



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 155

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 2009

No. 130

House of Representatives

The House met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. SPEIER).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 15, 2009.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JACKIE SPEIER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2009, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 30 minutes and each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, limited to 5 minutes.

REBUILDING AND RENEWING AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, these times demand that Congress and the administration do more than one thing at a time, health care, energy, dealing with the economic downturn and near financial meltdown inherited by the new administration. One challenge needs more attention, rebuilding and renewing America.

Our fraying infrastructure has been a growing problem for years. The Amer-

ican Society of Civil Engineers has rated our overall infrastructure with a grade of "D" and has done so repeatedly. It is one of those rare, important issues that actually unites people rather than dividing them.

Water and transportation investments are overwhelmingly supported by the public across the board from coast to coast. And a majority of Republicans, Democrats and independents would increase their taxes to get this job done.

Rebuilding and renewing America will make a huge difference in both the economy and the everyday quality of life of Americans. The economic recovery package that we passed early in the year was an important step to stop the economic free fall. I would hate to think what my State of Oregon would be facing without the \$6 billion for education, health care, unemployment and infrastructure. It was very important for the State of Oregon and for States across the country, important but not enough.

The perfect next step is to reauthorize and fund the next transportation bill, which expires in 15 days. Our Transportation and Infrastructure Committee has been hard at work. They have developed a great outline for the new legislation.

But the highway trust fund that would fund that new vision faces a significant shortfall. Our recent stopgap efforts to plug the hole just adds to the long-term deficit without the certainty that communities and contractors require to start needed big projects.

In the short term, the House should come together, work with the Senate and pass a short-term extension of 4 to 6 months that will allow us to get the reauthorization and the funding in order.

In the meantime, every Member ought to take advantage of this opportunity to involve people back home in this critical discussion. People from

the private sector, from their local Chamber, contractors, unions, the local community leadership, all being part of this movement to rebuild and renew America.

This is the fastest way to get the economy on track, to improve the environment, put people to work and make our communities more liveable, our families safer, healthier and more economically secure.

GET HEALTHCARE DONE RIGHT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Madam Speaker, the American health care system is clearly in need of reform. Yet at the same time our system of health care continues to be the envy of the world in producing life-saving innovations in the pharmaceutical industry, in medical procedures and in treatment.

Congress certainly must act to help bring down costs and expand access to health insurance, while preserving the quality of care patients receive in this great, great Nation. I have heard many of my Democratic colleagues, and certainly the President, speak about the need to increase competition in the health insurance marketplace to help reduce costs, and I could not agree more.

But where I part company with my Democratic colleagues is in their prescription for the problem. The way they want to increase competition is to create a new government insurance company, better known as the public option, to provide this competition. They have demonized insurance companies in an effort to build support for this misguided plan, even though recent public opinion surveys have shown that over 80 percent of Americans are satisfied with their current plan. My concerns with the public option, which

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H9493

are shared, I think, by huge amounts of Americans, is that it would have an unfair advantage that could crowd out private health care, and it would put huge new costs on the American taxpayers.

For months the President has said if you like what you have, you can keep it. Then just last week, the President changed that and he said, instead, there is nothing in this bill that would force you or your employer to change what you have.

Well, it may be true that nothing will force you or your employer into the public option, but the bill before the House has perverse incentives to encourage your employer to do just that. The bill mandates individuals to purchase insurance, and it requires large employers to provide care for their employees. Businesses that do not provide health care insurance will be taxed at 8 percent of their payroll as a penalty, and most employers will tell you that health care costs typically run about 14 to 16 percent of their payroll.

So businesses that are struggling to make ends meet will now face a choice, either continue to pay 15 percent of their payroll to provide coverage for their employees, or just dump them out onto the public plan and take the 8 percent penalty. Well, that is a pretty easy business decision to make. Unfortunately, it has very broad implications for their employers, and I believe this Nation will go to a government-run health care plan very, very quickly as a result of that.

