

□ 0915

HEALTH CARE COVERAGE ONE-SIDED

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, yesterday, The New York Times, the Washington Post and the Los Angeles Times each featured a news story about President Obama's trip to Missouri to promote his health care plan. Combined, the three articles feature 16 quotes from individuals who support the administration's plan compared to just two quotes from those opposing it. This is a high level of bias considering that most Americans oppose the health care proposal and about two-thirds of Americans want Congress to start over and get it right.

The national media continue to be an unpaid public relations firm for this administration's health care scheme. To restore their credibility, the national media should give Americans the facts on health care, not just the administration's opinions.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3650, HARMFUL ALGAL BLOOMS AND HYPOXIA RESEARCH AND CONTROL AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2010

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1168 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1168

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3650) to establish a National Harmful Algal Bloom and Hypoxia Program, to develop and coordinate a comprehensive and integrated strategy to address harmful algal blooms and hypoxia, and to provide for the development and implementation of comprehensive regional action plans to reduce harmful algal blooms and hypoxia. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Science and Technology now printed in the bill, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions of the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science and Technology; (2) the amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules, if offered by Representative Flake of Arizona or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes

equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maine is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER). All time yielded during consideration of this rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, the resolution provides for consideration of H.R. 3650, the Harmful Algal Blooms and Hypoxia Research and Control Amendments Act of 2009, under a structured rule.

The resolution waives all points of order against consideration of the bill except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The resolution provides 1 hour of debate on the bill. The resolution provides that in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Science Committee, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the Rules Committee report shall be considered as adopted.

The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against the bill, as amended. The resolution makes in order the amendment printed by the Rules Committee report if offered by Representative FLAKE or a designee. The resolution waives all points of order against the amendment except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The resolution provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Madam Speaker, harmful algal blooms, or HABs, are a growing problem along U.S. coasts and they impact almost every coastal district. Some algae, like red tide, produce toxins that contaminate shellfish and shut down shellfish beds to local harvesters.

Severe red tide blooms can be harmful to tourism across the country. When red tide affects an area, people can't go in the water, seafood isn't bought and sold, and stores and hotels along the coast are empty.

Over the past few decades, harmful algae have begun to bloom more frequently and with greater intensity. HABs are one of the most complex and economically significant coastal management challenges facing the Nation.

We know that algae growth is influenced by a number of factors, including light, water temperature, salinity, and

nutrient availability, but the factors that drive outbreaks like red tide are not understood as well, and additional efforts are needed to monitor, control, prevent, and mitigate these outbreaks.

A professor at the University of Maine has done research that shows that the blooms start offshore and are blown towards shore by easterly winds. This sounds simple enough; yet in the field of red tide research, this was groundbreaking work.

Addressing HABs on a national level requires a coordinated approach that involves a number of Federal agencies, including the EPA and NOAA. The underlying bill oversees the development and implementation of regional research and action plans to help coastal managers understand and deal with HAB outbreaks.

New England, and Maine in particular, have been especially hard hit by outbreaks. Severe red tide events occurred in 4 of the last 5 years, causing tens of millions of dollars in lost income to shellfish harvesters.

The shellfish industry is vital to the Maine economy, Madam Speaker. Over 2,000 harvesters and dealers depend directly on access to healthy shellfish beds to make their living and support their families. Maine's Department of Marine Resources estimates total annual economic value of the shellfish industry in Maine to be about \$50 million.

Last spring and summer, the shellfish industry in Maine was shut down because of severe red tide bloom. At its peak, the density of the red tide toxin was nearly 100 times the federally mandated quarantine level and closed 97 percent of the State's shellfish beds and 100 percent of the offshore beds in Federal waters. Many shellfish harvesters were stuck on land for months with nowhere to go. This all occurred during the peak of the tourist season, and the results were devastating.

Coastal families rely on the income generated during the short summer months to carry them through Maine's long, cold winters; and the timing could have not have been worse for these hardworking harvesters. Not only were they missing out on the best time to sell their product, but they had no way of knowing when it would be okay to return to the mudflats. The uncertainty made it impossible to know whether to look for other employment or to wait and see if the next week would bring clear water.

Predictions for 2010 indicate that it could be an even worse year for red tide in the Gulf of Maine. According to a recent NOAA report, the cysts that cause red tide are at some of the highest levels ever measured, 60 percent higher than what was observed in the sediments prior to the historic red tide of 2005.

