

REVISIONS TO ALLOCATION FOR HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

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

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Speaker, under section 423(a)(1) of S. Con. Res. 13, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010, I hereby submit an adjustment to the budget allocations for the Committee on Appropriations for each of the fiscal years 2009 and 2010. Section 423(a)(1) of S. Con. Res. 13 permits the chairman of the Committee on the Budget to adjust discretionary spending limits for overseas deployments and other activities when these activities are so designated. Such a designation is included in the bill H.R. 3082, Making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes. A corresponding table is attached.

This adjustment is filed for the purposes of section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended. For the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended, this adjusted allocation is to be considered as an allocation included in the budget resolution, pursuant to section 427(b) of S. Con. Res. 13.

DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS—APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE 302(A) ALLOCATION

(In millions of dollars)

| | BA | OT |
|---|-----------|-----------|
| Current allocation: | | |
| Fiscal Year 2009 | 1,482,201 | 1,247,872 |
| Fiscal Year 2010 | 1,086,660 | 1,306,614 |
| Changes for overseas deployment and other activities designations: | | |
| H.R. 3082 (Appropriations for Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies): | | |
| Fiscal Year 2009 | 0 | 0 |
| Fiscal Year 2010 | 1,399 | 145 |
| Revised allocation: | | |
| Fiscal Year 2009 | 1,482,201 | 1,247,872 |
| Fiscal Year 2010 | 1,088,059 | 1,306,759 |

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 South Carolina (Mr. INGLIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. INGLIS 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.)

IN MEMORY OF WILLIAM LOUIS ISSA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from California (Mr. ISSA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ISSA. Today is July 7, 2009. Today would have been the 24th birthday of my own nephew, William Louis Issa. Last week, I attended his funeral.

He had a connection to this House because he worked both in Cleveland, his home, and here in Washington for his Congressman, DENNIS KUCINICH. In his passing, I lost a nephew; Cleveland lost somebody who cared about the environment, who was passionate about wolves in the wild, who in fact had graduated from college and was going on to law school to be an environmentalist, to seek what liberty allows us in this country, which is the right to feel and do what you think is right for your country.

I speak from this side of the center of this body and I speak about somebody who I disagreed with on many policies. As a young man, while he was summering here and staying at our home, he wanted me to know that the eating of meat was wrong and that if I wasn't a vegetarian, then I wasn't getting it. And he admired DENNIS KUCINICH, who's a lifelong—or at least as an adult person—a vegan. And he on a host of other issues felt so strongly. But, most of all, he felt strongly about the individual liberties, particularly his.

Now his choice was a Prius and his choice was in fact to try to do and be everything for a sustainable ecology as he saw it. So when I thought about coming and using his nexus here to the House floor tonight to speak on what would have been his 24th birthday, I thought it appropriate to say that from the left—and he certainly was a child of the left; perhaps a child of the sixties reborn in a next generation—and from someone on the right, I wonder if we shouldn't come together the way this young man did with everyone he met and talk in terms of America's liberty.

What in fact is this body doing—not to pass new laws. That wasn't what we were sent for. But to defend the inherent constitutional obligations: Life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness.

I believe that he ended his life far too soon and without accomplishing what he would have, had he lived longer. But tonight I will tell you that I'm brought to the House floor for perhaps only the third or fourth time in 8 or 9 years to say that those on the left and those on the right, we need to recommit ourselves.

At a time when we're talking about regulating CO₂, where we regulate the highways, the waterways, where we're looking at an 8 percent tax on health care to pay for the new health care proposal, while so much of what we once thought of as the free wild, wild west of the United States has been changed, particularly post-9/11, I wonder if this wouldn't be a good time for men and women of good conscience on both sides of the aisle to say: Shouldn't we relook at every liberty? Shouldn't we

form a liberty caucus? Shouldn't Congress be dedicated to ask the question not as Republicans or Democrats, but in fact as Americans sworn to uphold the Constitution?

Isn't it time we start looking at every single law we passed and the regulation they produced and find out how many of them we could do without—not liberal laws, not conservative laws, but all of them. I believe that that is the highest calling for those of us here in Congress.

I will tell you tonight, perhaps as a small tribute to my nephew, that I will reach out and I will ask every Democrat I see and all of my colleagues on this side of the aisle: What have we done in fact to defend liberty? What have we done to give somebody the right to decide they want to spend three months with wolves in the wild or that they want to in fact go out and save our delicate ecosystem from the unnatural twisting that 300 million people here in America bring upon the world.

That liberty is important. It's important that we pay tribute to it every chance we have, and can.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank you for the opportunity to, in a small way, talk about liberty and a man who would have fought for it.

DRAINING THE SWAMP OF CORRUPTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. As always, I appreciate the privilege to be recognized here on the floor of the House of Representatives. We have had a little bit of a break here, a hiatus to go back home and spend some time on the 4th of July to celebrate the birth of our great country—233 years of freedom.

A lot of that freedom has been debated, deliberated, and argued over here on the floor of the House of Representatives in this world's greatest deliberative body. The most costly freedom was fought for and lives and blood were sacrificed for on this soil and in foreign lands as well for this Nation to emerge at what has been and had become a strong and vibrant constitutional Republic. Part of the requirements to maintain that strong and vibrant constitutional Republic are that we engage in debate here and that we bring together and aggregate the best ideas of the 300 million Americans that elect the 435 Members of the House of Representatives and the 100 Senators.

