

This bill will be impossible to undo once it is passed. We need to step up and do our duty, stop this bill, then fix the things the American people want us to fix.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, purely political about expanding the dependency class because the dependency class expands the political power of the left in America at the expense of our freedom and at the expense of our liberty, never to be gotten back again.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your indulgence tonight, and my colleagues for joining me.

I yield back the balance of my time.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for the remaining time until midnight.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I appreciate the opportunity here to respond to some of the criticisms that have been made here, unjust as they seem to be to me, and try to straighten the record out just a little bit.

It is our belief on this side of the aisle that the United States Government and the government of many of our States have a moral mission to protect our citizens, a moral mission to empower our citizens, and a moral mission to improve the lives of many of our citizens. The issue of health care reform to us on this side of the aisle is a moral issue, and it is an economic issue.

When we see throughout our country the level of abuse that has been put upon the people of this country through the insurance system, that, my friends, that, Mr. Speaker, is a moral issue. Nobody is saying that this health care reform bill is a perfect bill. Nobody says that it is going to be a panacea, that it is going to fix all of our problems in this country. But this is a major step forward for our country. And we have as a country a moral obligation to stand up between what the insurance industry is doing to the American people, somebody has to intervene. And there is nobody left because average people who are in Ohio or Iowa or some of these other States have no recourse. They cannot battle the insurance industry.

This has been going on for years and years and years, where the insurance industry kicks people off the rolls when they need coverage or when they get sick, when they deny people coverage because they have a preexisting condition; and so they therefore can't get any insurance at all. And they have created a system here over the past few years, past 5, 10 years where we see 20, 30, 40, 50 percent increases in health care costs for individuals and small businesses, and large businesses in many instances and the government.

So we have a situation where we are that far from addressing one of the

great moral issues of our time. And we are that far from addressing an economic issue that will continue to strangle the economy of the United States of America if we fail to act.

Now, I think it is very convenient for our friends on the other side of the aisle and those in the insurance industry to say let's start again. Let's start all over. Let's start from scratch. Well, if the insurance industry wants to go back and revoke 10 years of increases that they have bestowed upon the American people, if they want to start over, then maybe we will start over. If they want to eliminate all of the increases that they put on the American people, eliminate them all. Let's go back to 1995 or 1994 rates, or even just cost of living from 1994 or 1995 when we tried to do this the last time. Why don't the insurance companies start over, Mr. Speaker, and go back and erase their increases that they put on the American people. Then we may consider starting over.

Now, for those people, Mr. Speaker, who have been listening to this debate, they need to recognize that maybe this process isn't pretty, and maybe we could have done a better job explaining what is going on. And many people, and our friends on the other side were talking about polls, and at the same time would lament the fact that we are governing by polls.

So when you look at what has happened over the course of the past few years and what has happened to average people—I want to find the poll that we had here when you pull out the issues from the poll. So the general consensus is, do you want the health care? And they hear on the news, Mr. Speaker, about different things that are going on and they say, well, it doesn't sound like such a good idea.

□ 2310

But then when you pull out specific provisions of this bill, of this health care reform proposal, most of those issues, most of those reforms poll at 60, 70, or 80 percent support.

Are you for getting rid of preexisting conditions and allowing insurance companies to not cover you because you have a preexisting condition? Sixty-seven percent of the American people support that.

Do you support eliminating lifetime caps so that when you get sick and you really need the insurance, you can get it? Sixty to 70 percent of the American people support that.

Do you support not being able to deny every child in the United States of America because of a preexisting condition? Seventy, 80 percent of the American people support that.

Do you support giving small businesses tax credits to cover their workers? Significant support for that.

So we are moving forward with a proposal that addresses the major needs of the American people.

When you ask seniors, are you for closing the doughnut hole? More than a

majority of seniors say, Yes, that is something that what we want included in the health reform proposal. And it is included in here. And many of these reforms will go in effect within the next year.

And so when we pass this, Mr. Speaker, and our friends campaign in November about repealing this, they are going to have to go to all the moms and dads in the country and say, No, you know how your child, if they get sick or you want to get insurance, they can't be denied because of a preexisting condition, they want to run a campaign saying, No, we want to repeal that. Our friends on the other side of the aisle, when we say, You can't be denied coverage for a preexisting condition, they are going to want to run a campaign saying, No, we want to repeal that. When we close the doughnut hole and start moving in the direction of fully closing the doughnut hole that the Republican Party put in here when they passed the prescription drug bill that they didn't pay for, we had to borrow money from China to pay for it, and it has a doughnut hole in it, and we attempt to close it, our friends on the other side of the aisle are going to run a campaign in November saying, We want to repeal the closure of the doughnut hole.