While red tide in Maine is a coastal issue, HABs are increasingly occurring in our inland lakes and rivers. Blue-green algae blooms in some Midwest lakes and the Great Lakes have killed

dozens of dogs and poisoned people all over the region. Frequently, these freshwater algae blooms are caused by a combination of droughts and fertilizer runoff. These outbreaks lead to rashes, sore throats, and other health concerns. This bill helps address algal blooms in lakes as well.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this important bill, and I am glad that Senator SNOWE from Maine is a leader on this issue in the Senate and is the author of the Senate companion legislation. I look forward to continuing to work with her to improve the economic health of our coastal communities.

This bill will help shellfish harvesters in every coastal community by improving our knowledge and ability to predict red tide blooms. We need a national strategy to address HABs and to provide for the development of regional action plans to reduce HAB outbreaks.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and "yes" on the underlying bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, let me begin by expressing my appreciation to my Rules Committee colleague, the distinguished gentlewoman from North Haven, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Madam Speaker, I sat and listened attentively as my colleague talked about the challenge of dealing with algal blooms and hypoxia research. And I am reminded, as I mentioned in the Rules Committee yesterday afternoon, of the rather famous vice presidential debate that took place in 1992.

Now, vice presidential debates, Madam Speaker, are not terribly memorable, but in 1992, for those who are old enough to remember, we saw three top-tier Presidential candidates, George H.W. Bush was running for reelection, Bill Clinton was the Democratic nominee, and H. Ross Perot was running as an independent candidate. In that vice presidential debate we saw Vice President Quayle, challenger Al Gore, who went on to become Vice President, of course, and this totally unknown figure, Admiral James Stockdale, a great man whom I was privileged to know. The famous line that came from that vice presidential debate, Madam Speaker, was from not Vice President Quayle or Vice-President-to-be Gore, but from Admiral Stockdale, who looked into the camera and said, "I'm sure you're asking who am I and why am I here." That term went on to be used throughout the decade plus in our vernacular.

I was reminded of that as we look at what it is that we're doing right here, Madam Speaker. One can't help but ask, who am I and why are we here? And having listened to the very

thoughtful statement on algal blooms and hypoxia research from my friend from North Haven, I would like to yield to her, if I might, Madam Speaker, to see if she could give us a really good description of why it is that we are here at this moment at 9:25 Friday morning when this was a measure that had been considered under a suspension of the rules and we had, mid-afternoon yesterday, completed the work and I know many of my colleagues have gone into their districts.

So I would like to yield to my colleague and ask her to provide us a clear, clear definition as to exactly why it is that we're here.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I appreciate my colleague's yielding, and I appreciate his thoughtful comments about red tide and hypoxia research.

I can only answer for the residents of my home State, who are deeply concerned about algal blooms, red tide, the economic impact in our communities, and the importance of passing this legislation so that the research is done.

Mr. DREIER. Well, Madam Speaker, let me reclaim my time and say that we had an emergency Rules Committee meeting yesterday to bring this measure up. Now, I understand the importance of dealing with algal blooms and hypoxia research, but in my State of California we have many counties, Madam Speaker, that tragically have an unemployment rate that is in excess of 20 percent. We have a nationwide unemployment rate that is hovering right around 10 percent, 9.7 percent—it's been around 10 percent for 7 months—and we know that millions and millions of Americans have lost their homes and many more continue to face either the threat of foreclosure or years of upside-down mortgages. Our deficit is \$1.4 trillion, and we all know that our national debt has exceeded \$12 trillion.

Credit remains very scarce. We hear regularly decried from both sides of the aisle about working families and small business owners who depend on a robust financial services system. We have serious, very serious issues as a Nation that the American people expect us to deal with aggressively and responsibly. And I would argue, Madam Speaker, that while we are considering the algal blooms and hypoxia research measure under an emergency structure that was put forth by the Rules Committee, I'm not in any way diminishing its importance, but I think these issues that I just mentioned are what are on the minds of Americans all across this country: job creation and economic growth.

So what is it that we do in response to the economic crisis that we're facing in the United States of America? It is, as I said, the Harmful Algal Blooms and Hypoxia Research and Control Amendments.

□ 0930

Now, Madam Speaker, I yielded to my colleague to say why it is that we

are really here, which is the fact that we were promised transparency. You don't need a really, really good pair of reading glasses to know exactly why it is that we are here.