□ 2000

It's essential that we maintain that kind of vibrant dialogue in this deliberative democracy, as some would call it. It's essential that we maintain the highest levels of integrity in order that this great Republic can continue on the path that has been charted for it by so

many of our Founding Fathers and our predecessors. However difficult the process that they were in might have been, they emerged and led this Nation clearly along a path, a higher road; and that higher road has been a road that held our own Members accountable for the highest standards of ethics. We have an Ethics Committee here in the House. I recall much of the debate that took place here on the floor back during the 108th and the 109th Congresses when allegations were made about Members and their levels of integrity. I remember prior to my arrival here many charges being filed in the Ethics Committee against Members of Congress who, it seemed to be, their only transgression was that they were effective in advancing the conservative cause. I recall, Madam Speaker, that when NANCY PELOSI was the leader and not the Speaker, she gave many speeches herself and alleged over and over again, Elect us into the majority, and we will come in, and we will drain the swamp, Madam Speaker. Well, here we are now. The majority has changed. The promise apparently is drifting away, and there are questions that continue to emerge and questions about the standards that are being adhered to, or not being adhered to, by certain Members of this body. Questions that are raised by publications that have a strong affinity for the majority party in this Congress, those who made a living out of attacking and criticizing Republicans when they were in the majority and Republicans when they were in the minority now are raising ethics questions about the activities of the Members of this new Democrat majority who is now halfway through their third year. So 2½ years into this majority, we're starting to see that the allegation about draining the swamp was only an allegation about using ethics charges to attack Republicans. I'm not seeing this same level of leadership, regardless of the promise made by the Speaker, to scrutinize the Members that are under the public's scrutiny now, and some who are reportedly under investigation by the FBI. Now I'm going to be a little gentle about how I discuss some of these issues, Madam Speaker, because it is a delicate subject. But it's essential that the subject be raised and that we have this debate and this dialogue here on this floor because in the end, it's not going to be the conscience of the people that are crossing the line or allegedly crossing the line. They aren't going to wake up in the night and have an attack of conscience or an epiphany and come down here and say, I'm going to clean up my act. I've gone too far. I slipped into some things that I shouldn't have been involved in. That is not going to happen. That is not what human nature does except in very, very rare circumstances. No. What will happen is, if this is to be cleaned up, and if it's to be addressed, the ethics questions, the cloud that hangs over Member after Member after Member here, influential

Members, members of the Appropriations Committee, Chairs of the Appropriations Subcommittees that exert significant influence over where taxpayer dollars go, this cloud that hangs over is only going to be cleared if the Speaker of the House follows through on her promise to drain her swamp—or if the public becomes so outraged that they demand that the situation be cleaned up.

Now we have had for a long time in this House—and I can think back at least 2½ years—we've had a dysfunctional Ethics Committee, a committee that was a black hole, that if there was a charge that was filed, it went in, and it was never acted upon. And they could investigate in complete confidentiality so no one could look over their shoulder, a committee that was balanced and nonpartisan in such a way that it was immobilized and couldn't take action at all. I cannot remember the last action of the Ethics Committee that had any effect in a constructive way of providing more cleanliness here in the House of Representatives.

Now if I get to these posters, I am going to go through some of the things that are constantly in the news. This summary comes out to be this: This is the "draining the swamp" leadership hour of the Republican leadership, and we have a pattern of ignoring the corruption. There is a pattern of practice for Speaker PELOSI. We have eight appropriators who, it's reported, are now under investigation for potential conflict of interest violations. With the Nation's spending out of control and trillions going to special interest, we have questions and challenges that are coming up, flowing throughout the media. Let me say that new allegations of these defense millions are funneled to aides and relatives; contractors are now charged with kickbacks. We have seen thousands in defense contractor dollars go through PMA, and out of there came donations to the Appropriations Chair of the Armed Services Committee. Then we've seen \$250 million in earmarks go back through that lobbying firm, PMA, which, it's reported, is clearly under investigation. A lobbying firm that has been closed down because of the investigation and those activities that are the subject of FBI investigations have shut down the lobbying firm PMA, a defense contractor lobbying firm, and have implicated a significant number of NANCY PELOSI's chosen Chairs, people whom she has handed the gavel to. This list is long, and I think it's expressive of what is going on. We had one of the Appropriations Chairs step down from the Ethics Committee because of reports of an ethics investigation but found himself chairing the Justice Appropriations Committee—the people that were reportedly investigating him, holding onto the gavel in one hand to control the Appropriations and Justice approps, at the same time holding the purse strings of the FBI, who is report-

edly investigating the chairman of Justice approps. This goes on in the United States Congress, and the American people are not outraged? I think they are. I think they just have so many things to be outraged about that they can't bring their focus on one subject or another because it comes at them over and over again like a trip-hammer. These allegations that are documented—the same Member, the chairman of Justice approps, received a \$70,000 donation to his family's foundation. At the same time millions were earmarked to the West Virginia High Tech Consortium. That's just a touch of what's going on there, Madam Speaker. And as I've watched this for 4 to 5 years, it just gets worse. When we see a chairman of Justice approps, for example, with 50 earmarks in a bill, and the people that are on the committee are afraid to challenge him for fear that their district will be punished, a certain culture grows up within the appropriators in this Congress, when their fear that they will lose their leverage and not be considered to be a loyal member of that committee, might be considered ineffective, if they are to raise the issues that they know should be raised. What happened to the altruism that I read about in our history books, the altruism that I was convinced existed and burned within the heart of all of our predecessors as they shaped this country? Yes, they disagree on policy; but I didn't think that they disagreed on ethics. That's the chairman of the Justice approps. We know about the Appropriations Chair of Armed Services and his connection with the earmark to the unused airport. I think we ought to take a CODEL to that airport. We have here a situation that has to do with the CBC. As we call it here, the Congressional Black Caucus, Madam Speaker, for those who are not on a day-to-day basis dealing with the acronyms of this House and, let me say, a separatist group that has formed themselves in a way that if it were any other group of people, they wouldn't be allowed to have an organization like this. But it's a matter of record that the Congressional Black Caucus took some trips down into St. Martin, Antigua and Barbuda. That was in 2007. And the question is: Were there corporate funds that sponsored these trips? And if so, it would be a clear violation of House rules. There is videotape, I'm advised, that shows the banners of the corporations hung up across the area where it's presented, and Members are thanking the corporations for sponsoring their trip. And who would be dealing with the investigation? Representative G.K. BUTTERFIELD, Democrat, North Carolina, member of the Congressional Black Caucus, and one who had gone on a previous trip into that same part of the world with the same group of people. So we would ask the same people who are being, let me say, evaluated for a potential ethics violations to investigate essentially themselves. So

maybe they want to get back together and have a little reunion and decide if they did anything wrong. We don't have answers to the public. We simply have a black hole of ethics that hangs over their head. They also argue that it's improper for someone—and I'll argue this. It's improper for someone who attended the Caribbean conference to lead an investigation into it as to whether it violated House rules. What a contradiction. But the same gentleman who's leading the investigation, Mr. BUTTERFIELD of North Carolina said, You cannot completely divorce yourself from relationships. Yet he would be willing to recuse himself if he got the sense that there was a contradiction. We shall see.

