

For all Americans, it means lower cost, quality care, affordable care and choice. You can take your insurance with you when you change jobs. You won't go broke because of limits on yearly health care expenses. It means no copayments for routine preventive care like colonoscopies and mammograms.

You choose your doctor, you choose to change, you choose to stay the same. Choose a public plan, choose a private plan. It's time for Congress to get this done.

INFLATION IS COMING

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

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, when interest rates go up, the value of bonds go down. But this presents a dilemma for the newest and largest bondholder on Earth, the Federal Reserve.

With interest rates low, quantitative easing policies and record spending, inflation is coming. Normally, we would expect the Fed to raise interest rates to protect the value of our dollars from runaway inflation, but now that the Fed's owe over \$1 trillion in bonds, an interest rate boost of only 70 basis points would trigger a loss of the entire \$51 billion of the Fed's remaining net capital.

Robert Eisenbeis, the former vice president for the Atlanta Fed, has highlighted this danger. With inflation coming, we do not want the losses that the Fed's would have to their own holdings to stop them from doing what will be needed to protect us, and especially seniors, from next year's expected inflation.

MEDICARE CUTS WOULD IMPACT OUR SENIORS

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

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Director of the Congressional Budget Office stated that seniors with current private Medicare plans could see their benefits cut or costs increase under one of the health care overhaul proposals currently being debated. Many seniors, including more than 140,000 in my home State of Louisiana, depend on these Medicare benefits for their health care.

Far too often, patients in our current government-run programs lack real access to a doctor. Now, under congressional Democrats' plans, they would see their benefits cut or higher costs, according to CBO, the official scorekeeper for Congress.

We can do better. We can achieve commonsense solutions in a bipartisan way. But the current bills in Congress focus on where we disagree. House Republicans have put forward a commonsense plan to revitalize the American

health care system to lower costs for families and businesses and to improve quality.

Our plan puts patients first and their doctors back in control of health care decisions. Our plan makes health care affordable and more accessible with patients able to see their doctor of choice.

Let's work together to put the patient and doctor back in control of their health care destiny.

STOP FUNDING ACORN WITH TAXPAYER DOLLARS

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I rise again to fight on behalf of Kansans who are furious that ACORN, the political machine of President Obama, is being funneled millions of taxpayer dollars to carry out fraudulent and illegal activities.

It's no secret President Obama paid ACORN over \$800,000 to help him win the White House. For years, this organization has been funded by liberal Democrats, and they have used the money to promote voter fraud and tax fraud, along with other illegal activities.

Despite the dozens of ACORN voter fraud scandals and its 70 convicted members, ACORN receives an outrageous 40 percent of its funding from hardworking taxpayers. This must stop. That's why we are fighting to defund this political machine and prevent further abuse of taxpayer money.

In addition to taking away every single tax dollar ACORN receives, we should strip its tax-exempt status. That's why this week I am introducing a resolution calling for the IRS to stop giving ACORN special tax treatment.

Let's help stop ACORN from using its tax-exempt status to advance liberal political agendas filled with corruption. It's time for Congress to put an end to this fraudulent use of public tax dollars and start working to revive our economy and create jobs.

GOVERNMENT TAKEOVER OF HEALTH CARE

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, it's clear from town hall meetings held across the country that the American people are rejecting the Democrat plan for a government takeover of health care. The President and Democrats in Congress need to start over on their health care plan.

House Republicans have a plan for reform that expands access to affordable health care and gives families the freedom to choose the health care that fits their needs. It's time for the President and Democrats in Congress to begin working with Republicans on real solu-

tions to the challenges our country faces, including health care reform.

According to economic modeling by the President's own chief economic adviser, the business tax increases alone will destroy up to 5.5 million jobs. An independent analysis by the non-partisan Lewin Group found that as many as 114 million Americans could lose their current health insurance.

The Democrats' health care plan also includes harmful cuts to Medicare Advantage, and according to the Congressional Budget Office, will raise seniors' Medicare prescription drug premiums by 20 percent over the next decade.