Very simply, we are here because the Democratic leadership is doing everything that it possibly can to twist arms and to line up votes. Based on public opinion polling and on three elections that have been held within the last couple of months in Virginia, New Jersey, and Massachusetts, they are twisting arms to try and pass a very, very, very unpopular and, I believe, outrageous, horrible measure that would see us have the Federal Government take control of one-sixth of our Nation's economy.

The most recent maneuver they were considering to ram this thing through was something that has been dubbed the "Slaughter solution." Many media outlets have tried to explain to the American people what exactly the Slaughter solution would be. Most explanations have left listeners more confused and outraged than when they started. It is a twisted and contorted process that can make anyone's head spin, but this is it in a nutshell:

Madam Speaker, the Slaughter solution is an end run around a vote in the House of Representatives on the health care bill. As the health care process has moved forward, the substance of what the Democratic majority is trying to accomplish has become ever more unpopular. The result is that they simply do not have the votes to pass a bill that can get to the President for his signature. We all know that.

In the last 30 minutes, the President has announced that he is delaying his trip to Indonesia and to Australia. We know that they are doing everything within their power to try and twist arms and to encourage people to vote for something that is extraordinarily unpopular and that, I believe, would be devastating for our Nation's economy.

So, Madam Speaker, what is it that you do if you don't have the votes? What is it that you do? Do you start over and work for a bipartisan solution, which is what the American people want? This is not a partisan issue on our part. We are saying let's take the commonsense approach that the American people have said we should take, a step-by-step approach. So is that the message that has come through?

Do you listen? Do you listen, as many of us have, to what it is that the American people are saying through town hall meetings and through other fora, and do you incorporate their ideas into this quest that we all share of trying to drive health care costs down so that we can increase access to health insurance for our fellow Americans?

Apparently, the answer to every single one of those, Madam Speaker, is "no," for this Democratic majority; when you don't have the votes, you simply come up with a scheme to avoid

a vote altogether, which is what the Slaughter solution is. This so-called "Slaughter solution" would allow the House to wait for the Senate to pass a fix-it package to their flawed health care bill. When the fix would be passed by the Senate, the bill would magically be deemed passed by the House without our ever having a transparent up-or-down vote on the original bill.

Let's remind ourselves of a new direction for America, the document that then-Minority Leader Nancy PELOSI put forward, one promising transparency, disclosure, accountability, and the kind of openness that we all aspire to, but which tragically has deteriorated over the past 3 years.

The approach that we have with the Slaughter solution is a hopelessly cynical attempt to completely upend the democratic process. It also, Madam Speaker, I believe, creates the potential for a real backfire. For months, the Democratic majority has blamed the Senate for their own inability to provide leadership and decisive action on the pressing challenges that we face, and now they want to put the fate of their convoluted plan on the ability of the Senate to pass a clean fix-it bill.

Madam Speaker, the Senate has disappointed my Democratic colleagues yet again. We got the report just yesterday which seemed to undermine the Slaughter solution. It appears that the Senate parliamentarian will insist on the enactment of the Senate health care reform bill before he will recognize the fix-it bill as reconciliation, meaning that reconciliation can only be utilized to deal with existing law. That means, if the Democrats won't take a straight up-or-down vote on the bill, their only option is the light version of the Slaughter solution, having the bill deemed as passed by the rule and sending the Senate bill to the President for his signature. Now, that's what the lawyers call, Madam Speaker, a distinction without a difference.

The reality is that a vote on the rule will be a vote on the Senate health care bill, complete with all of the special interest provisions that it contains—the Cornhusker kickback, gator aid, the Louisiana purchase, these kinds of things that we have heard about. Then there are all sorts of hidden items in there which some friends of mine have been discussing with me, like promises that there won't be a middle class tax increase. What does the measure do? It slashes FSAs, Flexible Savings Accounts, which have been utilized by people who are trying to address their health care needs. By doing what they do in this bill, it will be a slap to the taxpayers of this country who are middle-income wage earners. Their problems don't end there. There will be, Madam Speaker, challenges to some proposed fixes and, therefore, changes to the Senate package.

Then there is the question of the Federal funding of abortion. If this cannot be banned through reconciliation, would the Slaughter solution be

further expanded to implement a fix on that issue as well? How would that fix make its way through the United States Senate?

