

Gingrey (GA)	Luetkemeyer	Radanovich
Goodlatte	Lummis	Rogers (AL)
Granger	Lungren, Daniel	Rohrabacher
Graves	E.	Roskam
Hall (TX)	Mack	Royce
Harper	Manzullo	Ryan (WI)
Hastings (WA)	Marchant	Scalise
Hensarling	McCarthy (CA)	Schmidt
Herger	McCaul	Sensenbrenner
Hoekstra	McClintock	Sessions
Hunter	McHenry	Shadegg
Inglis	Mica	Shuster
Issa	Miller (FL)	Smith (NE)
Jenkins	Moran (KS)	Smith (TX)
Johnson, Sam	Myrick	Stearns
Jones	Neugebauer	Thornberry
Jordan (OH)	Nunes	Tiahrt
King (IA)	Paul	Wamp
Kingston	Pence	Westmoreland
Kline (MN)	Pitts	Whitfield
Lamborn	Poe (TX)	Wilson (SC)
Latta	Posey	
Linder	Price (GA)	

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

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. POLIS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-40) on the resolution (H. Res. 257) providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

add no safety benefits or protections to consumers. These forced changes will result in higher prices for vitamins and minerals many Americans rely on to maintain a healthy diet and lifestyle.

In December of 2006, the Dietary Supplement and Nonprescription Drug Consumer Protection Act was passed into law. The law requires mandatory reporting of serious adverse events. That is a good thing. But the FDA has now mandated label changes which they're only giving the industry 1 year to comply with. Industry will make the required changes in their labels, but forcing them to do so in less than 9 months is not the answer.

Keep in mind, however, the law underlying this guidance did not require any label changes. It was the FDA's decision, independent of legislation, to force these changes on supplement producers. And what is the price tag for these required changes? According to the FDA's own documents, compliance would exceed \$220 million. Not a small amount in today's business environment.

Clearly, now is not the time for our government to find ways to needlessly increase costs for consumers, especially when these mandates provide no added benefits or protections for consumers.

NOT VOTING—6

Boustany	Hinchev	Oison
Gohmert	Miller, Gary	Sanchez, Loretta

AIG'S EXECUTIVE BONUSES

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my deep outrage over AIG using \$165 million in government funding to pay top executive bonuses.

The company, for all intents and purposes, is bankrupt and has been bailed out by taxpayer dollars, and the fact that these bonuses could have gone forward simply defies logic.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend Chairman FRANK and Chairman KANJORSKI for presiding over today's hearing on AIG and for their continued oversight to make sure that taxpayer funds are being used responsibly to get our economy back on track.

While I was pleased to hear that Edward Liddy said that he would try to recoup the bonuses from his employees, I remain furious at how and why AIG chose to reward complete incompetence with taxpayer money. AIG executives must be held more accountable for their decision and may need to pay for mismanagement with their jobs. That is why I joined over 90 of my colleagues in sending a letter to Secretary Geithner demanding a full accounting of the use of taxpayer money at AIG and to block these bonuses and why I support legislation to ensure that taxpayers receive a full refund.

At this time of great uncertainty and instability in our Nation, the public deserves more from AIG and from us, their elected officials, who are entrusted to make responsible decisions on their behalf.

FDA ADVERSE EVENT REPORTING LABELING CHANGES

(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, Americans are concerned not only about the safety of their food but their ability to put food on their tables. So it makes no sense that the Food and Drug Administration has mandated change to dietary supplement labels which will

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining to record their vote.

□ 1639

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 1388, GENERATIONS INVIGORATING VOLUNTEERISM AND EDUCATION ACT

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections in the engrossment of H.R. 1388, to include corrections in spelling, punctuation, section numbering, cross-referencing, and the insertion of appropriate headings, and that the Clerk make the correction that I have placed at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DRIEHAUS). The Clerk will report the correction.

The Clerk read as follows:

In section 1306 of the bill, strike the close quotation mark and following period after the matter proposed to be inserted by such section, and insert at the end of such section the following:

“(m) NO MATCHING FUNDS REQUIREMENT FOR SEVERELY ECONOMICALLY DISTRESSED COMMUNITIES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a severely economically distressed community that receives assistance from the Corporation for any program under the national service laws shall not be subject to any requirement to provide matching funds for any such program, and the Federal share of such assistance for such a community may be 100 percent.”

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (during the reading). I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1645

THE FIGHTING TIGERS OF MISSOURI

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

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, if you listen very closely, very closely, you can hear it. It's the sound of Tigers roaring from their den at the University of Missouri-Columbia, deep in the heart of the Ninth Congressional District.

For those of you who haven't heard, the Fighting Tigers of Mizzou were unleashed upon their unsuspecting Big 12 prey and earned MU's first league championship in 16 years and first Big 12 Basketball Championship this past weekend.

I want to congratulate Coach Anderson and the 2009 Missouri Tigers for a regular season to remember. I also want to recognize the best defense in the country for offering their opponents “40 Minutes of Hell.”

But these Tigers are still hungry. And as the No. 3 seed in the West Regional, they are seeking new prey, beginning with Cornell this Friday. Mr. Speaker, I'm not a betting man, but something tells me that the Tigers will roar when they hit the floor, knocking down that national championship door. Go Tigers.

CAP-AND-TRADE ENERGY TAX

(Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, let me quote from a meeting with the editorial board at the San Francisco Chronicle that then-candidate Barack Obama had in January of 2008. He said, "under my plan of a cap-and-trade system, electricity rates would necessarily skyrocket. This will cost money. They will pass that money on to consumers."