Those are the issues that are in here, that are in this reform proposal, and these are the issues that are going to bring some justice to the health care industry in the United States of America.

This isn't about whether the government is going to run health care or the insurance industry is going to run health care. This is about whether doctors can make decisions. And our friends on the other side want to talk about life and liberty. Let's talk about life and liberty. Let's have this debate.

You want to talk about freedom? How free are you when you are sick and you can't afford health insurance? You can't get out of bed to go to work. You have to give up your job because you don't have health insurance. How free are you? I cannot be convinced that the Founders of this great country thought that freedom is somehow the government not protecting individual citizens from underhanded practices from a corporation. I can't believe it.

I believe that the definition of freedom is about being healthy and empowered in 2010 in America. And if there is a corporation or an industry that is limiting your freedom by their underhanded practices, then the government has a moral responsibility to intervene and to protect the individual citizen and protect the rights of the individual citizen. Let's have this debate all day long, Mr. Speaker, telling me some boogie man is being created here that is going to come in to Washington, D.C.

My one friend said nationalizing our bodies. One of our friends on the other side said that this was about nationalizing our bodies. What? Talk about fear mongering, Mr. Speaker. Nationalizing

our bodies? This is about protecting individuals in the United States of America who can't protect themselves, and the government has a moral obligation to do it. If it is a foreign terrorist, moral obligation to do it. If it is crime in the streets and our cities, moral obligation to do it. If it is an unruly industry that has underhanded business practices, moral obligation to stop it. That is what we have here. That is why we are here. That is how this country was founded, to protect the individual freedoms.

To say to small business people, You have to go out into the shark-infested waters to try to get health insurance and have 40, 50, 60 percent increases and do nothing about it because of some warped concept of freedom that is made up, how free is that business person who takes money continually out of wages, out of capital investments into their factories, into their machine shops, into their businesses, into their technology, into training their workers? They are not free to make good business decisions. They probably have all kinds of good ideas about what kind of investments they would rather be making than paying to some health insurance company that doesn't give us value added.

You want to help manufacturing in the United States of America? Help fix some of the health care burdens that our manufacturers are plagued with day in and day out. And how many factories were shuttered because they couldn't make the capital investments because they had to put so much money into health care? How many?

We have seen the decline in manufacturing over the last 10 or 20 years. We have seen stagnant wages over the last 10 or 20 years because businesses had to absorb health care costs while simultaneously trying to compete with China and India and manufacturing all over the globe. And our friends on the other side want to start all over. And they want to tell all these people who are getting denied because they have a pre-existing condition we need to start all over and wait another hundred years to do it, or at least another 15 years, the last time someone had the courage like President Clinton had to try to do this.

We have an obligation to fix these problems. We didn't get sent here to take polls. We were sent here to do the right thing. And it is my hope that this week—you know, it was great today. We were in Cleveland with the President. And he was in the middle of his speech, and he said something like, What we need, or, We need, and there was a pause. And a woman shouted out, "We need courage."

We need courage. That is what people are feeling. They feel like there's no one there to help them. They get stuck in situations where they don't have anywhere to turn. And imagine the United States Government passing a law that says, when you get sick, you can't get kicked off your insurance.

□ 2320

That is what is in this bill. That is why, when you look at the lists of faith-based organizations who are supporting this bill—Sojourners, Network, Catholic organizations, Evangelicals for Social Action, Jim Wallis at Sojourners, Catholics in Alliance for the Common Good, New Evangelical Partnership for the Common Good, former Associate General Secretary for U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, Sisters of Mercy of the Americas. Boston College professors, University of Dayton professors, Marquette University professors. On and on and on and on.

Then, this weekend a huge endorsement for this bill. As my friends on the other side were talking about the abortion issue, 25 pro-life Catholic and evangelical leaders have endorsed this bill, and this weekend the Catholic Hospital Associations endorsed this bill. Do you think the Catholic Hospital Associations of America would endorse this bill if this was a pro-abortion bill? This is the pro-life bill. This may be the most pro-life bill that has passed this House in 20 years.