Now, with serious unanswered questions like these, why would any Member of this House take the bait and support the Slaughter solution, even in its light version, by deeming a measure passed with the passage of a rule? There is a high probability that House Democrats would be forced into taking the tough votes they tried so hard to avoid after putting themselves on record as supporting an end run around a real transparent vote.

In the end, Madam Speaker, rank-and-file Democrats would be making themselves all the more vulnerable for having supported their leadership's egregious tactics. The Slaughter solution is bad policy, bad process, and bad politics. The fact that the Democratic leadership is pursuing this option exposes its unwillingness to abandon the most fundamental element of legislating. The most fundamental element of being a deliberative body is a transparent up-or-down vote, and they are doing that in order to achieve what everyone recognizes, based on public opinion polling. And I don't make my decisions based on public opinion polling; I make my decisions on what I think is right, but it just so happens that public opinion overwhelmingly has pointed to this as a very, very, very unpopular, unpopular proposal.

Today, on which I have just had an exchange with my colleague from North Haven, they are hiding behind blooming algae as they twist arms and try to work their backroom deals. But, Madam Speaker, your leadership cannot hide forever. If the Democratic majority proceeds with its plan to ram through their health care bill without actually holding a vote, it's going to take more than algae to protect them from the American public's outrage.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Madam Speaker, I had no idea that we were here to debate health care this morning, but I appreciate that the gentleman, my friend from California, has brought up the differences between us. I would like to make a couple of points.

First off, we are here today to take up this bill that could have been done under a suspension; but as I understand, my colleague voted "no" when this bill originally came to the floor, which is why we're back here today—to pass what is a relatively simple, I agree, piece of legislation but what is very important in coastal districts like mine.

Yes, we do have a disagreement on health care legislation, and I wish that your caucus were doing what my caucus is doing right now, which is going through the health care legislation that we hope to bring to this floor soon, line by line, to make sure that we are confident this is excellent legislation to move forward the cause of

health care reform, something on which he and I don't agree.

I support very strongly and am looking forward to the debate that we will have on this floor about that health care legislation, and I am thrilled with the year and a half that I have spent here and with the number of hours that the committees and Members on both sides of the aisle, Republicans and Democrats, have put in in crafting health care legislation. Now, we may not agree on the final product, and that will come down to a vote. You're right. It will depend on making sure that we have enough votes on our side of the aisle, and I am glad that we are making sure that everyone feels confident about that vote.

You know, it was interesting. I, as you know, am a freshman, so I wasn't here in previous years when you were. But when you talk about arm-twisting and about getting votes, I am reminded of the stories that I've heard about passing the prescription drug legislation, and about what it took for the other party, in the middle of the night and with a vote open for many hours, to pass a piece of legislation. I have to say, from my perch as a former State legislator from a State where the cost of prescription drugs is crippling the health care costs for many of our senior citizens, I was shocked to see what that final piece of legislation came to be. I am thrilled that our health care legislation, which I believe will be on this floor soon, will fix some of the problems in there, but, I'm sorry to say, not all.

I remember hearing about that legislation. Was it 2 hours or was it 3 hours in the middle of the night when people were convinced to change their votes so as to get the votes, and when every minute counted to get one more vote? That was the legislation that left us with this tremendous doughnut hole of which our senior citizens talk to me every day. Frankly, that's the public opinion polling that I hear about when I go back to my district.

Yet it's not a public opinion poll. It's senior citizens who come up to me and ask, Do you see what it costs me to buy my prescription drugs? Do you see what happens when I get into the doughnut hole?

Here is what they really ask me. They ask, How could the Republican Party, in the middle of the night and in twisting arms for every vote, pass a piece of legislation that doesn't allow us to negotiate with the pharmaceutical manufacturers for the price of prescription drugs? I can tell you, in my home State of Maine, this was an issue for years.

When I first got elected in 1992 to my State legislature, senior citizens came up to me and asked, Do you see what it costs me to buy my prescription drugs? Then, every year, it got worse and worse and worse as the pharmaceutical manufacturers, which are some of the wealthiest corporations and multinational corporations in this country,

were able to sell their drugs at the highest prices in the world to senior citizens in America. Those people had to pay cash for their prescription drugs. Those people had to decide whether to put heating oil in their tanks to keep warm or put food on their tables.