Madam Speaker, there is a better way to reduce the cost of insurance at virtually no cost to the government, and that is to simply allow individuals and businesses to purchase health care insurance across State lines. Lifting this restriction would bring hundreds, if not thousands, of new competitors into the private marketplace to compete for business. This would absolutely reduce costs, and it's a simple change which we can enact immediately.

The President actually made an analogy to private auto insurance, and I would respectfully remind the President that auto insurance can be purchased across State lines, and there is no public option in auto insurance. The market regulates itself to keep costs down.

Additionally, millions of Americans today have their health care covered by a health savings account. If H.R. 3200 is enacted, health savings accounts will be gone and those who utilize them will be forced to change their coverage. So, again, this is actually less choice and less competition in the health care industry.

I was very glad last week when the President said he would look at pilot programs with regard to medical liability reform. For too long, trial attorneys have looked at doctors as ATM machines and have filed countless frivolous lawsuits.

This has driven up costs by forcing insurance companies to settle because these suits cost too much to fight, regardless of their merit, and the costs are passed along to doctors in the form of higher premiums and ultimately higher health insurance costs to consumers. It has also made it very difficult for specialty doctors like OB/GYNs to practice, and it limits access, particularly in rural areas.

Many States have enacted caps on noneconomic damages. And in every place where this has happened, doctors have moved in, lawyers have moved out, and costs have gone down.

So I was very disappointed when the President said over the weekend that he doesn't believe caps work. Respectfully, Mr. President, actually, caps on noneconomic damage is medical liability reform.

Madam Speaker, the American people are rightfully concerned about how any reform will impact out-of-control Federal spending and our exploding Federal deficit. It just stretches credibility when people are told that we can create a public option, expand access and availability of care, and we can do so without dramatically increasing taxes or adding to the Federal debt.

Well, you can't get something for nothing, particularly when the government is involved. And many seniors find it difficult to believe that we can pay for some of this by reducing spending on Medicare by \$600 billion and more and not impact their level of care.

The proponents say these cuts are just waste, fraud and abuse. Well, if there is that much waste, fraud and abuse, we should be attacking that.

Madam Speaker, we can do better. And, for the sake of the American people, we must do better.

CHILDREN AND EMPLOYMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Madam Speaker, I rise to introduce the Children's Act for Responsible Employment, better known as the CARE Act.

This month, millions of children across the country are returning to school. After meeting their teachers and reconnecting with friends, they will launch headlong into their studies. Absent from our Nation's classroom, however, will be thousands of children who, instead of going to school, will be working in the fields and orchards of our country. These are not children of local farmers, but hired hands who travel from crop to crop to help their families make ends meet.

These children who help put food on their table start school late and continue to work long hours, leaving them little time or energy to do their homework. If previous years are any guide, some of these students will miss 1 out of every 6 days of school.

The results are predictable. Studies show that 50 percent of youth who regularly perform farm work drop out of school. The consequences of this high drop-out rate are tragic.

In addition to these children being deprived of educational opportunities, which could help them escape a lifetime of being stooped over in the hot sun picking fruits and vegetables, it deprives our country of the talents and potential contributions of these young children.

Adding to their heartbreaking circumstances is the fact that many of our labor laws do not protect them equally. Not only do they earn subminimum wages, but under current law the children of agriculture are allowed to use hazardous farm equipment and work in an environment that continually exposes them to poisonous pesticides, which can lead to serious injury or even death.

These dangerous and exploitive conditions, which are illegal for children in every other industry, simply do not reflect the precious value we Americans place on children. I am introducing the CARE Act to reflect our value.

The CARE Act raises labor standards for farm worker children to the same level as those for children in all other occupations. Specifically, the bill raises the minimum age for working in agriculture to 14 and restricts children under 16 from working when it interferes with their education or endangers their health and well-being.

