amendment. The majority campaign platform said they would run the House of Representatives in an open and bipartisan manner, yet they systematically and consistently block the minority time and time again from offering amendments.

All Members of this representative institution wish to do the most they can to provide workers a safe working environment, Mr. Speaker. And it is most unfortunate that the majority blocks Members from offering their proposals. Instead of offering such a tightly structured rule, the majority should be allowing every Member the opportunity to offer their thoughts and proposals to the House for consideration.

As important as the underlying legislation may be, I believe there are other issues that are on the minds of Americans at this point that are pressing to Americans: For example, confronting the rising cost of gasoline.

On Monday, hundreds of truckers drove through the streets of this capital city to protest in desperation the rising cost of diesel fuel. They are not the only ones desperate due to the rising oil prices. All consumers are paying more for gasoline, which also causes price increases in virtually every consumer product, including food. A recent policy found that 44 percent of Americans find paying for gasoline to be their top personal economic problem.

Since Democrats took control of Congress in January of last year, the cost of a gallon of unleaded gasoline has skyrocketed. According to AAA, the national average for regular unleaded gas has gone up \$1.20 during that time. The cost of gas has gone up more in 15 months than it had gone up in the prior 6 years.

But oil prices don't have to be so high, Mr. Speaker, because I understand the majority claims to have a plan, a plan to reduce oil prices. Just over 2 years ago, April 2006, now-House Speaker NANCY PELOSI, then the Democrat minority leader, issued a press release claiming that House Democrats, "have a commonsense plan to bring down skyrocketing gas prices." Two weeks after that press release, then-Minority Leader PELOSI said that Democrats have "real solutions" that would lower the price at the pump. That was 2 years ago.

Democrats have controlled Congress for a year and a half, and we have yet to see them act on their "commonsense plan to bring down skyrocketing gas prices."

Instead of empty promises, Republicans are working on providing relief to consumers faced with the constantly rising cost of gasoline. For example, last week, I, along with several of my colleagues, introduced H.R. 5905, the CARS Act, the prime sponsor of which is Congressman MARIO DIAZ-BALART. That legislation would give commuters a tax break on their commuting expenses. That important legislation will actually help taxpayers with the rising cost of gasoline, unlike the majority's "mystery plan," the mystery plan, Mr. Speaker, that we have not yet seen.

At this time, I reserve my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I would ask the gentleman if he has any other speakers.

I will reserve my time and let the gentleman close.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, again, I would like to thank Mr. MCGOVERN for the time. Back in April of 2006, as I just said, over 2 years ago, the now distinguished Speaker, Ms. PELOSI, issued the following statement, "With skyrocketing gas prices, it is clear that the American people can no longer afford the Republican rubberstamp Congress and its failure to stand up to Republican big oil and gas company cronies. Americans this week are paying \$2.91 a gallon on average for regular gasoline, 33 cents higher than last month and double the price than when President Bush first came into office."

Mr. Speaker, most Americans would be happy if they were paying \$2.91 for a gallon of gasoline.

In the same press release, the distinguished Speaker went on to say, "Democrats have a commonsense plan to help bring down skyrocketing gas prices."

Well, while I hear they have a plan, I haven't seen the mystery plan, Mr. Speaker. Instead, while we wait for the majority to act, the cost of fuel continues to rise with the average cost of a gallon of gasoline now being over \$3.60, hitting consumers at the pump every time they go to fill up their cars, reinforcing the fact that the majority has yet to confront the high price of gasoline.

Today, Investor's Business Daily in an editorial said that this Congress is "possibly the most irresponsible in modern history. This is especially true when it comes to America's dysfunctional energy policy."

Mr. Speaker, I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that editorial from Investor's Business Daily.

[From Investor's Business Daily, Apr. 30, 2008]

CONGRESS VS. YOU

We've said it before, but we'll say it again: This Congress is possibly the most irresponsible in modern history. This is especially

true when it comes to America's dysfunctional energy policy.

The media won't call either the House or the Senate on its failures, for one very obvious reason: They mostly share an ideology with the Democrats that keeps them from understanding how free markets and supply and demand really work. Sad, but true.

So we were happy to hear the president do the job, calling out Congress for its inaction and ignorance in his wide-ranging press conference Tuesday.