The Republicans came to the point where they could have changed the law like they've done in Canada or like they've done in virtually every other country in the world. They could have done what they're always telling us: Be like a good business, have good business practices. You know, I own a small business. I wouldn't think of buying something I didn't negotiate for. Well, that's what that bill said. It said we won't negotiate. In fact, we'll give them sweetheart deals. We'll say to our senior citizens, You know what? You're going to pay the highest prices in the world, so there will be no cost savings. These are the same Republicans who tell us now there aren't enough cost savings in our health care bill. They use it as an excuse, but that was what was done in the dark of the night, for 3 hours, in holding open a debate.

Do you know how I first found out about this? I got on a bus with senior citizens from the State of Maine. Let me tell you how it worked. We'd stop in Biddeford, Maine. Then we'd go to Portland, Maine. Then we'd go to Lewiston, Maine. We'd stop at places all along the State of Maine, and we'd drive all the way up to the Canadian border. We'd get all the way to the Canadian border, and we'd visit with a duly licensed physician so that they could have their prescriptions rewritten and they could take them across the Canadian border legally. So then we'd go to a Canadian drug store. This is a busload of senior citizens. We'd go into that Canadian drug store, and they'd buy their prescriptions. I want to tell you about one person I sat next to on one of the many bus trips.

I sat next to a person who had to take Tamoxifen, which is a wonderful drug that we're glad we have for breast cancer, but this person takes 30 pills a month. At that point, I think it cost her about \$150 a month for her 30 pills. When we got across the Canadian border, it was \$12.35. In my opinion, that was highway robbery. Do you know why that was? Because the Canadian Government, just like every other Western nation, requires that they negotiate for the best prices possible.

So, as far as I'm concerned, that's what should have been in that prescription drug plan that was decided in the middle of the night when arms were twisted to get every last vote. That is what should be: closing the doughnut hole and lowering prescription drug prices in the health care bill that we will debate soon.

□ 0945

As far as I am concerned, I am thrilled that members of my caucus are

here today to go through line by line, to make sure that we are getting the best possible health care plan we can get. And I will say, it is not going to be everything I want in a health care plan.

I come from the State of Maine. Our doctors think that single payer ought to be the health care plan in Maine, and I am right there with them, but I know that is not what we are going to get to vote on here on the floor. But I am anxious to make sure that we get the best possible compromise, and I would be thrilled if some of the members of your caucus would vote for that bill. I would be thrilled.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to yield to my colleague to engage in a colloquy, if I might, so we might have a discussion.

I found it very interesting, very interesting, Madam Speaker, that she talked about that amazing drug that is used for breast cancer, and, unfortunately, the huge disparity in the cost that that woman she was riding on the bus had in Canada versus the United States of America. There is an important reason for that, Madam Speaker, and that is the fact that we want to make sure that there are more amazing drugs created.

There are many very serious ailments that exist out there today, and one of the things that we have as our great comparative advantage here in the United States of America is that we are the center for research and innovation. And, unfortunately, we have had to shoulder the financial burden for that research so that that woman riding on the bus with my friend from North Haven was able to have a drug that would never have been developed had it not been for the kind of innovation that exists here in the United States of America.

I would like to yield to my friend to see if she would recognize that the innovation and creativity that exists in the United States of America is what allowed that friend of hers on the bus to have.

I am happy to yield whatever amount of time my friend consumes from my time.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Well, thank you so much for yielding your time and for allowing me to address this topic, and even though we are here to address algal blooms, I appreciate the chance to go back and forth on this important topic.

Mr. DREIER. Let me just say, Madam Speaker, that I am very happy that we are here to address an issue that is of concern to the American people. With all due respect to the importance of algal blooms and hypoxia research, I believe what we are talking about today is much more important. And the thing we should be talking about is not something that happened 5 years ago, which, frankly, many, many

seniors are benefiting from, but what we should talk about is what is about to happen and what is happening behind closed doors throughout this Capitol at this moment.

I am happy to further yield to my friend.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Thank you. And just to answer your point, I, too, think it is essential that we continue our research and development here in this country. Frankly, much of it is done around the world on research and development. But I don't think that negotiating for a better price, that lowering the prices to our senior citizens, would cost us research and development. And, frankly—

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, if I could reclaim my time just to say to my friend that she is right. She is right, Madam Speaker, that there are other parts of the world where research and innovation are taking place. But it all pales, it pales in comparison to the kind of research and development that takes place here in the United States.