And what do we hear from the Congressional Black Caucus when the issue was raised and the press asked them the question, Did you go on a corporate-funded trip to the Caribbean? Or was it two or three? Their response was—well, they complained about a lack of minorities in the office that was taking a look at this issue, the Office of Congressional Ethics, which was set up by NANCY PELOSI. So Speaker PELOSI's Office of Congressional Ethics is looking into the activities of the Congressional Black Caucus and their trips to the Caribbean, potentially funded by corporations. And what does the Congressional Black Caucus have to say? They don't think that the committee looking into them has enough minorities. The first question asked, and they have to play the race card. That doesn't speak to me as an issue that they have a very strong defense for. That's the knee-jerk response, Play the race card. That's why they are the Congressional Black Caucus, after all, the liberal Congressional Black Caucus. And we have Peter Flaherty, the president of a conservative watchdog group, and upon uncovering evidence of the trip's corporate sponsors, he said he was disappointed with the appointment of Mr. BUTTERFIELD to head up the investigative group. His answer was, the Congressional Black Caucus really sticks together. You can see their solidarity in the face of these ethics charges. To put one of their own members in charge of the investigation just shows that nothing has changed. The ethics process is still a complete mockery, Peter Flaherty.

And Mr. McGee also questioned whether the Congressional Black Caucus members should be leading the probe. He said, In this case, this is a trip that is publicly connected to the CBC, and only CBC members were participants. To have a CBC member lead the investigation is not the best way to ensure a publicly credible and acceptable result. Mr. McGee, I agree.

We could go on and on. But here is the quote from Speaker PELOSI when she said that she's making a commitment to "draining the swamp of corruption." I don't see activity on that commitment, and it is time. It is time we raised the issue. It's time the Amer-

ican people look into these allegations. It's time that this Congress form an effective Ethics Committee, an Ethics Committee that can clean this up and drain this swamp, as defined by the Speaker, who I think eventually is going to have to respond to this. She's going to have to keep her word. She has created the organization, the evaluation organization, and now it's time to use it. And the name of the organization that she shaped escapes me for the moment, but it was formed by the Speaker of the House for the purposes of—in her words, "draining the swamp," and what do we get from the Congressional Black Caucus but a complaint that there weren't enough minorities on the committee that were appointed by the Speaker. Now, I'd like to think that ethics is completely independent of ethnicity. I'd like to think that morality is independent of ethnicity or race or gender or whatever one happens to be oriented.

□ 2015

I would like to think right is right and wrong is wrong, that truth is truth, that fiction is fiction, that the Constitution is what it is, that the Bible says what it says, that the Declaration says what it says, and that every Member here would speak the truth.

I would like to think that every Member of this Congress carries with them, internally, an ethical conscience that we owe a duty to the American people, that we owe a duty to the American people to live here at the highest standards and that we will not be drawn down into the low standards, and that we owe a duty to them to stop and to evaluate ourselves. That is what the Ethics Committee is about.

The working group that is designed to enhance the Ethics Committee apparently is not functioning, but we do have a Member of the Congressional Black Caucus investigating the Congressional Black Caucus under the auspices of the organization that is formed by the Speaker to do just that. I don't think it is quite the fox guarding the henhouse because I don't know what goes on in the mind of Mr. BUTTERFIELD. But I will say it raises questions. This Congress needs to raise questions.

We are watching favoritism here on the floor of the House. A week ago last Friday, the cap-and-trade bill, cap-and-tax bill, I call it, passed off the floor of this House. There were dozens of Members of this Congress, Democrats in the dozens, who had made the public statement that they were opposed to this cap-and-tax bill. But what we saw happen was as they needed the votes to get it passed, Member after Member would walk down in a lineup. They would queue up back here behind the microphone. And they would have in their hand their little script. They would carry that script down to the microphone. And the chairman who was managing the time would yield to

them. They would read from the script. And the script would say something to the effect of "I took a position against the bill because I was concerned about the interests of my constituents," which really means "because I know it will cost my district a lot of money, it will transfer our jobs overseas, and it is a bad idea." This is what they said before the bill came to the floor.

An amendment was dropped in at 3 o'clock in the morning. It was 309 pages. No one had a chance to read it. But still they read from their script, and it said, on balance, I think that we have mitigated some of the disaster created by this—they wouldn't say it quite that plainly, of course—but I think we've mitigated some of the problems in this bill and I think we're working on this and we're going in the right direction. I think my constituents are going to be adequately covered.

Then they would pause while the committee chairman would read from his script. And he would say, I appreciate working with the gentleman. We've made progress on this bill. And even though we haven't had a chance to change any more language in this amendment that came in, 309 pages at 3 o'clock in the morning, to accommodate for this component that this Member would like to have, still, the fact that we read this colloquy into the RECORD changes the meaning of the bill.

And now the Member that was there and had read off the script, "So therefore I'm going to vote for the bill because I've worked with the chairman and we each agree we've done our duty to God and country and the bill is not as bad as it would have been otherwise."

Really? The bill changes because one Member won't vote for it unless he gets some cover? So he walks down here, reads from the script, the chairman reads from the script, the Member reads from the conclusion of the script, and now we have changed the meaning of the bill? And it is enough to turn a vote around 180 degrees and deliver to America a cap-and-tax bill by a vote of 219-212 which, by all appearances, is this: They're wrong on the science, they're wrong on the global warming argument, and the idea that you can set the Earth's thermostat simply by controlling CO₂ emissions, only CO₂ emissions, and by doing so from American industry is going to lower the temperature of the Earth, and that by lowering the temperature of the Earth, we are going to have a higher quality of life. That is the undercurrent of this.