The CARE Act also prohibits children under the age of 18 from agricultural work that the Department of Labor has specified as particularly hazardous. This is consistent with current law governing all industries outside of agriculture.

The CARE Act also requires employers to document the injuries, illness and deaths of these young people. This documentation will enable the Department of Labor to monitor and protect children working in agriculture from exploitation and dangerous work conditions. And, finally, to help ensure compliance with the bill's protective measures, the CARE Act sets a minimum fine of \$500 for child labor violations and a maximum fine of \$15,000.

Madam Speaker, it is our moral obligation to do all we can to protect the rights, the safety and the educational future of our most precious resource, our children. The CARE Act is a positive step toward meeting that obligation.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor and help pass the Children's Act for Responsible Employment, known as the CARE Act.

□ 1045

EXAMINING THE PRESIDENT'S CLAIMS ON HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from

North Carolina (Ms. Foxx) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, in a recent article, conservative commentator Thomas Sowell, an African American, examined some of President Obama's claims about the health care legislation moving through the Congress. I wanted to quote some excerpts from his column that I found insightful.

Sowell writes that in his joint address to Congress, President Obama is wrong about the spending levels of his health care reform. Sowell says:

"To tell us, with a straight face, that he can insure millions more people without adding to the already skyrocketing deficit, is world class chutzpa and an insult to anyone's intelligence. To do so after an analysis by the Congressional Budget Office has already showed this to be impossible reveals the depths of moral bankruptcy behind the glittering words."

Sowell continues along this accounting line by addressing the issue of paying for the health infrastructure implied in the President's health reform plan. He writes:

"Even those who believe that Obama can conjure up the money by eliminating 'waste, fraud and abuse' should ask themselves where he is going to conjure up the additional doctors, nurses, and hospitals needed to take care of millions more patients.

"If he can't pull off that miracle, then government-run medical care in the United States can be expected to produce what government-run medical care in Canada, Britain and other countries has produced—delays of weeks or months to get many treatments, not to mention arbitrary rationing decisions by bureaucrats."

Sowell later draws a parallel to the difference in the words and deeds of President Obama in other areas of policy. He writes:

"Obama can deny it in words but what matters are deeds—and no one's words have been more repeatedly the direct opposite of his deeds—whether talking about how his election campaign would be financed, how he would not rush legislation through Congress, or how his administration was not going after CIA agents for their past efforts to extract information from captured terrorists.

"President Obama has also declared emphatically that he will not interfere in the internal affairs of other nations—while telling the Israelis where they can and cannot build settlements and telling the Hondurans whom they should and should not choose to be their President."

Then Sowell writes that:

"President Obama tells us that he will impose various mandates on insurance companies but will not interfere with our free choice between being insured by these companies or by the government. But if he can drive up the cost of private insurance with mandates and subsidize government insur-

ance with the taxpayers' money, how long do you think it will be before we have the 'single payer' system that he has advocated in the past?

"Mandates by politicians are what have driven up the cost of insurance already. Politicians love to play Santa Claus and leave it to others to raise prices to cover the inevitable costs."

Sowell concludes by noting that no manner of lofty rhetoric about certain policies not coming to pass will convince many Americans that those same policies will not in fact occur because of the intrusive nature of government-run health care. As Sowell says:

"Barack Obama's insistence that various dangerous policies are not in the legislation he proposes sounds good, but means nothing. Unbridled power is a blank check, no matter what its rationale may be. No law gave the President of the United States the power to fire the head of General Motors, but TARP money did."

Furthermore, in the bill, an analysis of the bill by objective agencies tell us that the Democrats' health care bill would increase the Federal deficit by \$239 billion over 10 years. The bill includes \$1.2 trillion in new Federal spending over the next 10 years.

The Democrats' bill spends so much that it needs 8 years of higher taxes to finance just 6 years of spending. The Democrats embedded an automatic tax increase in their bill by doubling the 1 percent and 1.5 percent small business tax in 2013, continuing their revenue grab from small businesses. 4.7 million jobs could be lost as a result of "pay or play" taxes on small businesses.

