

SUPPORT DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL REPEAL

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Speaker, later today we're going to vote on Don't Ask, Don't Tell. This is a personal thing. I know a young gentleman who was in the Army, a graduate of West Point, extraordinary young African American. He's had two tours in Iraq, brought his company back safely from both tours without loss or injury to any member of his company.

But he also honored the commitment of the military not to lie and to be honest and straightforward. He was gay, and he was drummed out of the military. It is an enormous loss to America. I have no doubt that this gentleman would be a general and could probably rise to the highest ranks of the military.

We have to change the Don't Ask, Don't Tell policy. Later today, we'll have a chance to do that, and I'm sure that our colleagues, in recognition of the need of this Nation for well-qualified men and women in the military, will do away with this policy and set in place an opportunity for every American to serve this country, wherever and whatever their circumstances might be.

TAX CUT PROPOSAL DEFINES CONTRASTING PRIORITIES

(Ms. WATSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WATSON. Madam Speaker, the tax proposal announced by the President further defines the sharp differences in the policies and priorities of Democrats and Republicans.

Democrats are fighting for the needs of the middle class and for provisions that creates jobs and expands economic opportunities. Republicans are demanding tax breaks for the wealthy.

Democrats continue to fight to maintain tax cuts on income up to \$250,000. Republicans continue to demand tax cuts on all incomes.

Democrats made a priority of extending unemployment benefits to help out-of-work Americans make it through the recession. Republicans were willing to hold the middle class and the unemployed hostage to benefit the wealthy.

Democrats will continue to fight for the economic priorities of middle class Americans, to create jobs, and to grow the economy. These are the principles that define the contrast between the Republicans and Democrats.

□ 1030

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. DEGETTE) laid before the House the fol-

lowing communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, December 15, 2010.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
*The Speaker, U.S. Capitol,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on December 15, 2010 at 9:40 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 4005.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER.

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.

APPROVING PURCHASES OF LITTORAL COMBAT SHIPS

Mr. TAYLOR. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6494) to amend the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 to improve the Littoral Combat Ship program of the Navy, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6494

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

SECTION 1. LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP PROGRAM.

(a) CONTRACT AUTHORITY.—Subsection (a) of section 121 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84; 123 Stat. 2211) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “ten Littoral Combat Ships and 15 Littoral Combat Ship ship control and weapon systems” and inserting “20 Littoral Combat Ships, including any ship control and weapon systems the Secretary determines necessary for such ships.”; and

(B) by striking “a contract” and inserting “one or more contracts”; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking “liability to” and inserting “liability of”.

(b) TECHNICAL DATA PACKAGE.—Subsection (b)(2)(A) of such section is amended by striking “a second shipyard, as soon as practicable” and inserting “another shipyard to build a design specification for that Littoral Combat Ship”.

(c) LIMITATION OF COSTS.—Subsection (c)(1) of such section is amended by striking “awarded to a contractor selected as part of a procurement” and inserting “under a contract”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. AKIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TAYLOR. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, the Littoral Combat Ship Program started off as a very good idea. It was to be a single purpose, low-cost war ship that would help our Navy get to the stated goal of at least three Chiefs of Naval Operations of getting back to a 313-ship Navy.

With that said, the program has had, admittedly, a number of problems. First of which was, we were going to build it to commercial specifications. That was a mistake that Congress later corrected because this is a warship. It needed to be built to warship recommendations. You don't build disposable ships unless you want to have disposable crews, and our Nation will never settle for disposable crews.

Madam Speaker, having solved that problem, we found that the two vendors took a ship that was supposed to stand for LCS, Littoral Combat Ship, and it came late, costly, and subject to protest. And only because of the great work, in my opinion, of Under Secretary of Defense Sean Stackley of devising a strategy about a year ago that, in effect, read the riot act to both vendors and told them they were going to do a number of things.

No. 1 in order to submit their package to Congress, their proposal, they were going to submit with that a technical data package which meant that our Nation that has paid to develop these ships would have the specifications to those ships so that if either vendor continued to underperform, we could then go out and seek additional vendors to build this ship if we felt like our Nation was not getting the ship we deserved at the price we need to pay. Under Secretary Stackley came back with a proposal that said we would give to one vendor a contract for 10 ships and then take that technical data package, put it out on the street and give a second vendor a contract for five, a winner-take-all strategy between a monohull ship and a trihull ship and gave the vendors about 8 months to come up with a price.

Madam Speaker, one of the few pleasant surprises of this Congress was that both vendors came back with remarkably good prices when given that all-or-nothing proposal. And I want to compliment, give credit where it's due to Under Secretary Stackley. I also want to give credit where it's due to the Seapower Subcommittee, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN), and the other gentleman from Missouri, Chairman SKELTON, for allowing us to work with Under Secretary Stackley to get this program back under control.