I will say they are wrong on the science. They can't make a scientific argument. They are completely wrong on the economics. The idea that we are going to create green jobs by taxing energy, specific kinds of energy, CO₂-emitting energy, is completely wrong.

What solution was the best solution if you accept the premise of Mr. WAXMAN? It would be a lot of nuclear-generated power, for which we have no

provision that opens it up so that we can build more nuclear-generating plants. It has become virtually impossible to build new coal-fired generating plants before this bill passed the floor of the House. The development of electrical generation in America is now frozen, suspended until we can figure out what is going to take place, what the Senate will do, if they take up the bill at all, and how they might amend it. But when you take something that is bad and you amend it marginally, it is still bad.

I have watched this unfold here on the floor of the House. I have watched it unfold behind the scenes. I have watched it unfold in committee. And I have yet to hear a legitimate dialogue in debate. I have yet to hear one Member of this Congress come here and raise the argument that scientifically they are right, that they can dial the temperature of the Earth down by reducing the CO₂ emissions in the United States and by raising the cost of energy.

This bill is an energy tax. It taxes all the energy in America. If you get in a car or on a bus and ride a half a block, you have used energy. If you throw on a light switch, you have used energy. If you pick up a cup of coffee, it took energy to heat the coffee and make it. It took energy to make the cup. Whenever you move, you are using something that took energy to produce. All of our components are intricately tied to energy.

A nation that has expensive energy will be uncompetitive against the nations that have cheap energy and lots of it. One of the strengths of this Nation has been that we have had a sound and good, competitive, multi-sourced energy policy in the United States. We pioneered the oil drilling in the world. We led with this. It started in Pennsylvania. It developed in Texas and Oklahoma and other places around the country. It went up to the North Slope of Alaska. It went offshore.

America has developed much of the technology that produces the oil and natural gas for the world today. That has been a core of the strength of America's vibrant and huge global economy that we drive. The percentage of it that we have is so significant. We have had almost unlimited natural resources for most of this term of 233 years. We have had a lot of cheap energy of many different varieties. We have had constitutional rights, especially property rights, the rule of law, a work ethic and a morality that has tied this country together. These are the pillars of American exceptionalism.

We had ideas for energy just a year ago. A year and a month ago, some of us were here on the floor of the House, and we had been debating energy for I will say about 6 weeks, when we got up to the August break. Now as the energy debate got turned up, the Speaker of the House decided she didn't want to hear any more discussion about energy. So they abruptly adjourned and shut

this process down. We kept debating anyway as the microphones were shut off and eventually the lights were shut off. We kept debating anyway. And we went out into the Capitol Building and brought people in to the seats, people off the streets, and set them in the seats here on the floor of the House of Representatives. People sat in CHARLIE RANGEL's seat. They sat over here in BARNEY FRANK's seat. They sat in Mr. DINGELL's seat. They sat in Republican seats too. They sat this close, right here, tourists off the streets of Washington, D.C., off the Capitol Building in here on the floor of the House of Representatives so we would have somebody to talk to because the TV cameras were shut off and turned to the side. The microphones were shut off. And the lights were shut down in here because the Speaker didn't want to hear any more energy debate. But the delivery we gave then and the delivery that we continued on up until nearly the election last fall was all energy all the time, as our leader says, "all of the above."

I put a chart here on the floor that showed all of the sources of energy that we consume in the United States. It is a pie chart with color code, how much is coal, how much is natural gas, how much is petroleum products, gas and diesel fuel, jet fuel, heating oil, how much is ethanol, biodiesel, wind, nuclear, geothermal, solar, and coal. The list goes on. We were consuming 101.4 quadrillion Btus of energy in the United States and producing about 72 quadrillion Btus of energy. So roughly speaking, we are producing only 72 percent of the overall energy that we are consuming in the United States. And yet we are an energy-rich nation. We are an energy-rich nation that should be able to shape an energy policy, an energy policy that will keep our energy cheap so that our economy can be competitive, so that Americans can make things here in the United States, and America will be where the jobs are. Jobs are going to be where it is competitive.

It is pretty obvious from looking at what is happening to General Motors and Chrysler that we have had a lot of trouble being competitive on labor. If we can't be competitive on labor, at least we can be competitive on our natural resources and at least we can be competitive on our energy prices. Instead, the Speaker of the House has embarked upon a path of making energy more expensive in this country under this viewpoint of trying to save the planet. Do you remember the quote from last year? "I'm trying to save the planet. I'm trying to save the planet." She is trying to save the planet by increasing the cost of all of the energy in America and driving up the cost of electricity.

We had a witness before an Energy and Commerce Subcommittee chaired by Mr. MARKEY. This gentleman's name is David Sokol, who is the chairman of the board at MidAmerican En-

ergy. Mr. Sokol testified as to the costs in increased electricity, the costs to the, I think the number is 6.9 million, ratepayers that MidAmerican has. They have a balanced portfolio of energy sources. They said they can meet the carbon caps that are being imposed on them in this cap-and-tax bill. But what will happen is the customers will have to pay. They will have to pay twice, once for the cap-and-tax, and again to change, to renovate the means by which they deliver that energy. He testified that the cost, just for the additional cost annually per household, was \$110 a month, which maths out to be \$1,320 a year just for the electricity. Add on to that the extra cost for gas for all of the costs on consumers because of diesel fuel in trucks and the extra energy that it takes to produce anything. Let's just say you're in the business of mining iron ore and shipping that over and melting it down and turning it into steel. All of the energy that is required there to mine it, to heat it, to convert it, all of that makes it almost prohibitive when you see costs that are going up for energy costs, in many cases a doubling of certain kinds of energy costs.

Also, when you look at the map of the United States, you will see that the States that have the credits, that have a surplus of hydroelectric power, a lot of the people in those States would like to put our rivers back where they were. I'm not among them. I think we can improve upon Mother Nature. I think hydroelectric power is a wonderful thing. I would be happy to have more of it. But the States that have it are the States that get carbon credits to trade back, to sell back to the States that are generating a lot of their electricity with coal.