The prescription of a health care bill from the Democrats and the President is wrong, and we need to do everything we can to stop it.

CHOOSING HEALTH CARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise today because in the Sturm und Drang of the health care debate, the voices and stories of real Americans have been drowned out, drowned out by misinformation, fear mongering and just outright demagoguery.

If we listen to those stories, we would hear of families struggling to pay dramatically increasing health care costs. We would hear of individuals denied coverage due to a previous existing medical condition. And we would hear of employees left without a choice of health care insurance providers. It is time we heard their voices.

In my district, the wealthiest in the Nation as measured by median household income, families are struggling with the rapid increase in health care costs. Recently I met with a family of four from Fairfax County whose health insurance premiums rose from 2001 at \$4,000 per year to 2009 at \$18,000 per year. Let me repeat that. In the space

of 7 years, their costs went from \$4,000 a year for health insurance premiums to \$18,000. That is a 450 percent increase, Madam Speaker. In the same time period, coincidentally, the profits of the 10 largest insurers in this country rose 428 percent.

In fact, over the past decade, the average health insurance premium has almost doubled, increasing nearly three times as much as wages. And they are still rising. Health insurance premiums are anticipated to increase 10.5 percent this year. This means a projected increase next year of almost \$2,000 for the family I met.

So while the insurance companies reap the benefits of a failing system, millions of families across the Nation, just like this family in Fairfax with whom I met, are waking up every day worrying how much longer will they be able to afford to protect their families with health care insurance.

And what, Madam Speaker, of the millions of Americans with previous existing conditions? Gall stones. Rheumatoid arthritis. Diabetes. Asthma. High blood pressure. Even severe acne has been described as a previously existing by some health insurance companies. In fact, 45 percent of all of us who have health insurance have a previous existing medical condition, and, if we are lucky to live long enough, virtually all us will end up with a previous existing medical condition and at risk of not being covered by our health insurance providers.

If you have a previous existing condition, insurance companies will often either deny coverage for that specific ailment, or worse, drop you altogether. Millions of Americans face this every year. Millions find they are not insured. Who is listening to their voices?

Madam Speaker I know of a young paraplegic, the victim of a virus that attacked his spinal column and therefore frequently has medical complications. He went to five insurance companies looking for coverage. He knew he was a greater health care risk and he was prepared to pay a higher premium for that risk. What he wasn't prepared for was that all five insurers denied him coverage at all. No health care coverage whatsoever. Due to a previous existing condition, he had no chance for insurance. And he is not alone.

That is why we must ensure that insurance companies end the practice of cherry-picking only healthy individuals and denying coverage for previous existing conditions.

Those Americans that are currently covered by health insurance often lack true choice in providers. Health insurance operates through risk pools. The larger the pool of people paying insurance premiums, the greater the insurance company can balance the risk of having to pay out for the sake of the injured. Unfortunately, between 2007 and 2008, the number of uninsured among the 18-34 age bracket, traditionally the healthiest group in our society, increased by 630,000, or 3.5 percent.

In other words, younger people were less covered by health insurance in that time period. Those of us remaining in the health pool paid more as a result for our insurance premiums.

When taking on new customers, insurance companies often have been far more willing to provide affordable coverage to larger groups. But even a company with 1,000 employees represents only a small number of overall customers, which is why most workers who have employer-provided insurance have the option of just one or two insurance providers. That is not competition.

For those working for a small business, the options are even fewer. Now, only 43 percent of all small businesses in America offer health insurance to their employees because they can't afford it. As health care premiums continue to rise, more and more companies drop coverage and more and more Americans find themselves without health care coverage.

So what happens to those Americans, Madam Speaker, whose jobs no longer provide insurance? What happens to those Americans who are self-employed or working part-time? Their voices have been drowned out in this debate, and I think it is time we heard from them.