Having said that, Madam Speaker, Under Secretary Stackley, once he looked at those prices—and I deeply regret the gentleman from Arizona was exactly right over in the other body when he said yesterday, What's the price? The public needs to know. Unfortunately, under the rules of our Nation, we are not allowed to divulge them just yet. Part of that reason is the fear that both vendors will drop their bids and come back later at higher prices.

So one of the limitations we are going to be working under today is the inability to give the exact price to Congress but to tell you that this ship that started out to be about a \$220 million dollar ship grew to be about a \$720 million ship. We have now got the price a heck of a lot closer to the first number than the last number which is where we needed to go all along.

Under Secretary Stackley is now asking, since both prices came back, and since there is a working ship of each variety out in the fleet right now that are performing well, he has asked for permission to buy both ships at the low price that the contractors have agreed to build them on. Having given that some thought, I think he is right. And also given the economic circumstances that the price of aluminum is down by about half since 3 or 4 years ago, the price of steel is down by about half from 3 or 4 years ago, that American vendors need work, that because they need work, they are supplying the kind of prices that our Nation should have been paying all along, that we can get the Navy the ships they need at a price our Nation can afford and build 20 ships for about \$2 billion less than we had originally budgeted to build 19 ships. For all of these reasons, Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this program. I want to thank the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN) for being a cosponsor to this measure.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 6494, a bill granting authority for the Secretary of the Navy to construct up to 20 Littoral Combat Ships, 10 each from the shipyards currently building the vessels. This is a change in already passed authorization to "down-select" to one of the two types of ships and build 19 of them over the next 5 years. This change in acquisition strategy is the result of lower than expected construction proposals from the two competing shipyards.

The LCS has a very troubled history, but the bill before us today is about the future, it is about how true competition between vendors has actually forced these contractors to return competitive bids that this Nation can afford. These are good ships. Up until now they have just been too expensive to build. Neither contractor, until faced with the prospect of being shut out of the program, had ever submitted a realistic proposal for affordable construction. They now have.

I would not be here today requesting this House pass this legislation if I was not highly confident that this is the right thing to do, and that this action will not come back to be an issue that my friend and colleague from Missouri will need to deal with in the next Congress as he takes the gavel of the Seapower subcommittee.

I will also be the first to admit that the timing for this new acquisition proposal from the Navy is flawed. Normally, this is not the kind of decision that we would consider at the end of a Congress. However, the Navy has bids in hand from the two contractors that will expire this month if not acted upon. Unfortunately, time is of the essence.

For my colleagues, the bottom line is this: The Navy has budgeted approximately \$12 billion dollars for 19 ships over the next 5 years. This new strategy would buy 20 ships for approximately \$9.8 billion dollars, a savings of over \$2 billion from the budget, with the additional benefit of getting an extra ship. I believe this is a good deal and we should take it.

I would like to state for the record that this affordable strategy for the purchase of this class of ships would not have been possible without the tireless work of our Assistant Secretary for Acquisition, the Honorable Sean Stackley. He was the official responsible for the strategy which forced the contractors to offer affordable bids, at a firm fixed price, to build these ships. I congratulate him on the effort. If the Department of Defense could just get 100 Sean Stackleys working over there, we would have far fewer issues with cost overruns and program delays on weapons and equipment our warfighters need.

I urge my colleagues to agree to this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. AKIN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN).

Mr. WITTMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 6494, a bill that would authorize procurement for the Littoral Combat Ship.

And I will start by thanking Chairman TAYLOR, who has been extraordinarily diligent in this effort in making sure that our Nation gets the best deal on LCS, knowing that there have been some hiccups in the past. He stood up and made sure this process was going to happen properly, that it was going to be the best value for our Navy and the best value for the United States. So I applaud the chairman for his leadership there. And also to Ranking Member AKIN who, alongside the chairman, made sure also that this process was going to happen properly and that the proper decisions were going to be made and that we were going to make the best decision on behalf of our Navy.

And as we all know, this legislation would amend the FY 2010 National Defense Authorization Act to authorize the procurement of 20 Littoral Combat Ships which are absolutely needed these days in our Navy. This bill would also allow the Navy to enter into one or more contracts and allow the Navy to conduct a competition for an additional shipyard for ship construction to be built to a design specification for that ship. That technical data package will belong to the United States, so if something doesn't go right with this two-ship acquisition, we have the opportunity to fix that and get it back on track.