So that amounts to a transfer of wealth from the States that are short on hydroelectric and other forms of renewable energy production to those that are long on the nongreenhouse-gas-emitting-generating systems. So you would see almost all of the country transferring their wealth to the Northeast, to the full West and the entire western seaboard. South Dakota would be a recipient State because they have a series of hydroelectric dams in South Dakota and not a lot of people to use the electricity. That is what happens. It pits Americans against Americans. It punishes some, and it benefits others. It punishes all of agriculture.

This is all taking place because an idea was generated 30 or so years ago and was pushed by Al Gore who received a Pulitzer Prize and made a movie. And they don't have to be factual. They don't have to prove anything. They just simply make an allegation that the Earth is getting warmer, and if the Earth is getting warmer, then we must do something because things are horrible. And so the only thing we can do is the thing that they present to us, of course.

It reminds me a lot of the stimulus package.

□ 2030

The stimulus package was put together by President Obama. He came to our conference and said it is one leg of a multilegged stool that we have to construct to get us out of this economic crisis we are in. It was all one leg at that time. It was about a \$2 trillion leg. It was \$787 billion, and they throw in some more from some other bailouts, and it is about \$2 trillion.

So we went down this path. We were all pressured to vote for that \$787 billion stimulus package because, after all, we were in an economic crisis and we must do something. Those of us who opposed the stimulus package were accused of being against doing anything. They just want to do nothing, they said, as if their idea was the only thing we could do.

I wrote legislation, introduced it, argued for it, and got the back of the hand from the people who thought government should own everything because they didn't want free market solutions. It looks to me like they wanted government intervention.

And so we have a stimulus plan and we have the nationalization that has taken place of Bank of America, AIG, Bear Stearns, and Merrill Lynch, is incorporated into that. Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac that used to be private became quasi-government, and now they are completely government, a wholly owned subsidiary of the Federal Government. And roughly, there is a \$5.5 trillion outside potential liability of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, and that is if it all melts down.

General Motors and Chrysler, there are about eight huge national entities that have been nationalized, formerly private, now nationalized under President Obama, the President Obama who said: I don't want to do this. I am not interested in taking over corporations. I don't want to be involved in the day-to-day operations of these corporations. He is a reluctant nationalizer of private businesses. He didn't want to be involved in the day-to-day operations.

There are other solutions out there. One would have been to take AIG, this huge insurance company which had such a large share of the market that no one could check its balance sheet, no one could evaluate the premiums they were charging because no one understood the scope of the business that they were in. And they guaranteed the return, the performance of these mortgage-backed securities, this toxic debt, this toxic paper that these investment bankers had. No one could evaluate AIG. But they could pour hundreds of millions of dollars into AIG, and we couldn't even have a discussion about splitting them up, dividing them up and throwing away the bad components and letting them compete against each other, or sending them into bankruptcy and letting them go that route and let the emerging insurance companies fill that market. That could have been a solution, too.

I argued this way. Look at AIG as if it were an apple, and you take that tool off the kitchen counter and it takes the core out and slices it up into six pieces. That could have happened with AIG like it happened to Ma Bell, and they could have competed with each other. But instead, hundreds of billions of dollars poured into AIG and our investment banks, propping them up, carrying them on, and then effectively nationalizing them, refusing to allow some of the lending institutions to pay the money back so they could be out from underneath the thumb of the White House, a White House that claims to not want to operate any of these companies, a White House that fired the CEO of General Motors and hired a new CEO of General Motors and named all but two of the board members of General Motors and dictated to the bankruptcy court the terms of the Chapter 11 before the court made the decision, dictated by the White House. By the way, the White House that says, as a matter of fact a President that says I don't want to be involved in the day-to-day operations of General Motors appointed a car czar who had never sold a car nor made one, and probably never even fixed one but probably has driven several, to call the shots on General Motors and on Chrysler, a car czar who is on the phone on a regular basis at the report of Fritz Henderson, the new Obama-appointed CEO of General Motors.

We are at the point where we have eight huge entities that are nationalized by the White House in a breathtaking fashion that many of us would have claimed would not have been a legal activity, or would have taken the authorization of Congress or resources that were not available to the White House to spend without congressional authorization, all happening so fast with the operation here that has shut down the kind of criticism that might have produced some free market results.

So the White House is involved in day-to-day operations of General Motors. The White House dictated who would be buying up what is left of Chrysler, appointed the new CEO of General Motors and all but two of the board members, and all of this works under the auspices of the car czar, who is one of 22 czars appointed by the President. There are 22 czars; more czars than the Romanovs, as Senator McCain famously said. One of them is the payroll czar. The payroll czar looks around to determine whether the CEOs of the companies that have been nationalized or received TARP funds or Federal funds by the White House, to determine if the CEOs and their executives are making too much money performing the service that they are performing. In America? The President appoints someone to decide who is making too much money while they advocate the class envy that was part of the campaign and nationalize eight huge formerly private sector entities and in-

vest our tax dollars in them and hold back shares now of common stock as if they were an outside investor, as if they were Warren Buffett riding to the rescue.

Madam Speaker, America has gone down the line. When I take us to the point of these hugely nationalized formerly private companies, all of that can be reversed at this point. All can be overturned in a saner time by a more prudent Congress and an administration that either sees the light or is replaced by one that does. All of it can be.

But this line of the cap-and-tax bill is the Rubicon. It is the stream that we have crossed here in the House that if they cross it in the Senate, it will be an irrevocable policy that forever burdens the economy of the United States of America to our detriment and hands over an advantage in global competitiveness to China and India and other emerging industrializing countries. And if that happens, there is no going back.

I talked about the culture of corruption and the promise of the Speaker to drain the swamp. There is new corruption on the horizon. The cap-and-tax bill lays the foundation for a massive amount of corruption.

When President Obama said look across to Spain for an example, an example of a country that gets it right, an example of a country that has already gone through the green revolution and created the green jobs and now they are in this new green economy, we can do that in the United States, too.