I would like to ask my colleague, Madam Speaker, if she would support making permanent the research and development tax credit so that we could have the kind of incentive for our pharmaceutical industry and others out there who are creating these innovative new ideas to deal with Alzheimer's and cancer and diabetes and other ailments that exist. Madam Speaker, would she be supportive of the notion of our pursuing that kind of incentive to deal with these problems that can play a role in driving costs down?

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. First off, I would prefer to answer you on my own time, because it seems to me when you yield me your time, you usually answer for me. So I would rather wait until I have my time.

Mr. DREIER. I just asked the question on my own time. I am happy to yield to my friend. I asked a question, and I would welcome your answer.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I have to say I am unprepared to answer your question about the research and development tax credit for the pharmaceutical industry—I know that I have industries in my State that benefit from that tax credit—before I say yes or no about the solution that you are proposing.

But I do want to go back to one other thing—

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, let me just say, because I control the time—

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. See, I don't think you are letting me finish my answer, so you go ahead.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I am happy to yield to my friend further, but the gentlewoman has chosen to say she doesn't know whether or not she would support making permanent the research and development tax credit, when we all know that would play a critical role in driving costs down for our seniors and others.

Madam Speaker, the fact of the matter is we are here at this juncture dealing with a measure that may be important to some, but this measure was

considered, as I said, under an emergency structure upstairs in the Rules Committee.

Now, I ask the question, when the President made his decision to delay his trip to Indonesia and Australia from March 18 to March 21 or 22, was that so that he could deal with the emergency of signing legislation dealing with algal blooms and hypoxia research? I don't think so. But that is the measure, as my friend said, she wanted to discuss here on the House floor today, when in fact we know, we know that arm-twisting is taking place. And to liken, to liken the structure that is taking place with what happened 5 years ago is preposterous.

It is true, it is true that under the rules of the House that vote may have been left open, and as a by-product of that we have seen literally millions and millions of seniors have access to affordable prescription drugs.

Madam Speaker, I have to say that that pales in comparison to this unprecedented and outrageous structure that is being utilized, that is being utilized to ram down the throats of the American people something that they don't want.

Madam Speaker, with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Madam Speaker, I will just say a couple of more things again.

I am thrilled that the President has decided to focus all of his energy on health care. I think that the people of this country have waited long enough for health care reform, and I am anxious to see it come to this floor. I am anxious to see us bring it to final passage.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me say that I was just reminded by my staff, Madam Speaker, and I have got a couple of articles that were just handed to me here today, about this process issue. I regularly argue that process is substance. And excuse me, I am not talking, by the way, about algal blooms or hypoxia research. I am talking about this convoluted process known as the "Slaughter solution."

For some strange reason, the Democratic leadership has said that, regardless of what the Senate is going to do, we are going to proceed with taking our action here, when reconciliation itself is a Senate process. That was designed, as we all know, it is called budget reconciliation, put into place in the 1974 Budget and Impoundment Act. It was put into place by Senator BYRD, and the goal of providing an opportunity for reconciliation, budget reconciliation, was so that there could be an opportunity to deal with tax increases or spending cuts.

I will say, the last time we dealt with meaningful spending cuts under this kind of structure was when we tried to tackle the issue of entitlement reform, and we were able to bring about a very,

very modest \$40 billion reduction. I think that we need to work harder on that and we need to utilize that process in doing it.

But what we are seeing right now and these reports that are out there, the confusion that exists in this House, and certainly with the American people, who are just casual observers of this, is that this is not what we were promised, Madam Speaker. It is not what we were promised.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I have no further requests for time, and I will continue to reserve my time.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, it looks like my friend from Texas is here and would like to be recognized. I am happy to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I appreciate so much the points my friend from California has been making. Here there have been discussions about health care and the White House wanting to take that over for the American people, and it really is highlighted by something that I ran into just this morning at the White House.

Now, we know from the prior hearings that were held that apparently the Social Secretary had a meeting with people at security at the White House and decided to change protocol so she wouldn't be there, and so some people got waved in that shouldn't have gotten waved in. As a result, what has happened now, with Members of Congress, it used to be that if you gave 24 hours' notice with Social Security numbers, date of birth, all that kind of thing, you could get six people into the White House at 8 o'clock, 7:45, something like that the next morning. Now, under this White House that has changed to where they want 48 hours. Okay, fine.