"Many Americans are understandably anxious about issues affecting their pocketbook, from gas and food prices to mortgage and tuition bills," Bush said. "They're looking to their elected leaders in Congress for action. Unfortunately, on many of these issues, all they're getting is delay."

Best of all, Bush didn't let the issue sit with just generalities. He reeled off a bill of particulars of congressional energy inaction, including:

Failing to allow drilling in ANWR. We have, as Bush noted, estimated capacity of a million barrels of oil a day from this source alone—enough for 27 million gallons of gas and diesel. But Congress won't touch it, fearful of the clout of the environmental lobby. As a result, you pay at the pump so your representative can raise campaign cash.

Refusing to build new refineries. The U.S. hasn't built one since 1976, yet sanctions at least 15 unique "boutique" fuel blends around the nation. So even the slightest problem at a refinery causes enormous supply problems and price spikes. Congress has done nothing about this.

Turning its back on nuclear power. It's safe and, with advances in nuclear reprocessing technology, waste problems have been minimized. Still, we have just 104 nuclear plants—the same as a decade ago—producing just 19% of our total energy. (Many European nations produce 40% or more of their power with nuclear.) Granted, nuclear power plants are expensive—about \$3 billion each. But they produce energy at \$1.72/kilowatt-hour vs. \$2.37 for coal and \$6.35 for natural gas.

Raising taxes on energy producers. This is where a basic understanding of economics would help: Higher taxes and needless regulation lead to less production of a commodity. So by proposing "windfall" and other taxes on energy companies plus tough new rules, Congress makes our energy situation worse.

These are just a few of Congress' sins of omission—all while India, China, Eastern Europe and the Middle East add more than a million barrels of new demand each and every year. New Energy Department forecasts see world oil demand growing 40% by 2030, including a 28% increase in the U.S.

Americans who are worried about the direction of their country, including runaway energy and food prices, should keep in mind the upcoming election isn't just about choosing a new president. We'll also pick a new Congress.

The current Congress, led on the House side by a speaker who promised a "common sense plan" to cut energy prices two years ago, has shown itself to be incompetent and irresponsible. It doesn't deserve re-election.

Today, I will be asking my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question for this rule, Mr. Speaker. If the previous question is defeated, I will amend the rule to make it in order for the House to consider any amendment that would actually do something to reduce gas prices for consumers, such as H.R. 5905, the CARS Act, which would give

commuters a tax break on their commuting expenses and actually help alleviate the price of energy for the consumer. It will also give the majority the chance to introduce, Mr. Speaker, the "mystery plan" that they claim to have.

By voting "no" on the previous question, Members can take a stand against these high fuel prices and demand that the majority act on their plan. The majority said they had a plan. Let's see the mystery plan, Mr. Speaker. Let's see the mystery plan.

I encourage a "no" vote on the previous question.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me remind my colleagues that the underlying bill that we are dealing with is a bill that would actually protect workers in the workplace, the Combustible Dust Explosion and Fire Prevention Act of 2008, and it's a bill that responds to a terrible tragedy that has killed a number of workers and injured a number of workers. We need to pass this bill, and I hope we will pass the rule and pass the underlying bill.

But I have to say, Mr. Speaker, it is almost laughable to hear a member of the minority get up and talk about energy prices. The Republicans have controlled the White House for 8 years. They controlled the Congress for 12 years, and we have seen energy costs rise and rise under their leadership; and we have seen their policy, which is to give more subsidies and more tax breaks to Big Oil, and they have fought us consistently in trying to invest resources into alternative sources of energy, into forms of energy to help make us more independent from foreign oil.

Speaker PELOSI called on President Bush to suspend purchases of oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve temporarily. You know, filling the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, Mr. Speaker, takes 70,000 barrels of oil off the market each day even though the reserve is 97 percent full with enough to meet our national security needs. That's a good idea. Republicans opposed that.

At a time of record gas prices, suspending these government purchases, as we have done in the past, could reduce gas prices by 5 to 24 cents a gallon, a critical first step for America's families, businesses and the economy.

For years, Mr. Speaker, Democrats fought to reduce our dependence on foreign oil and bring down gas prices and launch a cleaner, smarter energy future for America. Yet with Republican obstructionism, American consumers and businesses have had more pain at the pump paying a record \$3.56 a gallon.