Absent an NDAA, it is imperative to ensure that our Navy shipbuilding pro-

gram remains on the right track. By procuring 20 Littoral Combat Ships, that gives our Navy the ability to increase its mission capability and project power throughout the littoral waterways around the globe.

We need to do everything we can to get Federal spending under control, and this bill does that. This bill, as Chairman TAYLOR says, cuts to the heart of reducing spending, gets us actually the same number, if not a little bit more, for \$2 billion less. It is a good deal for this Nation. The thing we have to keep in mind in the future is looking at the operation and maintenance costs of two platforms, making sure they were holding the Navy firm to controlling costs there, both the training costs of multiple crews and the operation and maintenance costs. We have been assured by Under Secretary Stackley that that will happen. So I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. TAYLOR. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation, which I think strikes the right balance in terms of the need for our Navy to build up its Littoral Combat Ship Program but also addressing I think a lot of the problems of this program, which has been very troubled over the last few years in terms of trying to get the cost per ship down.

□ 1040

I'd just like to say, though, on a personal note, that the work that Chairman TAYLOR has done on this program going back to 2007 with a series of hearings, looking at, again, the alarming increases in cost growth has been an extraordinary contribution, not just to this Congress, but to our country. There has been no one who has been more diligent in terms of trying to look out for the American taxpayer. There is no one who, in my opinion, has been more knowledgeable about every aspect of these vessels than the gentleman from Mississippi who is departing in a few days, and who I think is going to be sorely missed by this country in terms of the amazing work that he's done as chairman of the Seapower subcommittee.

All across the spectrum, in terms of ships, he has been there trying to, again, advance this country to get to the goal of a 314-ship Navy, which has been a struggle, protecting the industrial base, from New England all the way to San Diego and, again, all the time while being open and accessible to all Members across both party lines in terms of making sure that, again, we're going to achieve those goals and make sure that our country, which is still a great maritime power, is going to have a Navy that can project our force in a way that, again, is adequate for the challenges of the 21st century.

Again, his service to this country has just been extraordinary. It has been a

privilege to serve with him over the last 4 years. Passing this legislation, I think, will be, again, another capstone to a great career in Congress. And, again, I want to thank him for his service.

Mr. AKIN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT), who has been the ranking member on this committee a number of times.

Mr. BARTLETT. Madam Speaker, I've been involved with the LCS program from its very inception; and when the Navy announced that they were going to do a down select with this competition, I was somewhat dismayed because these are two very different ships, an aluminum trimaran, and the more conventional ship optimized for these special missions. And I wasn't sure that we knew enough about the potential of these two ships to make that down select during this competition.

So I was very pleased when Sean Stackley called me and said that they were surprised and shocked by the quotes that came in. Competition, you know, really does matter. And when the down select was threatened, each of these competitors came in with a really good price.

So I was very pleased when the Department decided that they would like to buy 10 of each of these ships. These are multi-mission ships. I'm sure one of these ships will be better for one mission than another, so I am very pleased that we're taking this route; and I couldn't be more supportive of where we're going now with this.

If we're ever going to get to a 313-ship Navy, the LCS is going to play a big part of that. This is going to be a huge class of ship. A half of that class is going to be bigger than almost any other class of ships that we have had, so this is a win-win for everybody, and I'm pleased that we are taking this route.

Mr. TAYLOR. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. AKIN. Madam Speaker, before I get into my comments, I think there are a couple of people that we, as a Congress, and even we, as a people, as Americans, need to be thankful for. And the first is Chairman TAYLOR, who I've had a chance to work with now a couple of years as the minority leader on the Seapower Committee. I don't know of anybody in our country who is more committed to the Navy or to making sure that we use our money wisely, and to the overall security of our country than Chairman TAYLOR.

And so I want to extend my personal thanks for the fact that what you don't see here just for a few minutes' discussion on the floor was hours and hours of tours through shipyards, all kinds of details, talking to all kinds of people and trying to make sure that a program that was a little difficult as it started out got on track, and now is not only on track, but represents a significant opportunity for us to invest in the security of our country.

And so hats off to Chairman TAYLOR. And I agree completely that we're going to certainly miss your expertise and your hard work, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BARTLETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BARTLETT. For 4 years I was the chair of this subcommittee, and Mr. TAYLOR was my ranking member; and then the leadership in the Congress changed, and for 2 years, I was his ranking member and he was my chair. And then, sadly, due to our term limits on the Republican side of the House, I had to leave that subcommittee, but never left my interest, strong interest in that subcommittee.

And I will tell you that there is no person in the Congress who has been more committed or more effective in making sure that we have the right kind of Navy, the right size Navy.

