

They worked in fields picking cotton, tobacco and crops just as the slaves.

Caribbean immigrants have been contributing to the well-being of American society since its founding. Alexander Hamilton, the First Secretary of the Treasury was from the Caribbean island of St. Kitts. We count among our famous sons and daughters, Secretary of State Colin Powell, Cicely Tyson, W.E.B. Dubois, James Weldon Johnson, Harry Belafonte and Sidney Poitier to name a few.

H. Con. Res. 127 recognizes the significance of Caribbean people and their descendants in the history and culture of the United States. Our nation would not be what it is today without these significant contributions of the Caribbean people and we should honor these accomplishments with the passing of this legislation. The contributions of Caribbean-Americans are a significant part of the history, progress, and heritage of the United States and play an important role in shaping the ethnic and racial diversity of the United States, which ultimately enriches and strengthens our nation.

By passing this legislation we continue to honor the friendship between the United States and Caribbean countries. We are united by our common values and shared history, and we should celebrate the rich Caribbean Heritage and the many ways in which Caribbean Americans have helped shape this nation.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution to pay tribute to the common culture and bonds of friendship that unite the United States and the Caribbean countries.

AMERICAN CLEAN ENERGY AND SECURITY ACT OF 2009

SPEECH OF

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 26, 2009

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, today, as we discuss comprehensive energy and climate legislation, our focus is on how we can lower the carbon footprint of electricity generation.

As we move to a clean energy future, however, the country still needs to make progress in reducing sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides, and mercury emissions, air pollutants that cause acid rain, ground-level ozone, particulate matter pollution, and mercury contamination.

In developing their strategies to reduce carbon dioxide, electricity generators will still need to take into account the need to reduce emissions of these conventional air pollutants.

For many years, Congressman McHUGH has worked to tackle the problems created by emissions of such pollutants. In particular, he has shown great leadership in his work to address acid rain and mercury pollution from power plants, as demonstrated by his bill H.R. 1841, the findings of which persuasively demonstrate the case for a strong control program for sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides and mercury emissions from power plants.

Putting in place strategies to reduce carbon dioxide emissions will also help address these problems. Mr. McHUGH's amendment to the American Clean Energy and Security Act does important work by making this link explicit.

It directs EPA to study what effects strategies and technologies that will reduce emis-

sions of carbon dioxide will have on emissions of conventional pollutants like SO_x, NO_x, and mercury.

Further understanding of this interaction between carbon control strategies and the reduction of criteria pollutants will be of clear benefit to policymakers, air quality planners, and the power sector.

Adopting approaches that reduce both types of pollutants would represent a major step forward towards cleaner coal use, and Mr. McHUGH's amendment will result in important information on what we know now, and what steps should be taken next, in order to achieve this objective.

I also wish to address the purpose of the intellectual property protection provisions in Title IV, Subtitle D, which are to ensure that funding for international climate change mitigation promotes robust compliance with and enforcement of intellectual property rights for clean technology. The intent of the provisions is to safeguard intellectual property rights in order to support investment in the research and development necessary to design and deploy new technologies. For the purposes of this section, clean technologies are any technologies or services relating to the qualifying activities enumerated in section 445.

Section 446 would prohibit bilateral assistance for the benefit of qualifying activities that would undermine compliance with and enforcement of intellectual property rights for clean technology as provided in the World Trade Organization's Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) and applicable bilateral Free Trade Agreements. With regard to multilateral assistance, the provision directs the President to seek to ensure that any climate change mitigation assistance disbursed through a multilateral framework not be permitted for any activity that on its own or in connection to a related activity would undermine intellectual property rights for clean technology, as provided in TRIPS. The objective is to prevent funds from being spent to support the export of a technology where the underlying patent or other intellectual property rights would be undermined as a result of the project. The objective is also to ensure that decisions about individual projects also scrutinize whether related activities have undermined intellectual property rights for clean technology. For example, a funding decision for a project involving the export of wind technology should take into account whether there is a history of intellectual property violations in similar projects involving solar energy technology or technology to support capture and sequestration of carbon dioxide emissions.

An annual assessment of compliance with and enforcement of intellectual property rights would be made by the interagency group established in section 443.

Madam Speaker, I also wish to address some unwarranted concerns that have been raised by misreadings of provisions in H.R. 2454.