How do we define life? How many people die too early because they are sick and they can't get the proper care? How many people have a reduced quality of life because they can't get proper health care? Aren't those pro-life issues? They most certainly are. And to have the Catholic Hospital Association endorsing this bill, and then to come out and fearmonger, Mr. Speaker, on the abortion issue is wrong. It is wrong. Twenty-five pro-life Catholic and evangelical leaders, strong, nationally recognized endorsing this bill, because this is a pro-life bill, and we should support it as a pro-life bill.

We talk a lot about freedom, too. How many people in America today are out there locked in a job that they probably don't like all that well, that they probably would rather go work somewhere else or maybe, even better, start their own business? But they can't leave their current employment because they know if they go out into the free market and they try to get their own insurance, that they won't get covered because maybe they have a preexisting condition or maybe their spouse has a preexisting condition or maybe one of their kids has a preexisting condition.

So our friends on the other side say, Start over. Don't do that, don't give that person who got an idea and wants to start a business in America and take a chance—don't help them.

Are we providing the kind of environment for someone to express, have the freedom to express their energy and their talents in America? No. We are limiting it if we don't fix this health care system. We are limiting it. We have a moral obligation as a country to allow each and every individual in this country to express their talents and their skills in this country. We have the opportunity here in the next week

or so to make this happen. We have never been so close, extending insurance to 30 million Americans who currently don't have it.

A lot of people say, too, as we talk about this bill that they don't want to pay for these 30 million people. It is important that we recognize that we all are already paying for these people who don't have health insurance.

You see, our friends on the other side—and I sat here and I watched them, and I listened very carefully, and they were picking these fringe issues to try to incite. They were talking about abortion, which, okay, I am sure they believe strongly in that. I do as well. I have a pro-life voting record. But when you have the Catholic Health Association and you have 25 national Catholic and evangelical leaders supporting this bill, it becomes very difficult to scare the American people about that issue.

They don't want to talk about pre-existing conditions. They don't want to talk about making sure kids don't get denied. They don't want to talk about tax cuts, tax credits for small businesses to provide health care insurance. Of course not. They don't want to talk about how the Democrats are going to close the doughnut hole. They don't want to talk about how seniors will not have to pay for any preventative care at all in Medicare. They don't want to talk about how this bill is deficit neutral, how it actually reduces the deficit. They don't want to talk about how this bill extends the life span of the Medicare program. They don't want to talk about any of that stuff. And it goes back to the original memo that one of their top pollsters gave them in the spring that said: Do not let Obama pass health care reform. Do not let him. You will be in the minority for a long time. And so they will do anything they can, anything in their power to try to prevent this President from passing health care legislation.

It is good to know, Mr. Speaker, because they are rooting against the President. They are rooting against the President. If the President fails, we all fail. He has extended his hand, taken all of the Republican ideas, put many of them into the health care reform proposal, and there still are Republicans who won't vote for it. Just like in the stimulus package, we had to put \$300 billion in tax cuts in the stimulus bill because that is what the Republicans wanted, and we didn't get any Republican votes, because there is no benefit for the Republican side to support the President, to support the American people, because politics has gotten in the way.

So we have all of these issues that are going to go into effect within the year. Within the year small business tax credits, up to 35 percent of premiums, will be immediately available to firms that choose to offer coverage, closing the part D doughnut hole. Immediate help for the uninsured now to create an interim high-risk pool. End

rescissions so insurers can't drop people from coverage when they get sick. No discrimination against children with preexisting conditions. Are you going to vote against that? Go ahead.

Extends coverage for young people up to their 26th birthday, so all the young people in our country will now be able to stay on their parents' insurance until they are 26 years old. So if you want to go to grad school, you will be able to stay on your parents' health insurance. Times are tough now. You may not be able to find work, or at least find work with some decent health care. You can stay on your parents' insurance until you are 26 years old.

Bans lifetime limits on coverage. Bans restrictive annual limits on coverage. Free preventative care under Medicare. This is a reform proposal that we should have passed 30 years ago. Those are the moral issues. But the economic issues are just as profound, just as great.

Small businesses have seen a 126 percent increase over the last 5 or 6 years, and the projections as we move forward are even higher for families and small businesses: Up, up, up, and away will their health care costs go if we do nothing.

And, as we said, they want us to start over. How about the insurance companies start over? How about the insurance companies repeal 10 years of increases and they start over? Maybe that would be fair. Wouldn't that be nice? We want to start all over in this country, come together and figure something out. Repeal 10 years of your health care increases. Free preventative care under all the new health care plans, new independent appeals process. Help for early retirees, which is something that is huge, I know, in Ohio. Creates a temporary reinsurance program until the exchange is available to help offset the cost of expensive health claims for employers that provide health benefits for retirees age 55 to 64. Billions of dollars for community health clinics, and it increases the number of primary care doctors by making huge investments, making sure that we get that done.