The President and many others make the argument that taxing energy in America and trading carbon credits will create these green jobs and we will have this new green economy that will be apparently healthy and vibrant, and they guarantee that they will create green jobs.

But what they don't do is talk about this in the context of, similar to the same philosophy we are going to create or save, and I don't remember the first number now, maybe 4.5 million jobs. I know it got down to 3.5 million or 3 million jobs this stimulus plan was going to create or save. Let's say 3 million jobs. That is on the low side. It has been lowered a little since then.

Create or save. Now the instant I heard that, it just hit me, create or save. If it is going to be 3 million jobs that you create or save with the stimulus plan, as long as there are 3 million jobs left in the United States of America, the President can always claim those jobs were the jobs I saved. You would have lost them all if it hadn't been for the stimulus plan. That's the logic of the "create or save" kind of phrase.

Those are slippery phrases, calculated ambiguities. They intentionally, I believe, give a dual meaning so people can listen and they hear something. What do they want to hear? They want to hear that the stimulus

package is going to create 3 million jobs and so they grab ahold of that, and they are not listening to the words “or save.” Create or save. They are not thinking that there is no way that anyone can quantify a job that is saved.

You can save a job if it is already lost and you put it back. I remember a company that was getting shut down, in the neighborhood of 40 jobs, and we engaged with the bureaucrats and entreated that they look at it more objectively and stick with their rules but not be so hasty. And out of that, those jobs remained. I would quantify we saved about 40 jobs.

But you can't deal with a national policy that can take credit for creating or saving jobs in the same category.

So what's the net increase or decrease in jobs? The stimulus plan hasn't created net new jobs. It has not lived up to the standards set by the White House which predicted we would see unemployment as high as 8 percent, maybe even 8.5 percent. Now it is at 9.4 or 9.5 percent, and the numbers are 14.5 million Americans unemployed and another 6 million who are looking for work. So let's just say 20 million, 20 million unemployed in the United States of America. None of those were jobs that were saved. None of those were jobs that were created, and the White House hasn't defined a single one yet of the jobs that were created, nor the ones that are saved.

So cap-and-trade, cap-and-tax, what does it do to the culture of corruption? What does it do to the ethics challenge that is before these many Members of Congress of which I have a list? Let me see. One, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine that are being scrutinized and are in the public eye.

Even under this environment of getting to the cap-and-tax, and I will share with you what happened in Spain as they lurched into their green economy to create their green jobs.

Spain drew a conclusion 7 or 8 years ago that they wanted to be a world leader in green jobs, a world leader in this green revolution, and they wanted to reduce the amount of CO₂ being emitted into the atmosphere and get themselves in line with the Kyoto treaty. So they set about replacing their normal generation in Spain with a lot of wind power generators; other means, too, but wind power in particular. When you get involved in issuing permits and who gets to put up and where you are going to locate a wind generator, that means bureaucrats and politicians are involved and favorites get chosen, just like the favorite dealership in Massachusetts that lost his franchise, but at the pleadings of the chairman of the Financial Services Committee had his franchise reinstated even though others did lose their franchise.

Favorites get played in politics. It happened in Spain. In the case of Spain, they were going to create these green jobs. Here is what they learned. This is the data that comes out of 7 to

8 years of experience, of going down this path that cap-and-tax takes the United States of America if the Senate passes it and the President has promised that he will veto it. They did create jobs. They created green jobs. And for every green job that they created, they had a net loss of 2.2 private sector jobs because it drew capital out of the private sector and out of the Spanish economy. They lost the two largest companies in Spain. One of them was British Petroleum, or BP as they are known now, that pulled out of Spain because their costs have gone too high.

They created a new green job here and there at the cost of, for every one, 2.2 lost jobs in the private sector. It took Spain up to the highest unemployment rate in the industrialized world, 17.5 percent unemployment and rising. The cost per green job created was \$770,000 per job.

So they spent \$770,000, created a green job and lost 2.2 jobs in the private sector. And they saw their electrical bills skyrocket. I think that was the phrase used by President Obama. You would see coal-fired generating plants, the cost of that electricity skyrocket under his cap-and-tax plan.

Well, electricity skyrocketed under a very similar plan, a plan that has been identified by President Obama as a model to follow, the Spanish model. In 3 years' time, the electrical bills for the residents in Spain increased 20 percent. Now that is not quite so shocking, I don't suppose, Madam Speaker, but industrial electricity costs in the same period of time went up 100 percent.

□ 2045

So residential electricity up 20 percent; industrial electrical costs 100 percent. Now, we already see the picture of why they've lost so many large companies out of Spain. They've driven up the electrical costs where they can't compete any longer. And with electrical costs doubling in industrial in 3 years and up 20 percent in residential, they actually just hit the political threshold.

It wasn't that that covered all the additional costs of generating electricity. The real truth is, Madam Speaker, that they took the cost of electricity up to the political threshold where they couldn't sustain it any longer, held it at a 20 percent increase for residents and a doubling, a 100 percent increase in industrial, and then, to pay for the rest of the cost of the electricity, went out on the financial market and borrowed the money to pay the electrical bills, borrowed the money from the international financial markets to pay the electrical bills in Spain at costs above the doubling of industrial and the 20 percent increase in the residential. And in order to borrow the money, they had to pledge the full faith and credit of the Spanish Government, which means children yet to be born and the children and the grandchildren and likely the great-grand-

children of those using electricity in Spain today will be paying the interest and the principal on the electrical bills of their parents, their grandparents and their great-grandparents—should the economy hold together long enough that they would even have the opportunity to do that—while the competitiveness of Spain digresses in the world.

And if this isn't bad enough, high electrical costs, borrowing on the international financial market to pay the electrical bill, 17.5 unemployment, \$770,000 per green job created, and for every time they created a green job they lost 2.2 jobs in the private sector. All of this going on, you still had the Sicilian Mafia involved in the politics of Spain, greasing the palms, so to speak, making sure that the right people received the right cash favors in the right denominations because politicians, business people are brokering who gets to put up the wind charger, who's going to issue the permit—well, they have that determined—who gets the permit issued to put the wind charger up on which land. And the Sicilian Mafia was involved in that and remains involved in that, according to the speaker we had for a breakfast I hosted a couple months ago. Not only were they involved in the politics of the permitting process, but also involved in the politics of determining who would be the contractors, the subcontractors, and the suppliers.