In new Section 811 of the Clean Air Act, the Administrator is required to publish an inventory of categories of stationary sources that includes each source category that is responsible for at least 10 percent of the uncapped methane emissions in 2005. The provision goes on to provide that the inventory shall not include sources of enteric fermentation. Thus, emissions from enteric fermentation shall be

included in the calculation of uncapped methane emissions in 2005, but enteric fermentation shall be not listed as a source category on the inventory.

I would also like to clear up some confusion on the covered entity definition in new section 700(13)(C) of the Clean Air Act. Under this provision, an entity that produces or imports any of the specified greenhouse gases for sale or distribution in interstate commerce in the specified amount is a covered entity. It has been suggested that somehow this provision might be interpreted so that beef producers would be covered because they produce beef for sale or distribution in interstate commerce because, in the production of beef, they produce manure as a byproduct that is not intended for sale or distribution in interstate commerce. This would be an impermissible reading of section 700(13)(C).

In addition, I would like to clarify that, contrary to claims made by the opponents of the building efficiency provisions, the building labeling provisions of Section 204 establish a voluntary program and are not mandatory requirements. This program is voluntary for the states to choose to implement once EPA produces a prototype label, and it is voluntary for building owners to utilize subject to state policy. Its sole purpose is to provide information to consumers about building energy performance. It is also limited to new construction. There is nothing in the bill, and never has been, that would provide a basis for assertions that homeowners would be required to pay for an expensive audit and upgrades to a home before being allowed to sell it.

I know that those outdoor lighting manufacturers, efficiency groups, and lighting consumer interests who are involved in the ongoing negotiations to reach new consensus efficiency standards for outdoor lighting may be concerned about amendments to the bill's language with regard to those standards. Their efforts provided the basis for the outdoor lighting provisions in the legislation as introduced, and I remain supportive of their ongoing negotiations. It's my hope and expectation that their process will yield a negotiated standard with as much consensus as possible that will deliver substantial energy savings from outdoor lighting products on a realistic schedule. Such a result could be very influential as Congress continues to consider this matter.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT, H.R. 2647

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 2009

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chair, amendment 106 to the Defense Authorization Act, H.R. 2647, requires a justification for the use of factors other than cost or price as predominant factors in evaluating competitive proposals for defense procurement contracts. The intent of this provision is to mandate that officials of the Department of Defense weight cost or price as the predominant factor in solicitations for defense procurement contracts, with only occasional and well-justified exceptions.

This amendment requires quantification of the relative weight of evaluation factors in the evaluation scheme, insofar as this is necessary to ensure compliance with the amendment.

The purposes of this amendment are two-fold. First, the use of cost or price as the predominant evaluation factor will result more frequently in the selection of the low-cost or a lower-cost offeror, which will save the Government money. Second, the use of cost or price as the predominant evaluation factor will encourage and incentivize offerors to submit "lean" proposals that will save the Government money.

Defense Secretary Robert Gates recently criticized military systems that "have grown ever more baroque, have become ever more costly, are taking longer to build, and are being fielded in ever-dwindling quantities." This amendment combats that trend.

Another recent reminder of the risk of "gold plating" comes from the "Marine One" Presidential helicopter procurement program. It would be difficult to identify any commercial helicopter that costs as much as \$40 million, but the VH-71 helicopters being purchased are likely to cost ten times that much. This is more than the cost of the Boeing 747s employed in the "Air Force One" program, even when that cost is adjusted for inflation.

Agencies may avoid the use of cost or price as predominant factors in solicitations only if the procurement officer or agency head determines that employing cost or price as predominant factors would—

(1) Materially increase the risk of failure of the mission or missions in which the item being procured will be employed, in an ascertainable manner specific to the mission or missions involved;

(2) Demonstrably threaten the safety or health of members of the Armed Forces or persons in their custody or care;

(3) Result in foreseeable and quantifiable additional defense expenditures outside the context of the procurement at hand that exceed any savings expected from employing cost or price as predominant factors;

(4) Deprive the Government of post-performance rights or property, such as warranties or intellectual property, the quantifiable value of which exceeds any savings expected from employing cost or price as predominant factors; or

(5) Violate an international agreement.