ON THE ONE-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF THE LEHMAN BROTHERS BANKRUPTCY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, one year ago yesterday, a major investment bank, Lehman Brothers, declared bankruptcy, a move which sent the Dow Jones tumbling 500 points and simply led to a chain of events in which the Federal Government nationalized AIG with a \$189 billion bailout. The American auto industry asked Congress to authorize help, hundreds of billions of dollars, to bail out them. Banks did the same thing. Private institutions across this country asked for support.

Today, just 1 year later, our Federal Government is in control of practically every sector of our economy, having spent almost \$800 billion or 5 percent of our GDP on a stimulus package that was pork-laden and is still working to create jobs and boost this economy. And, most alarmingly, nothing has been done to cure the culture of bailouts that our government, with the help of the Federal Reserve, has continued to perpetuate. Bailout after bailout is not a strategy for economic recovery.

My colleagues, we are at a critical point in our Nation's economic history. Financial regulatory reform proposals are being discussed here in Congress and across this country. We all agree that reform is certainly needed, but, unfortunately, the plan put forth by the Obama administration is not the

kind of reform that will put an end to this culture of bailouts, nor will it bring transparency to the opaque and ever, ever expanding Federal Reserve. In fact, it does just the opposite.

In June of this year, Treasury Secretary Geithner unveiled the administration's plan for financial regulatory reform, and the cornerstone of the proposal is centered on ceding vast new powers to the Federal Reserve as a means of preventing future financial crises. But this overreliance on the Federal Reserve is unwise.

History shows us that in times the Fed saved us from one crisis, it inadvertently instigated another one. In 1913 when the Fed was founded, it was intentionally set up to serve as an institution that could help cushion the blow when banking crises occurred. However, the problem with an institution that is designed to insulate banks from the consequences of their own poor investment decisions is that it also inadvertently encourages these same banks to keep taking unwise risks, thereby laying the groundwork for a vicious cycle of bailout after bailout.

In fact, every time there is a potential financial crisis, the Federal Open Market Committee quickly cuts short-term interest rates. These cuts have become larger over time, as evidenced by our current zero percent interest rates. And, more importantly, these cuts essentially function as a bailout to those banks that have run into financial problems. Banks know they can count on the Fed to lower interest rates during times of financial distress, and markets know the Fed is always prepared to provide loose credit to financiers facing big losses.

Now, what lessons have the banks learned from the financial crisis? The truth is that if they get into trouble, the Fed will be there to lend unlimited amounts of money at extremely low interest rates. So where is the motivation then for curbing risky investment behavioral by these banks? The only one on the proverbial financial hook under a current Federal bailout system is you, the taxpayer.

Yesterday, President Obama gave a speech on financial reform at Federal Hall on Wall Street. Ironically, Federal Hall is where the founders of our great Nation once bitterly argued over how much the government should control the national economy.

In his speech, the President warned Wall Street that they shouldn't ignore the lessons from the past financial and current financial crisis. They shouldn't become complacent and expect future bailouts. Yet the financial regulatory reform, the plan the President's administration is putting forth, calls for expanding the powers of the Federal Reserve, and the Fed is essentially a bailout machine for the financial sector. Clearly there is a discrepancy between the President's rhetoric and the reality of the policies.

In 55 B.C., the great Roman statesman Cicero wisely said, "The budget

should be balanced, the treasury should be refilled, public debt should be reduced, the arrogance of officialdom should be tempered and controlled, and assistance to foreign lands should be curtailed, lest Rome become bankrupt."

My colleagues, looking back on the one-year anniversary of the Lehman Brothers bankruptcy, we would do well to heed Cicero's advice and seek out financial reform policies that will steer us away from the practice of bailouts and the policies that will bankrupt future generations. My colleagues, America is too great a country to not learn from its past mistakes.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 59 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BLUMENAUER) at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Lord God, may this fall session of the 111th Congress be shaped in timely fashion by divine providence so that You are glorified in Your creatures.