As a result of the incompetent handling over letting people into the White House that shouldn't have been, not by the Secret Service, not by the armed guards there—now they have doubled the number of guards that are out there—they now make both Members of Congress and those people who are obviously law-abiding and have had their security checked and double-checked with not one smudge on their record, now they have to go clear down a block away to 15th Street and go through security there.

The Member of Congress, like today in the rain, has to go down a block and then go through security there, with double the number of guards, and then come up and go through security again and go through guards again, all not because Secret Service messed up or the armed guards that are now doubled in number, but because somebody in the White House staff screwed up. Now they are deciding to punish Members of Congress and law-abiding citizens that normally just get in.

The point here is that this is a circus over there. Nobody seems to know

what is going on. When accountability was demanded and the Social Secretary was requested by Members of Congress to come testify, they said, "We are not going to let you come testify."

The same thing happened on the Auto Task Force. Could you have them at least come tell us about their secret meetings, these czars and all that stuff? "We are not going to be accountable."

It is a circus going on over there, and now the people in the circus want to be in charge of your health care. Good grief. It is time to say we don't want clowns in charge of something as important as our health care. I don't even want them in charge of algal blooms.

With that, I appreciate the time.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for his very thoughtful remarks.

Let me just close—I know my colleague is prepared to do the same—by making a couple of comments.

I began by pointing to the fact that in California we have a number of counties with an unemployment rate in excess of 20 percent. In part of the area I represent in suburban Los Angeles, we have an unemployment rate in excess of 14 percent. We have, obviously, tremendous numbers of home foreclosures and small business people are unable to gain access to credit.

I believe that we can get our economy growing boldly, strongly, and dynamically, with bipartisanship—and I underscore that term "bipartisan," Madam Speaker—by utilizing the John F. Kennedy-Ronald Reagan approach with marginal tax rate reduction which, during the 1960s under John F. Kennedy and the 1980s under Ronald Reagan, stimulated economic growth by reducing marginal tax rates and doubled, doubled the flow of revenues to the Federal Treasury.

Everyone is decrying the \$1.4 trillion deficit and the \$12 trillion debt that we have today. And what is it we are doing? We are sitting here with a discussion about algal blooms and hypoxia research, and we are witnessing arm-twisting to see the Federal Government take control of one-sixth of our economy, while the American people want us to focus on job creation and economic growth.

□ 1000

We can be doing that, Madam Speaker, if we can refocus our attention to where it is that the American people want us to be. And I urge a "no" vote on this rule.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I thank my colleague from California.

We have had a lively debate this morning on a whole variety of issues. I had no idea I was going to have the pleasure of coming to the floor to talk about the bus trips with senior citizens, about the prescription drug debate in the middle of the night and many of the things that have been part

of our process for years before I was ever here. And I thank you for that opportunity to go back and forth on those issues.

I appreciate your thoughts and our differences of opinion on this issue of health care reform. I want to reiterate we are here today on the issue of algal blooms and red tide and a variety of things that are important to my constituents here in Maine.

The reason this bill is here on this floor today is because many of those on the other side of the aisle, including my Republican colleague, whom we have been going back and forth with today, Mr. DREIER, voted "no" on the bill when it first hit the floor and we are taking up again.

I would like to close and stick to the topic for a minute and let us move forward with our business today making sure that we continue to bring more bills around jobs here, and I hope that we have some Republican votes on our future jobs bill and certainly on our health care bill.

In closing, I just want to say that the 2009 red tide in Maine hit our coastal communities hard. Most shellfish harvesters are self-employed and make the majority of their living in the summer months. Every day, shellfish harvesters were calling the State agencies and asking for help with mortgages payments, utility bills, doctor bills, car payments, and even food. In my State and in many coastal States, these are jobs. These are jobs that keep families working through the summer and help them get through the winter.

The economic impact of closing much of the coast to shellfish harvesters, aquaculturists and related businesses was conservatively estimated to be between \$1.6 million and \$2.5 million each week. This is real money to coastal States in every corner of this country.

This bill will make a difference for coastal communities. With improved testing and tracking, scientists will be able to accurately identify localized areas. This means that smaller portions of the coast will be shut down instead of entire regions. In addition, it will build on so much of the good work that has already been done, improve our prediction and monitoring capabilities, and take steps to mitigate the impact of red tide and other HABs. We need a national program dedicated to coordinating and integrating Federal resources to minimize or even prevent HABs in both fresh and saltwater. Enhanced coordination will help resource managers make better decisions, and with better decisions will come less economic hardship in our coastal communities.