Well, ladies and gentlemen, unfortunately, the President's cap-and-trade plan, or as many people call it, the cap-and-tax plan, does exactly that.

There was a recent study conducted by MIT, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and it was able to assess the fact that a total energy bill for the average household will increase over \$3,000. As a matter of fact, it will be up by \$3,128 per year. According to CBO testimony, those figures actually will relate.

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.

ON THIS SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF WAR, LET US WORK FOR PEACE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, in 2 days, we will mark the sixth anniversary of America's invasion and occupation of Iraq. When President Bush announced the start of the conflict on the night of March 20, 2003, he said that America must go to war against a regime "that threatens the peace with weapons of mass murder." Of course, Mr. Speaker, we know that those weapons did not exist and that the war should never have been fought. But today, I don't want to go back, and I don't want to revisit all the many mistakes of the past. Instead, I want to use this time to remember the literally millions of men, women and children from the United States of America, from Iraq and from the many other countries whose lives have been shattered over the past 6 years.

These include those who died, the wounded, the veterans, the refugees, the orphans, the widows and the many other family members who are left to mourn and to struggle. We have a great responsibility in this House of Representatives to honor and to give meaning to their sacrifice. I believe the best way to do that is by committing ourselves to work for peace so that war becomes a thing of the past.

On this sixth anniversary, Mr. Speaker, this anniversary of the occupation, we have more reason to hope for peace than on the previous five. That is because we have a new leader in the White House, one who has already taken some very positive steps. Presi-

dent Obama is committed to diplomacy, not war, and the most important tool of American foreign policy. He has banned the use of torture. He is closing the notorious prison at Guantanamo Bay. And he has announced a plan to remove all combat troops from Iraq. But Mr. Speaker, there is much more that we need to do.

The Iraq withdrawal plan will leave 50,000 troops behind to continue the occupation. That is unacceptable. All troops and military contractors must come home by August 2010, at the latest. In Afghanistan, the administration is planning to double down on our military involvement. But, Mr. Speaker, there is no military solution to the situation in Afghanistan. That is why I have joined my colleagues, BARBARA LEE and MAXINE WATERS, in asking the President to establish a timeline for the redeployment of our troops out of Afghanistan. We have also called for a plan to assist the Afghan people, because we cannot defeat the Taliban with bombs and bullets. We can only defeat the Taliban by helping the Afghan people to meet their desperate needs for schools, for roads and for economic development.

But we need to do more than just solve problems as they arise. We need to be proactive. We need to have a comprehensive strategy for keeping the peace. Let me suggest two ways to achieve that goal. First, I believe this is a good time to renew Congressman KUCINICH's calls for the establishment of a Cabinet-level Department of Peace so we can work full-time to analyze international problems and advise the President on strategies to prevent war and to peacefully resolve conflicts around the world. The President of the United States has never had the advantage of such advice. I believe it is high time that he did.

Second, I believe that this is a good time to renew our proposal for a smart national security plan. "Smart" is based on a simple idea: War is an outdated concept. That is why my smart plan keeps Americans safe through strong global alliances and better intelligence, as opposed to pre-emptive military strikes. Smart also calls for the United States to support nuclear nonproliferation, and it includes an ambitious humanitarian development agenda to end the hopelessness and oppression that lead to war and terrorism in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, after these many years of violence, one thing is clear. The American people have had enough war. They are seeking a better way to make the world safe for their children and grandchildren. So let us resolve in the honor of those who suffer because of a mistaken occupation 6 years ago to do everything we can to avoid the mistakes of the past and lay the foundation for a peaceful future.

That is the best way to honor those who were caught up in the chaos of Iraq. And it is the best way to turn the tragedy of this sixth anniversary into a

time of hope for the people of the world.

REDESIGNATING THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY AS THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY & MARINE CORPS

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

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues in the House, from both parties, for joining me as cosponsors of H.R. 24, legislation to redesignate the Department of the Navy to be the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps. As of today, this legislation has 100 cosponsors.

Mr. Speaker, this is the right thing for the Congress to do. For the past 7 years, the language of this bill has been part of the House version of the National Defense Authorization Act. And this year, I'm grateful to have the support of Senator PAT ROBERTS, a former Marine, who introduced the same bill in the Senate, S. 504. With his help, I'm hopeful this will be the year the Senate supports the House position, and we can bring proper respect to the fighting team of the Navy and the Marine Corps.

It is important to remember: The National Security Act of 1947 defines the Marine Corps, Army, Navy and Air Force as the four services. It clearly indicates that the Marine Corps is a legally distinct military service within the Department of the Navy. The Navy and Marine Corps have operated as one entity for more than two centuries, and H.R. 24 would enable the name of their department to illustrate this fact.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to share part of a 2006 editorial published by the Chicago Tribune which describes what that legislation is really all about. And I quote the editorial, "no service branch shows more respect for tradition than the United States Marine Corps does, which makes it all the more ironic that tradition denies the Corps an important show of respect, equal billing with the other service branches." They are the words that were in the editorial in the Chicago Tribune. But sometimes it is good to break with tradition. The War Department, for example, became the Department of Defense after World War II. The Army Air Corps was elevated in 1941 to the Army Air Forces, and in 1947 to the autonomous Air Force.

The Marine Corps has not asked for complete autonomy. Nothing structurally needs to change in their relations with the Navy which has served both branches well. The Corps only asks for recognition. Having served their Nation proudly and courageously since colonial days, the leathernecks have earned a promotion.

Mr. Speaker, the marines who are fighting today deserve this recognition.

Before closing, I would like to show you what this change could mean to