The Republicans didn't do anything to address any of these issues for 10 years. Now, all of a sudden, they are late to the game, and they still won't support it. They say, Well, we are for repealing preexisting conditions. They are not going to vote for this bill. We are for tax credits for small businesses. They are not going to vote for this bill. We are for closing the doughnut hole. They are not going to vote for this bill. We are against preexisting conditions, making sure that any child doesn't get denied coverage because of a preexisting condition. They are going to vote against this bill. We are for children allowed to stay on their parents' insurance until they are 26. They are going to vote against this bill.

□ 2330

We're for increased competition. They're going to vote against this bill, because they've been told by the people who guide their political decisions, their pollsters, the cottage industry in Washington that tells political parties what to do, they have been told, Do not let the Democrats succeed in this. And we have asked time and time and time again for their suggestions. The President has taken many of them, implemented them into this bill, and they keep moving the yardstick further and further down because they don't want to support this because their political leadership, their pollsters, their lobbyist friends say we can't do it. We can't let them get a win.

And it's not about the Democrats winning. This is about the people in our districts who are getting hurt; that are getting hurt by the current practices. And when you see the number of faith-based organizations supporting this legislation—Evangelical, Catholic, Jewish, Muslim, Buddhists, I mean, the spectrum of faith-based organizations in the United States of America are supporting this. And they all say, Is it perfect? No. Of course not. This is a body made of human beings who are flawed and make mistakes. But this is a tremendous step forward in our country—monumental, historic.

I'm proud to be here today. I'm proud to support this bill. I'm going to be even prouder after it passes and we can point to X, Y, and Z, as I am tonight, exactly what is in here and exactly what the benefits are. I'll be honest with you: I'm excited to run a campaign in November talking about this. I want to see the campaign where all of the stuff that I just listed is the debate in the fall. And our friends on the other side and our TEA Party folks who haven't done anything in 10 years to try to address any of these problems are going to want to repeal a ban on preexisting conditions for kids—children; a ban on preexisting conditions for adults, saying that you shouldn't be able to stay on your parents' health insurance until you're 26. They're going to run a campaign saying that we should expand the doughnut hole instead of closing the doughnut hole, which is what we're doing in here. They're going to run a campaign saying that we want to repeal the tax cuts that we have given to small businesses to try to make this happen. We want to repeal the subsidies that people are going to get to help them pay for insurance.

It's going to be a heck of a campaign. And they're going to scream socialism like they have been doing for 7 years. They screamed about it.

This is the same party, Mr. Speaker, that just a few years ago, when I first got in the Congress, the early part of this first decade, wanted to privatize Social Security. You don't hear anybody here saying they want to get rid of Medicare. I remember, we sat on this floor, Congresswoman WASSERMAN

SCHULTZ, KENDRICK MEEK, and myself. Started when we first got in Congress. The first issue we were addressing was President Bush's idea to privatize Social Security.

Now, imagine a year and a half ago if you had dumped your 401(k) or your Social Security was looking like your 401(k) and you had nothing to draw upon. That's the kind of vision we're getting from the other side of the aisle. We're talking about tax cuts for small businesses and individuals so that employers can provide health care and jobs. That's what this is about. Our friends on the other side did not act. They led to what is happening here today, and we have got the consequences of their inaction that we're forced to deal with today.

We have got a lot of issues to talk about. This is not going to be the last time we're on the floor. We're going to be here all week talking about these issues. But, again, our government has a moral mission, a moral responsibility to protect our citizens and to empower our citizens. This health care reform bill is about protecting our citizens. It's not about government-run; it's not about insurance-run. That's a false debate. This is about making sure that doctors and patients and families make their own health care decisions. That's what this is about.

This is about making sure that seniors have an extended Medicare program by making sure we rid it of waste, fraud, and abuse. This is making sure that our seniors have prescription drug programs. This is making sure that our government protects individuals from the practices of the insurance company, being denied a preexisting condition; that we protect our citizens from, when they get sick, their insurance company says to them, We can't cover you any more. That's what this reform bill is about. And those protections will empower and stimulate and allow the American people to express their talents in the marketplace.