Despite claims that reform will reduce health care costs, the Congressional Budget Office has said the Democrats' health care plan will actually increase government spending and increase our national debt. The last thing we need is a government takeover of health care.

HEALTH INSURANCE NEEDS TO BE AFFORDABLE

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

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk of health care. Last week I had the opportunity to speak and listen at a town hall meeting in Bella Vista, Arkansas. This retirement community voiced their concern that insurance needed to be much more affordable and that we should do away with preexisting conditions. They did not want this paid for, though, on the backs of seniors.

In the current proposal, \$500 billion is taken away from Medicare. They do this by decreasing or eliminating the subsidy on Advantage plans, so most seniors would lose this opportunity to help them. There would be less money to providers when, in the situation we have now, it's very difficult to even find a Medicare provider in some cases.

Again, it makes no sense, Mr. Speaker, to cut Medicare \$500 billion, increase the patient load by 30 percent, not provide any more doctors to take care of the people, and no more facilities. We need reform, but we need commonsense reform. We must not do something just for the sake of doing it.

LIVINGSTONE AND JOHNSON C. SMITH TO RENEW 117-YEAR RIVALRY

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

Mr. WATT. Mr. Speaker, on December 27, 1892, the first college football game between two historically black institutions of higher education was played in Salisbury, North Carolina. On October 3, 2009, The Livingstone College and Johnson C. Smith University football teams will extend this 117-year rivalry in the 2009 Commemorative Classic football game.

I rise to recognize and pay tribute to Livingstone College and Johnson C. Smith University as they prepare to participate in this historic game, which is being played in my congressional district. Collegiate sports provide a backdrop for a multitude of life's lessons and a crucible in which many of society's leaders are shaped.

To quote Livingstone College President S.E. Duncan: The claim that football engenders school spirit has seldom been challenged. For the stimulation of academic improvement, its impact on citizenship and the outcome of our students on physical fitness, football comes increasingly to their attention for consideration.

I wish continued success to Livingstone College and Johnson C. Smith University and wish both of them success in this year's game.

□ 1030

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT REAUTHORIZATION OF 2009

Mr. WATT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1677) to reauthorize the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes.

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

S. 1677

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Defense Production Act Reauthorization of 2009”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Reauthorization of Defense Production Act of 1950.
- Sec. 3. Declaration of policy.
- Sec. 4. Priority in contracts and orders.
- Sec. 5. Designation of energy as a strategic and critical material.
- Sec. 6. Strengthening domestic capability.
- Sec. 7. Expansion of productive capacity and supply.
- Sec. 8. Definitions.
- Sec. 9. Voluntary agreements and plans of action for national defense.
- Sec. 10. Employment of personnel; appointment policies; nucleus executive reserve; use of confidential information by employees; printing and distribution of reports.
- Sec. 11. Defense Production Act Committee.
- Sec. 12. Annual report on impact of offsets.

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950.

(a) TERMINATION OF ACT.—

(1) TERMINATION.—Section 717 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2166) is amended—

(A) by striking subsections (a) and (b) and inserting the following:

“(a) Title I (except section 104), title III, and title VII (except sections 707, 708, and 721) shall terminate on September 30, 2014, except that all authority extended under title III on or after the date of enactment of the Defense Production Act Reauthorization of 2009 shall be effective for any fiscal year only to such extent or in such amounts as are provided in advance in appropriations Acts.

“(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a), any agency created under a provision of law that is terminated under subsection (a) may continue in existence, for purposes of liquidation, for a period not to exceed 6 months, beginning on the date of termination of the provision authorizing the creation of such agency under subsection (a).”; and

(B) in subsection (c), by striking the second undesignated paragraph.