When I first came here, I looked up GENE TAYLOR because we shared some social things. And as a Democrat, he kind of shone out as different than the other Democrats. And we've become the very best of friends since then. He tells people that we're joined at the hip, and indeed we are.

GENE, it's been a real, real pleasure to serve with you, and your departure is a grave loss to this Congress and to our Nation. I've been honored to serve with you, sir.

Mr. AKIN. Thank you for those most appropriate comments, ROSCOE.

The second gentleman that I think we need to recognize, Under Secretary Stackley, has really helped tremendously with his level of detailed knowledge about how you work these contracts. And he got the contracts, as Chairman TAYLOR mentioned, reorganized to some degree a couple of years ago, and now we have two excellent bids before us.

Now, one of the things that people know that have been around Congress a little bit is Congress has trouble making decisions rapidly or even wisely sometimes. I don't think that's the case today. Today, Secretary Stackley came to a number of us and said, look, there's two different ways we could go, the way we were planning to go, which is we down select, buy 10 ships, and then we resubmit bids to a number of different vendors.

He said the other alternative, which is very interesting, is that we just go with both contractors and buy the 20 ships right off the bat. And so as we had a chance to ask some questions, though not to the degree that many of us would have felt comfortable with, it became apparent that we would save money for the Navy and we could project more seapower more rapidly by going with both contractors, buy 10 from each side.

Now, the ships are different, as has been mentioned this morning. Certainly, an aluminum trimaran is a lot different than a monohull. It has its difficulties in anchoring in certain

places or docking in certain places because it is so wide. But each has their place overall in the Navy.

Now, these ships, to try to put them in perspective, there may be some people who are not immersed in the detail here, we're not allowed to talk about the price that's been bid, but, generally speaking, you're looking at, you could buy five of these for the cost of one nuclear-powered submarine. So what we're talking about is a ship that is inexpensive enough, and we have enough of them that it allows America to project its seapower to little corners of the world where otherwise we don't have a presence that we need to have.

About a year or so ago, there was a lot of talk about pirates, and everybody got their best pirate voice out and talked about the pirates that were seizing commercial shipping. Some of that was allowed because of the fact that we didn't have as many ships as we might like in certain areas. This would be just one example of where these ships might become useful. They would become useful in hunting submarines and for all kinds and varieties of other missions.

And so this proposal that's before us is a result of some very good work by both Under Secretary Stackley, his coming to us and saying, look, there is a better way to do this but, Congress, you have to be able to respond and be agile on your feet.

Fortunately, there is a uniform agreement across the people that have been working these projects that, in fact Secretary Stackley is right and this is what we should do. So hats off to Secretary Stackley and particularly to Chairman TAYLOR for the good work that's been done.

I'm obviously speaking in favor of the proposal before us here. And there was some sense of frustration early on in trying to get the numbers and to get through the details that we had to in order to make a decision here; but I am very comfortable that what we're doing is the right thing.

The opportunity before us to pass this piece of legislation allows us to prove that it's wrong once in a while that Congress can't be agile and make wise decisions.

□ 1050

We will look to the Navy and to Secretary Stackley to help to continue to manage this program and make sure that the bids come in as we expect, that the Navy gets a good buy, and that we work to where we should be with enough ships to secure and give Americans the security that we believe is necessary and to provide a safe and peaceful world.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TAYLOR. Madam Speaker, first let me again thank future Chairman AKIN, former Chairman BARTLETT.

I believe it was CNO Vernon Clark who first proposed this program. The idea was to build a ship under the speed

of light, an inexpensive ship. That obviously didn't happen, and we learned some very painful mistakes as a Congress, and I hope those of you who remain on the committee will remember those painful mistakes. We can make mistakes doing things too rapidly. We made a lot of mistakes in this program.

But the thing I want to most compliment the Armed Services Committee for, and particularly the Seapower Committee, was, when we recognized those mistakes, we admitted them and we went as far as to threaten to cancel the program if it wasn't corrected. I think those threats and, again, the phenomenal work of Secretary Stackley and Secretary Mabus in holding the vendors' feet to the fire, the economic circumstances of our Nation where people need work, the fact that the Navy needs the ships, that the frigates that these ships will replace are getting to the end of their useful life, and, again, the willingness of all the members on both sides of the aisle to hold these vendors accountable was the key element in turning this program around.