So add Sicilian Mafia to this web, this web of corruption, this web of political favoritism, this ethical snarl that's there in Spain that contributes to dragging down their economy—the green economy that they set up with the idea they were going to create green jobs.

There is no empirical data, no quantifiable way that one can look at Spain and declare that Spain is a model that the United States should emulate, but the President has declared that we should do that and doesn't seem to be accountable for that flawed judgment.

So when I asked the question, of all of these things that are wrong in the Spanish green economy—the high unemployment, the high electrical bills, borrowing money to pay your electrical bills, the Sicilian Mafia wrapped up in the politics that's contributing to political corruption—of which there are many indicators here in this swamp that the Speaker has declared she wants to drain but taken no move to do so when it's her own Democratic Members—all of this going on in Spain, and here in the House of Representatives we pass a cap-and-tax bill that is a tax on all of our energy, that sets up carbon credits that will be traded—not just in the United States, but around the world.

And so somehow, with a bill in the House, we are going to pay somebody to plant trees in Brazil, thinking that that's going to sequester some carbon so we can burn some more natural gas to generate some electricity in Florida. How about that?

And I would just ask the question, aside from this snarled mess and the open door for confusion and corruption and favoritism and people getting rich off of credits, aside from all of that, aside from the extra cost in electricity of \$1,320 a year just for the households in my district—according to Mid-American Energy, who hasn't seen a rate increase in over 10 years—aside from all of that, where are we going?

If we could take the 25 or the 50 or the 100 smartest people in America, or the world, erase from their minds any of the last 25 or 30 years of this global warming fear that has been perpetrated—and now has had to morph itself into “climate change” because we don't have evidence that the globe has been warming since 2002 so they had to change it to climate change—but if we could put the smartest people together, send them off on a retreat somewhere—send them down to the Caribbean where the Congressional Black Caucus had their little codel that's being looked at—set them up on an island, erase from their memory anything that they've heard about this global warming allegation or the proposed solutions, and first ask the question on the science, do you really believe that the Earth is getting warmer? Well, maybe.

And there are some trend lines prior to 2002 that would indicate that. That's not so much the point, but we should ask that question. Do you believe it is? And if you conclude that it is—smartest people in the world with great training in all of the fields that they need, then the next question would be, do you believe that the emissions from the industrial era, the industrial revolution are contributing to it? How much, and what could we do about that?

Now, remember that if you would take the atmosphere—and we're dealing only with CO₂ emissions in the United States of America, the cumulative total—and I've got to go a little bit from memory, but I'm going to get the scale of this exactly right, and if you take the entire atmosphere of the Earth—I know all this air has a volume to it, it's measured in metric tons, and that number is 105.5 million metric tons—I believe that's the number, that's the right decimal anyway—all of that Earth's atmosphere and draw it out and represent it proportionately in a circle, let's say a circle 8 feet in diameter, two 4 by 8 sheets of drywall side to side, draw a circle 8 feet in diameter, a foot higher than my hand around, draw that circle, think of that circle in your mind's eye, Madam Speaker, and that represents all the Earth's atmosphere.

Now, the cumulative total of the CO₂ suspended in the Earth's atmosphere over the last 205 years, since the dawn of the industrial revolution, all of that CO₂ that's gone in and that's now suspended in the atmosphere, if you would draw it on a circle, in the middle of that 8-foot circle—which is all of the

Earth's atmosphere—that circle would be how big: 5 foot, 4 foot, 3 foot, 2 foot, 1 foot in diameter, perhaps, in the middle of that 8-foot circle? Or 6 inches, or 3 inches, or 1 inch—we're still going, Madam Speaker. About the diameter of my little finger; .56 inches would be all that would represent all of the CO₂ that is suspended in the Earth's atmosphere that has been emitted by the United States of America in the last 205 years, the dawn of the industrial revolution. And we're talking about that half-inch diameter circle in the middle of the 8-foot circle and reducing those emissions by 17 percent in the near term, as much as 83 percent per year in the long term.

Now, where does that get us? And how can anyone think that you can put a drop into an ocean and change the temperature of the ocean, or think that you could microscopically alter the dimension of that center little circle that represents all of the suspended CO₂ from the United States and somehow magically that's the key to adjust the Earth's thermostat. It is utter vanity, Madam Speaker. And you can put the smartest people in the world off on an island somewhere, erase all of the things that have been pumped out in their brain, start them out with fresh data, scientific data, empirical data, put some physicists there, put some meteorologists out there, some mathematicians there while we're at it, and by the way, let all of those people churn around on this climate change model—and let's put some economists out there also to churn around on what happens—and I would just be about willing to guarantee that 50 or 100 of the smartest people in the world, if you erase their institutional memory of all of the information that has been pounded into this country over the last 30 years since we made the transition from the impending ice age—which some of us remember, and at least one scientist made the switch himself, said it was certain that there was a near-term ice age that was going to come down and freeze us off of the North American continent. Now he's a global warming enthusiast. He was right one time maybe, and he will never live to see if he was right or wrong.

But all of those smart people that we could put on an island and erase their institutional memory and start them with an objective analysis, very well trained physicists, meteorologists, economists, mathematicians, chemists, put them on that island and ask them, evaluate the data that we have today and look at the science that we have, if the Earth is getting warmer and if you think that's a problem, what would you do about it, I can't imagine that 25 or 50 or 100 smartest people in the world coming up with such a concoction as a proposed solution as passed off the floor of this House in the form of the bill that's called Waxman-Markey cap-and-trade, cap-and-tax—or whatever the other acronyms are for this bill. I can't imagine that really smart people

could ever cook something like that up.