How many business people are going to have more money in their pocket to reinvest back into their business, into the technology, into the capital improvements? How many families are going to have more money to send their kids to college, to go on a family vacation, to make sure their kids can go to graduate school? How many people who are locked into jobs now and fear starting their own business are out there? We don't know. It's a hard thing to quantify. But there are thousands of them. Who's the next Bill Gates who has a spouse that maybe has a preexisting condition so they're stuck in a cubicle somewhere and can't start their own business? How many children in our country have been denied health insurance because they have a preexisting condition? How many people are in a hospital right now, right now, because they didn't get the proper health care that they needed? And so their problems, their issues, their

health concerns got worse and they ended up in the hospital.

We have a moral obligation to step up to bat and to make this happen. This reform bill is a good piece of legislation. And I recognize that there are some outlets, some people who want to maybe not be quite as straightforward with the facts that are presented here in this bill, and they want to touch upon those same issues of abortion and immigration, all the issues that have been addressed in this bill. When you have 25 national pro-life Catholics and Evangelicals organizations endorsing this bill, when you have the Catholic Hospital Association endorsing this bill, you can honestly say that the abortion issue has been taken care of and that this is a pro-life bill. Because the idea of pro-life is very broad and should have a very broad interpretation. Quality of life, shortened life spans, those are pro-life issues. Shortened and reduced quality because they don't have the proper health care, those are pro-life issues.

Freedom to invest in your business, start your own business, those are issues that our Founding Fathers talked about a great deal.

□ 2340

So we do have a moral obligation to pass this piece of legislation. When we pull out all of the parts of this bill, you will see that the American people support this. And the American people want this legislation. Here it is. I will read them real quickly. They would be more likely to support the reform if it has tax credits—these are all issues that are in here—if it has tax credits to small businesses, 73 percent more likely to support; if it has insurance exchanges, 67 percent more likely to support; if you can keep what you have, which is exactly how this is set up, 66 percent more likely to support the reform; if you ban preexisting conditions and denials, 63 percent; Medicaid expansion, 62 percent; dependent coverage through 26 years old, 60 percent; close the Medicare doughnut hole, 60 percent; subsidy assistance to individuals, 57 percent. These are all things that are in the bill. These are all things that are in the bill and are all the reasons why we need to pass it.

This is a basic human rights issue. This will be the most significant pro-life piece of legislation that has passed this House in a long, long time. This will be the most historic piece of legislation that has passed this House in a long, long time.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Mr. BACA (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for March 12 on account of business in the district.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of illness caused by food poisoning.

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.

Mr. ENGEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, 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, March 22.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, March 22.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida for 5 minutes, today and March 16, 17, and 18.

Mrs. CAPITO, for 5 minutes, March 16.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 16, 2010, at 10:30 a.m., for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

6584. A letter from the Executive Director, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting Final Commission's final rule — Final Model Privacy Form Under the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act [Release Nos.: 34-61003, IA-2950, IC-28997; File No. S7-09-07] (RIN: 3235-AJ06) received February 17, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6585. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2008-0020] received February 5, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6586. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket ID: FEMA-2009-0020; Internal Agency Docket No. FEMA-8105] received February 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6587. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes In Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2008-0020] received February 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6588. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket No.: FEMA-2008-0020] received February 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6589. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket ID: FEMA-2008-0020; Internal Agency Docket No. FEMA-8107] received February 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6590. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2010-0003] received March 8, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6591. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket ID: FEMA-2010-0003; Internal Agency Docket No. FEMA-8119] received March 8, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6592. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility for Failure To Maintain Adequate Floodplain Management Regulations [Docket ID: FEMA-2010-0003; Internal Agency Docket No. FEMA-8117] received March 8, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6593. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket ID: FEMA-2010-0003; Internal Agency Docket No. FEMA-8115] received March 8, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6594. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket ID: FEMA-2008-0020; Internal Agency Docket No. FEMA-8103] received February 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6595. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Commission Guidance Regarding Disclosure Related to Climate Change [Release Nos.: 33-9106; 34-61469; FR-82] received February 17, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6596. A letter from the General Counsel, Corporation For National and Community Service, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Serve America Act Amendments to the National and Community Service Act of 1990 and the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973 (RIN: 3045-AA50) received February 22, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

6597. A letter from the Acting Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits received February 17, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

6598. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor/Chief, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — MARITEL, INC. and MOBEX NETWORK SERVICES, LLC Petitions for Rule Making to Amend the Commission's Rules to Provide Additional Flexibility for AMTS and VHF Public Coast Station Licensees [WT Docket No. 04-257] received February 17, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.