President Bush and congressional Republicans have spent all of their time in power doling out billions and billions and billions of dollars in subsidies to big oil companies instead of working for energy independence plans for America.

We have had a number of important pieces of legislation that we have

brought to the floor such as H.R. 1252, the Federal Price Gouging Prevention Act, to crack down on gas price gouging, something that is a reality in this market.

□ 1430

It was opposed by 140 Republicans.

We had a bill, H.R. 2264, the No Oil Producing and Exporting Cartels Act, to hold OPEC accountable for oil price fixing. That was opposed by 67 Republicans, including almost the entire Republican leadership.

We have had a bill to repeal the subsidies to profit-rich big oil companies and invest in renewable energy, which was H.R. 5351, the Renewable Energy and Energy Conservation Tax Act of 2008. It passed on February 27, 236-182. One hundred seventy-four Republicans opposed that, including the President of the United States. Now, get this, Mr. Speaker, the Republicans have opposed a measure that would take away the taxpayer-funded subsidies from the five biggest oil companies in this country that are making record profits, historic profits, it would take those subsidies and put it into renewable energy to help us become more energy independent, and they opposed it, and the President said he would veto it. And they have stopped progress on that measure.

They opposed the Energy Independence and Security Act, which would be an energy independence law with a market manipulation ban and new vehicle mileage standards. Again, the majority of the Republicans stood up and opposed these commonsense measures to help us become more energy independent and to help bring these gas prices down.

So their record is clear. It has been one of obstructionism. And it has been a record that has always been in the corner of Big Oil and against investing properly in some of these new technologies.

So President Bush and the Republicans have blocked our efforts virtually every step of the way. I hope that that will change after the next election. I expect that will change after the next election. But it is time for the Republicans to change their habit of saying "no" to consumers and American business on gas prices and always saying "yes" to Big Oil.

Enough is enough. It is time for House Republicans to provide the critical votes needed for a veto-proof majority for the legislation that I have outlined here today.

Americans are paying a heavy price for the obstructionism of the Republicans in this Congress and the President of the United States. They don't want to give any more taxpayer subsidies to the big oil companies. They want us to redirect those resources into commonsense, clean, renewable, alternative sources of energy. If we do that, Mr. Speaker, then we will get these gas prices under control, and we will also take a big step forward in cleaning up our environment.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would urge a "yes" vote on the previous question and on the rule.

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1157 OFFERED BY MR. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALARAT OF FLORIDA

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution or the operation of the previous question, it shall be in order to consider any amendment to the substitute which the proponent asserts, if enacted, would have the effect of lowering the national average price per gallon of regular unleaded gasoline. Such amendments shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for thirty minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived except those arising under clause 9 of rule XXI.

SEC. 4. Within five legislative days the Speaker shall introduce a bill, the title of which is as follows: "A bill to provide a common sense plan to help bring down skyrocketing gas prices." Such bill shall be referred to the appropriate committees of jurisdiction pursuant to clause 1 of rule X.

(The information contained herein was provided by Democratic Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 109th Congress.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Democratic majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's *Precedents of the House of Representatives*, (VI, 308-311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

Because the vote today may look bad for the Democratic majority they will say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the definition of the previous question used in the *Floor Procedures Manual* published by the Rules Committee in the 109th Congress, (page 56). Here's how the Rules Committee described the rule using information from Congressional Quarterly's "American Congressional Dictionary": "If the previous

question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business."

Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Democratic majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

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

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. 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, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

COMMENDING THE KANSAS JAYHAWKS FOR WINNING THE 2008 NCAA MEN'S BASKETBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1096) commending the University of Kansas Jayhawks for winning the 2008 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I basketball championship.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1096

Whereas on April 7, 2008, the University of Kansas Jayhawks defeated the University of Memphis Tigers 75-68 in the final game of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division I Men's Basketball Tournament in San Antonio, Texas, on the 20th anniversary of the historic win by the team led by Danny Manning, known as "Danny and the Miracles";

Whereas the Jayhawks now hold 5 men's basketball national titles, including 3 NCAA men's basketball championships;

Whereas with this win, the Jayhawks achieved a school record for all-time season wins, posting a 37-3 record during their run for the title, and finished the season with a 13-game winning streak, securing the Big XII Conference Championship title after starting the season with a 20-game undefeated record,

in addition to the 2008 NCAA Division I men's basketball crown;