Justifications that are not satisfactory include:

(1) Preexisting law, other than international agreements;

(2) A generalized preference for quality, reliability, experience or high performance;

(3) Evolving technical requirements;

(4) Concerns about contractor responsibility; and

(5) Any other reason not enumerated as a valid justification above.

The justification required by this provision generally should follow the same procedures as the justifications required for other than full and open competition, as currently set forth in Federal Acquisition Regulation sections 6.303 and 6.304. In all cases in which extrinsic sav-

ings or risks are the justification, they shall be described in detail, with a description of how they were derived.

PROVIDING FOR ENGRAVEMENTS IN CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER

SPEECH OF

HON. MICHAEL R. TURNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 7, 2009

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I am a cosponsor of H. Con. Res. 131 which directs the Architect of the Capitol to engrave the National Motto, "In God We Trust," and the Pledge of Allegiance in the U.S. Capitol Visitor Center.

Over one million visitors have passed through the new U.S. Capitol Visitor Center since it was opened in December 2008. The new Visitor Center is more than just a pathway to the 200-year-old Capitol. It is also a museum and classroom. In it you will find historic documents, including the patent drawing for the Wright Brothers' Flying Machine.

The Visitor Center is a magnificent addition to the Capitol, but it is incomplete without our National Motto, "In God We Trust," as well as the Pledge of Allegiance. This resolution will ensure that these important words are given appropriate recognition.

Our national reverence to God is fundamental in our history. Our National Motto and the Pledge of Allegiance both mention God. Yet, there have been attempts, including a 9th Circuit Court of Appeals decision in 2002, to remove references to "God" from government.

In 2007, I joined in a successful effort to reverse one such prohibition. When a 17-year-old Eagle Scout from Dayton, Ohio, wanted to honor his grandfather's "dedication and love of God, Country, and family" with a flag flown over the U.S. Capitol, the Architect of the Capitol censored the word "God" from the flag certificate. I strongly objected and introduced legislation to permanently allow religious references on Capitol flag certificates. The Architect of the Capitol later reversed his position and restored the reference to God on the flag certificate.

It's important that America's traditions, religious freedom and freedom of expression be promoted and protected. I support this resolution and urge its adoption.

PROVIDING FOR DESIGN OF SLAVE LABOR MARKER IN CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 7, 2009

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I speak in strong support of H. Con.

Res. 135, and thank my colleague Congressman JOHN LEWIS, for authoring this important resolution which designates a marker in Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center to acknowledge the role that slave labor played in the construction of the United States Capitol. We have already taken the first step in recognizing the slave labor that was used to construct this great Capitol building, by naming the hall Emancipation Hall. Now, we must complete our promise by educating visitors to the Capitol about the enslaved African-Americans who worked tirelessly to build the Capitol.

According to records, local farmers rented out their slaves for an average of \$55 a year to help build the Capitol. While this may not seem like a lot of money today, the physical, mental and emotional cost this backbreaking work had on the slaves cannot be overlooked. Slaves cut trees on the hill where the Capitol would stand, cleared stumps from the new streets, worked in the stone quarries where sandstone was cut and assisted the masons laying stone for the walls of the new homes of Congress and the president.

It is estimated that over 400 slaves were used to perform the backbreaking work of quarrying the stone which comprised many of the floors, walls, and columns of the Capitol. Enslaved African-Americans also participated in other facets of construction of the Capitol, including carpentry, masonry, carting, rafting, roofing, plastering, glazing, painting, and sawing.

We have already taken steps to acknowledge the role slaves played in building the Capitol; now we must place a marker in Emancipation Hall so that all visitors to the Capitol Visitor's Center are aware of struggles and contributions of our ancestors to helping establish one of the most fundamental institutions of our great country.

Approximately 4 million Africans and their descendants were enslaved in the United States and the colonies that became the United States between 1619 and 1865. I know that many would think it a non-issue to address the events of over 135 years ago, but the scars from over 400 years of slavery in this nation still ache for a balm that is sufficient to the injury to the minds of this nation's people. After slavery there were still many difficult journeys for former slaves to overcome. Placing this marker in the Capitol allows us to give a voice to those slaves who were never heard and to tell their story.

I thank Congressman LEWIS from Georgia for your leadership in sponsoring this important legislation. I know that you are a firm believer in our nation and that we as a nation should recognize and take great pride in the contribution of all Americans to the creation of this great nation.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bill.