I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question and on the rule.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill, H.R. 3650.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Florida). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

HARMFUL ALGAL BLOOMS AND HYPOXIA RESEARCH AND CONTROL AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2010

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the resolution just adopted, I call up the bill (H.R. 3650) to establish a National Harmful Algal Bloom and Hypoxia Program, to develop and coordinate a comprehensive and integrated strategy to address harmful algal blooms and hypoxia, and to provide for the development and implementation of comprehensive regional action plans to reduce harmful algal blooms and hypoxia, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1168, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Science and Technology printed in the bill, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part A of House Report 111-439 is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Harmful Algal Blooms and Hypoxia Research and Control Amendments Act of 2010".

SEC. 2. AMENDMENT OF HARMFUL ALGAL BLOOM AND HYPOXIA RESEARCH AND CONTROL ACT OF 1998.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Harmful Algal Bloom and Hypoxia Research and Control Act of 1998 (16 U.S.C. 1451 note).

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

(a) AMENDMENT.—The Act is amended by inserting after section 602 the following:

"SEC. 602A. DEFINITIONS.

"In this title:

"(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term 'Administrator' means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

"(2) PROGRAM.—The term 'Program' means the National Harmful Algal Bloom and Hypoxia Program established under section 603A.

"(3) STATE.—The term 'State' means each of the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, any other territory or possession of the United States, and any Indian tribe.

"(4) UNDER SECRETARY.—The term 'Under Secretary' means the Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere."

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 2 of the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1998 is amended by adding after the item relating to section 602 the following new item:

"Sec. 602A. Definitions."

SEC. 4. NATIONAL HARMFUL ALGAL BLOOM AND HYPOXIA PROGRAM.

(a) AMENDMENT.—The Act is amended by inserting after section 603 the following:

"SEC. 603A. NATIONAL HARMFUL ALGAL BLOOM AND HYPOXIA PROGRAM.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (d), the Under Secretary, through the Task Force established under section 603(a), shall establish and maintain a National Harmful Algal Bloom and Hypoxia Program pursuant to this section.

"(b) DUTIES.—The Under Secretary, through the Program, shall coordinate the efforts of the Task Force to—

"(1) develop and promote a national strategy to understand, detect, predict, control, mitigate, and respond to marine and freshwater harmful algal bloom and hypoxia events;

"(2) integrate the research of all Federal programs, including ocean and Great Lakes science and management programs and centers, that address the chemical, biological, and physical components of marine and freshwater harmful algal blooms and hypoxia;

"(3) coordinate and work cooperatively with State, tribal, and local government agencies and programs that address marine and freshwater harmful algal blooms and hypoxia;

"(4) identify additional research, development, and demonstration needs and priorities relating to monitoring, prediction, prevention, control, mitigation, and response to marine and freshwater harmful algal blooms and hypoxia;

"(5) encourage international information sharing and research efforts on marine and freshwater harmful algal blooms and hypoxia, and encourage international mitigation, control, and response activities;

"(6) ensure the development and implementation of methods and technologies to protect the ecosystems affected by marine and freshwater harmful algal blooms;

"(7) integrate, coordinate, and augment existing education programs to improve public understanding and awareness of the causes, impacts, and mitigation efforts for marine and freshwater harmful algal blooms and hypoxia;

"(8) assist in regional, State, tribal, and local efforts to develop and implement appropriate marine and freshwater harmful algal bloom and hypoxia response plans, strategies, and tools;

"(9) provide resources for and assist in the training of State, tribal, and local water and coastal resource managers in the methods and technologies for monitoring, controlling, mitigating, and responding to the effects of marine and freshwater harmful algal blooms and hypoxia events;

"(10) oversee the development, implementation, review, and periodic updating of the Regional Research and Action Plans under section 603B; and

"(11) administer peer-reviewed, merit-based competitive grant funding to support—

"(A) the projects maintained and established by the Program; and

"(B) the research and management needs and priorities identified in the Regional Research and Action Plans.

"(c) COOPERATIVE EFFORTS.—The Under Secretary shall work cooperatively and avoid duplication of efforts with other offices, centers, and programs within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and other agencies represented on the