Because this bill that passed the House, it was never a product of, let me say, sound science, peer-reviewed analysis, sound economics. It was never a product that ever laid this thing out down through the continuum and gamed it out to the end. No, Madam Speaker. It's a political concoction that's put together in a hodgepodge. It's—what shall I call it—liberal genetic engineering of policy. And we are stuck with it coming out of this House.

I think that this House made the single most colossal mistake made in the history of the United States Congress a week ago last Friday when they passed the cap-and-tax bill. I think they're wrong on the science, and I think they're really, really wrong on the economics. And if they're right on the science, they hand over the economy of the United States and put us at a disadvantage and allow India and China and other developing countries to continue to belch crud into the atmosphere and out-compete us economically. And more and more companies will be moving to those countries while those economies prosper and pollute the atmosphere, even to the extent of producing or developing an average of one new coal-fire generating plant per week without the emissions controls that we have here in the United States of America, pouring this all forth out of the smoke stacks in Asia and shipping us more and more of our goods.

So what's happening is we're buying plenty from Asia already, and that contributes to our trade imbalance. And then, in order to meet these budget shortfalls that are driven by the President and the liberals in Congress—trillions of dollars, a \$9.3 trillion deficit in the budget offered by President Obama on top of an \$11.3 trillion existing deficit, over \$20 trillion—and what do we do to deal with that? We buy everything we can that we don't want to make here in the United States anymore, and then we borrow the money from the Chinese to buy things from the Chinese. So it's the equivalent of going to the car dealer, I suppose, and borrowing the money from him to buy the car that he makes.

And you keep doing that over and over again, but you've got to build something that has value. You've got to make things. You've got to provide goods and services that can be competitive. And we need to be competitive globally.

The very idea that this country is a giant chain letter, a giant ATM to be cashed into and that we can create a government economy is false. It has to have value, and it has to have value in the private sector. The private sector is the productive sector of the economy; the government sector is the parasitic sector of the economy. And you cannot grow the parasitic sector of the economy at the expense of the productive sector of the economy and

think that you can compete indefinitely in this world while you're borrowing money from the Chinese to pay the bills that you're creating by having the Chinese make the things that we can't be competitive anymore and buying it from them.

And I get along fine with the Chinese, but you've got to build things that have value and you've got to have a sound economy. We've got to have an ethical Congress. We've got to stand on free markets. And we've got to reverse the nationalization of our privatized industries. And I urge that we do so with all haste.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of Michael Jackson memorial.

Ms. FALLIN (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of attending a funeral.

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. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. QUIGLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SPRATT, 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, today, July 8, 9, 10, 13 and 14.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FLEMING, for 5 minutes, July 8.

Mr. PENCE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, today, July 8, 9, 10, 13 and 14.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today, July 8, 9 and 10.

Mr. OLSON, for 5 minutes, July 9.

Mr. INGLIS, for 5 minutes, today and July 13.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, today, July 8, 9 and 10.

(The following Member (at his request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ISSA, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 8, 2009, at 10 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for speaker-authorized official travel during the first quarter and second quarter of 2009, pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO HAITI, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 8 AND MAY 11, 2009

| Name of Member or employee | Date | | Country | Per diem ¹ | | Transportation | | Other purposes | | Total | |
|--------------------------------|---------|-----------|-------------|-----------------------|--|------------------|--|------------------|--|------------------|--|
| | Arrival | Departure | | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ² | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ² | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ² | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ² |
| Hon. Mazie Hirono | 5/8 | 5/11 | Haiti | | 888.00 | | | | | | 888.00 |
| Hon. David Dreier | 5/8 | 5/11 | Haiti | | 888.00 | | | | | | 888.00 |
| Hon. Jim McDermott | 5/8 | 5/11 | Haiti | | 888.00 | | | | | | 888.00 |
| Hon. Gwen Moore | 5/8 | 5/11 | Haiti | | 888.00 | | | | | | 888.00 |
| Delegate Gregorio Sablan | 5/8 | 5/11 | Haiti | | 888.00 | | | | | | 888.00 |
| John Lis | 5/8 | 5/11 | Haiti | | 888.00 | | | | | | 888.00 |
| Margarita Seminario | 5/8 | 5/11 | Haiti | | 888.00 | | | | | | 888.00 |
| Tommy Ross | 5/8 | 5/11 | Haiti | | 888.00 | | | | | | 888.00 |
| Rachael Leman | 5/8 | 5/11 | Haiti | | 888.00 | | | | | | 888.00 |
| Mofiah McCartin | 5/8 | 5/11 | Haiti | | 888.00 | | | | | | 888.00 |
| Clay Wellborn | 5/8 | 5/11 | Haiti | | 888.00 | | | | | | 888.00 |
| Maureen Taft Morales | 5/8 | 5/11 | Haiti | | 888.00 | | | | | | 888.00 |
| Committee totals | | | | | | | | | | | 10,656 |

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. MAZIE K. HIRONO, May 21, 2009.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 28 AND FEB. 1, 2009

| Name of Member or employee | Date | | Country | Per diem ¹ | | Transportation | | Other purposes | | Total | |
|-------------------------------|---------|-----------|-------------------|-----------------------|--|------------------|--|------------------|--|------------------|--|
| | Arrival | Departure | | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ² | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ² | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ² | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ² |
| Hon. Carolyn B. Maloney | 1/28 | 2/1 | Switzerland | | 2006.40 | | | | | | 2006.40 |
| Committee total | | | | | | | | | | | 2006.40 |

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY, Chairman, June 16, 2009.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2486. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's May 2009 Semi-Annual Report providing the progress toward destruction of the U.S. stockpile of lethal chemical agents and munitions by the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) deadline of April 29, 2012, but not

later than December 31, 2017 pursuant to section 8119 of the Department of Defense (DoD) Appropriations Act, 2008, Pub. L. 110-116, and section 922 of the National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2008, Pub. L. 110-181; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2487. A letter from the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, Department of Defense, transmitting a copy of a report to Congress entitled, "Reachback Distributed Decision Support" recommended by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2488. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's Uniform Resource Locators (URLs) for documents recently issued related to regulatory programs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2489. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction that was declared in Executive Order 12938 of November 14, 1994, and continued by the