Whereas Kansas head coach Bill Self won his first NCAA title and improved his all-time record at Kansas to 142-32;

Whereas Kansas guard Mario Chalmers was chosen as the Most Outstanding Player of the Final Four, and was named to the NCAA Final Four All-Tournament Team, along with guard Brandon Rush and forward Darrell Arthur;

Whereas Kansas seniors Jeremy Case, Darnell Jackson, Sasha Kaun, Russell Robinson, Rodrick Stewart, and Brad Witherspoon ended their collegiate careers with a national championship;

Whereas the roster of the Kansas Jayhawks also included juniors Brennan Bechard and Matt Kleinmann; sophomores Sherron Collins and Brady Morningstar; and freshmen Cole Aldrich, Chase Buford, Tyrel Reed, and Conner Teahan;

Whereas the Jayhawks' student-athletes, coaches, staff, and others associated with the team continue to represent the University of Kansas and the State of Kansas with exemplary sportsmanship, and deserve praise and credit for their efforts and their dedication to the common goal of winning the NCAA men's basketball championship;

Whereas the students at the University of Kansas, Jayhawk fans, and members of the Lawrence, Kansas, community showed tremendous class in their celebration of the Jayhawks' historic win; and

Whereas the families of the student-athletes, students, alumni, and faculty of the University of Kansas, and all the supporters of the University of Kansas, are to be congratulated for their commitment to, and pride in, the basketball program at the University: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) commends the University of Kansas men's basketball team for winning the 2008 National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division I basketball championship;

(2) recognizes the achievements of all the student-athletes, coaches, and support staff who were instrumental in helping the University of Kansas men's basketball team win its 3rd NCAA Division I basketball championship and 5th national championship; and

(3) respectfully requests the Clerk of the House of Representatives to transmit a copy of this resolution to—

(A) the University of Kansas for appropriate display;

(B) Robert Hemenway, the Chancellor of the University of Kansas;

(C) Lew Perkins, the Athletic Director of the University of Kansas; and

(D) Bill Self, the Head Coach of the University of Kansas men's basketball team.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert relevant material to H. Res. 1096 into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, all of us know of the tremendous importance of the game of basketball to the United States of America and all that it provides for all of us in terms of the thrills everybody shares when they're watching their favorite team.

I rise to congratulate the University of Kansas Jayhawks for their win in the 2008 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I men's basketball tournament.

On April 7, 2008, the University of Kansas won their fifth men's national basketball title by defeating the University of Memphis Tigers. College basketball fans and players were treated to an exciting national championship game, with victory coming to the Jayhawks after an amazing effort which pushed the game into overtime.

I want to extend congratulations to Head Coach Bill Self, Athletic Director Lew Perkins, University of Kansas Chancellor Robert Hemingway, and Kansas' student athletes on an excellent season. While securing their first national title in 20 years, the Jayhawks also won the Big 12 Conference championship title. The Jayhawks also set a school record for all-time season wins with a 37-3 record.

I also wish to extend congratulations to the University of Memphis Tigers and their student athletes for a great season. The Tigers' loss in the finals was only their second loss of the season. Memphis also won Conference USA with a perfect 16-0 record.

Winning the 2008 national championship has brought national attention and acclaim to the University of Kansas' outstanding basketball program. I know that the fans of this university will remember this very special moment for many years to come.

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 1096, commending the University of Kansas Jayhawks for winning the 2008 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I basketball championship.

On April 7 of this year, trailing 60-51 with just 2:12 left in regulation, the University of Kansas Jayhawks mounted a comeback that will go down as one of the most memorable in NCAA history. In overtime, the Jayhawks defeated Memphis 75-68 to win the national championship, its fifth national title in school history. With this win, the Jayhawks achieved a school record for all-time season wins, posting a 37-3 record during their run for the title. The Jayhawks finished the season with a 13-game winning streak, securing the Big 12 Conference championship in addition to the national title.

Jayhawks guard Mario Chalmers was chosen as the Most Outstanding Player of the Final Four and was named to the NCAA Final Four All-Tournament Team along with guard Brandon Rush and forward Darrell Arthur. Seniors