(2) REPEALS.—Titles II, IV, V, and VI of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2151 et seq., 2101 et seq., 2121 et seq., and 2131 et seq.) are repealed.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 711 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2161) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking “(including)” and all that follows through “)” by” and inserting “by”; and

(B) by striking “(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Except as provided in subsection (b), there” and inserting “There”; and

(2) by striking subsection (b).

SEC. 3. DECLARATION OF POLICY.

(a) FINDINGS.—Section 2 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2062) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 2. DECLARATION OF POLICY.

“(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

“(1) the security of the United States is dependent on the ability of the domestic industrial base to supply materials and services for the national defense and to prepare for and respond to military conflicts, natural or man-caused disasters, or acts of terrorism within the United States;

“(2) to ensure the vitality of the domestic industrial base, actions are needed—

“(A) to promote industrial resources preparedness in the event of domestic or foreign threats to the security of the United States;

“(B) to support continuing improvements in industrial efficiency and responsiveness;

“(C) to provide for the protection and restoration of domestic critical infrastructure operations under emergency conditions; and

“(D) to respond to actions taken outside of the United States that could result in reduced supplies of strategic and critical materials, including energy, necessary for national defense and the general economic well-being of the United States;

“(3) in order to provide for the national security, the national defense preparedness effort of the United States Government requires—

“(A) preparedness programs to respond to both domestic emergencies and international threats to national defense;

“(B) measures to improve the domestic industrial base for national defense;

“(C) the development of domestic productive capacity to meet—

“(i) essential national defense needs that can result from emergency conditions; and

“(ii) unique technological requirements; and

“(D) the diversion of certain materials and facilities from ordinary use to national defense purposes, when national defense needs

cannot otherwise be satisfied in a timely fashion;

“(4) to meet the requirements referred to in this subsection, this Act provides the President with an array of authorities to shape national defense preparedness programs and to take appropriate steps to maintain and enhance the domestic industrial base;

“(5) in order to ensure national defense preparedness, it is necessary and appropriate to assure the availability of domestic energy supplies for national defense needs;

“(6) to further assure the adequate maintenance of the domestic industrial base, to the maximum extent possible, domestic energy supplies should be augmented through reliance on renewable energy sources (including solar, geothermal, wind, and biomass sources), more efficient energy storage and distribution technologies, and energy conservation measures;

“(7) much of the industrial capacity that is relied upon by the United States Government for military production and other national defense purposes is deeply and directly influenced by—

“(A) the overall competitiveness of the industrial economy of the United States; and

“(B) the ability of industries in the United States, in general, to produce internationally competitive products and operate profitably while maintaining adequate research and development to preserve competitiveness with respect to military and civilian production; and

“(8) the inability of industries in the United States, especially smaller subcontractors and suppliers, to provide vital parts and components and other materials would impair the ability to sustain the Armed Forces of the United States in combat for longer than a short period.

“(b) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States that—

“(1) to ensure the adequacy of productive capacity and supply, Federal departments and agencies that are responsible for national defense acquisition should continuously assess the capability of the domestic industrial base to satisfy production requirements under both peacetime and emergency conditions, specifically evaluating the availability of adequate production sources, including subcontractors and suppliers, materials, skilled labor, and professional and technical personnel;

“(2) every effort should be made to foster cooperation between the defense and commercial sectors for research and development and for acquisition of materials, components, and equipment;

“(3) plans and programs to carry out the purposes of this Act should be undertaken with due consideration for promoting efficiency and competition;

“(4) in providing United States Government financial assistance under this Act to correct a domestic industrial base shortfall, the President should give consideration to the creation or maintenance of production sources that will remain economically viable after such assistance has ended;

“(5) authorities under this Act should be used to reduce the vulnerability of the United States to terrorist attacks, and to minimize the damage and assist in the recovery from terrorist attacks that occur in the United States;

“(6) in order to ensure productive capacity in the event of an attack on the United States, the United States Government should encourage the geographic dispersal of industrial facilities in the United States to discourage the concentration of such productive facilities within limited geographic areas that are vulnerable to attack by an enemy of the United States;