So, again, I want to thank future Chairman AKIN, former Chairman BARTLETT, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. BONNER, Mr. STUPAK, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. CONAWAY for being cosponsors of this measure.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6494, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONGRATULATING CAMERON NEWTON ON WINNING THE 2010 HEISMAN TROPHY

Mr. ALTMIRE. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1761) congratulating Auburn University quarterback and College Park, Georgia, native Cameron Newton on winning the 2010 Heisman Trophy for being the most outstanding college football player in the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1761

Whereas Cameron Newton graduated from Westlake High School in College Park, Georgia, in 2007;

Whereas Cameron Newton became Auburn University's starting quarterback in 2010;

Whereas Cameron Newton became the first player in Southeastern Conference history and only the eighth player in National Collegiate Athletic Association Football Bowl Subdivision history to achieve over 2,000 yards passing and over 1,000 yards rushing in a single season;

Whereas the Auburn University football team finished the regular season with a 12-0 record;

Whereas the Auburn University football team won the Southeastern Conference Championship game by a score of 56 to 17 over the University of South Carolina;

Whereas Cameron Newton accounted for 6 touchdowns, 4 passing and 2 rushing, in the Southeastern Conference Championship game;

Whereas the Auburn University football team is ranked number one in both the Bowl Championship Series and Associated Press rankings;

Whereas Cameron Newton was named the Southeastern Conference Offensive Player of the Year for 2010;

Whereas Cameron Newton was named the Walter Camp Football Foundation Player of the Year for 2010;

Whereas Cameron Newton received the Maxwell Award for the Collegiate Player of the Year in 2010; and

Whereas Cameron Newton was named the 76th winner of the 2010 Heisman Memorial Trophy for the most outstanding college football player in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives congratulates Auburn University quarterback and College Park, Georgia, native Cameron Newton on winning the 2010 Heisman Trophy for being the most outstanding college football player in the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ALTMIRE) and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ALTMIRE. Madam Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend and insert extraneous material on House Resolution 1761 into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, as a member of the Higher Education Subcommittee, I rise today in support of House Resolution 1761, which congratulates Auburn University quarterback and College Park, Georgia, native Cam Newton on winning the 2010 Heisman Memorial Trophy.

Each year, the most outstanding college football player in the United States is recognized by the Heisman Committee. Mr. Newton has earned the 76th such distinction this year.

Cam Newton was selected as winner of the Heisman Memorial Trophy last Saturday, December 11, live from Times Square. He became the third Auburn Tiger to win the Heisman, joining 1971 winner Pat Sullivan and 1985 winner Bo Jackson, and he is the 31st college quarterback to win the Heisman Trophy.

Mr. Newton became Auburn University's starting quarterback just this season, and with one very big game remaining, he has so far completed 165 of his 246 passes for 2,589 yards and 28

touchdowns. Additionally, he rushed 242 times for 1,409 yards and 20 more touchdowns. Both Newton's passing and rushing touchdown totals are the best in Auburn University's history, and he becomes only the third NCAA major college player in history to have more than 20 rushing and passing touchdowns in the same season.

While leading the Auburn Tigers to an undefeated 13-0 regular season, Mr. Newton was also named the Southeastern Conference Offensive Player of the Year and led his team to a number one ranking and an appearance in the January 10 BCS championship game. He was one of the four finalists for the 2010 Heisman Trophy, and he was awarded that trophy in a well-deserved landslide victory. For his outstanding performance, Cam Newton was officially honored at the 76th annual Heisman Memorial Trophy Award Dinner in New York last Monday evening.

Madam Speaker, I would like to thank Representative ROGERS, who represents Auburn University, and Representative LEWIS, who represents Cam Newton's hometown, for sponsoring this resolution and, once again, express my congratulations and the congratulations of everyone in this House to Cam Newton as the 2010 Heisman Trophy winner and wish him continued success. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Resolution 1761, a resolution congratulating Auburn University quarterback and College Park, Georgia, native Cam Newton on winning the 2010 Heisman Trophy for being the most outstanding college football player in America.

I would like to thank everyone that came together to bring this resolution to the floor today, including the leadership of both sides, the Committee on Ed and Labor, and especially Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

Madam Speaker, Cam Newton is from College Park, Georgia, outside Atlanta, and went to Westlake High School in Mr. LEWIS' congressional district. From there, he came to Auburn University in my congressional district earlier this year. Cam quickly became a starting quarterback.

From his first few games with Auburn, it was easy to see that, standing at 6-6 and 250 pounds, Cam was no ordinary quarterback. He could rush, throw, and even catch touchdowns from anywhere on the field. If the ball was in his hands, he was a threat to score.

Needless to say, Cam has set many records in his long list of statistics that are downright unbelievable. If you saw his incredible performance against LSU, Cam had a 49-yard run for a touchdown, the miraculous comeback to win in the Iron Bowl in the second half after trailing 24-0, or, with 16 seconds left in the first half of the SEC