Make the Members of the House of Representatives ready to receive Your holy inspiration and open to colleagues who have a mutual and accountable vision for this country.

This is the season for the seeding of a strong annual growth not to be seen until the cloak of winter is lifted. The bright colors of this fermentation will soon splash against our mountains and touch roadsides with the natural resemblance of dying.

Yet, Lord, we pray that autumn's full splendor may so captivate national attention that daily photos of what is happening will trace only Your steady cycle at work, and we hardly notice personal gain and partisan advantage fall to the ground like falling leaves.

We place all our trust in You, Lord of the harvest and the ages.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause one, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr.

BUTTERFIELD) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

SECURE OUR NATION'S TECHNOLOGY INFRASTRUCTURE

(Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest threats to our national security is the vulnerability of our Nation's technology infrastructure.

In this age where everything is becoming wired, computers oversee our bank accounts, military system, electric grid, communication systems, dams and power plants, air traffic control systems, and countless other vital parts of our society. These systems are attacked every single day. The fact is one of these systems is likely being attacked right now.

The President has said that securing our Nation's networks is a priority for his administration. However, I am concerned that, while Congress was away in August, two of our government's top cybersecurity officials resigned, and we still have no cybersecurity coordinator within the White House.

We must regain focus, fill these vacant high-level positions and implement a plan to secure our networks before an attack does irreparable harm to our Nation.

TWO REFORM AMENDMENTS

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, during the August recess, I held four of the largest townhalls in the history of South Carolina: 1,700 in Columbia; 1,500 in Lexington; 1,500 in Beaufort; and 1,200 in Hilton Head. These were passionate events, full of honest patriots, and nearly 95 percent want us to work together for health insurance reform but not for a government takeover. During these events, I explained two health care bill amendments which were adopted.

The first was to exempt and protect TRICARE from the proposed mandates already included in the bill. TRICARE serves 9.4 million active duty members, National Guard and Reserve members, veterans, their families, and survivors. The second amendment urges Members of Congress who vote in favor of a government-run option to enroll in the program themselves. If it's good enough for the American people, it's good enough for Congress.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

THE VIETNAMESE GOVERNMENT MUST STOP DENYING THE RIGHTS OF THEIR PEOPLE

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

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, on September 3, the Vietnamese police arrested blogger Nguyen Ngoc Nhu Quynh.

This arrest followed an earlier arrest of two other Vietnamese bloggers. Fortunately, Quynh was released on Sunday. However, there was one condition for her release, and that was that she had to stop blogging. In order to be released from jail, she had to give up her freedom of expression, and I believe this is unlawful and is absolutely unacceptable.

The Vietnamese Government continues to deny their people's fundamental rights, and this must be stopped. Vietnamese citizens have the right to advocate their views whether it's on the Internet or in public protest.

For that reason, I have introduced House Resolution 672, calling on the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam to release these imprisoned bloggers and to respect Internet freedom. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor House Resolution 672.

GAZA STUDENTS AND THE HOLOCAUST

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, in Gaza and the West Bank, the U.N. Relief Works Agency operates hundreds of schools, many of them controlled by Hamas-approved teachers' unions. When the U.N. considered adding the Holocaust to the history curriculum, Hamas wrote a vicious letter, denying the events and refusing to let their children hear about one of the most well-documented, horrific events of the 20th century.

Sadly, in typical fashion, U.N. officials have backed off their pledge, effectively ceding control of curriculum to Hamas.

It is hard to imagine that there can be a lasting peace agreement in the Middle East when the party that controls the Gaza Strip steadfastly denies even well-known facts. Hamas teaches the children of Gaza outrageous lies about Israel; and, unfortunately, the U.N. does little to combat this disinformation and hate speech.

It is far past time for the U.N. to take a stand against the hatred of Hamas extremists by ensuring that history is no longer distorted. Peace will only come when the children of Gaza are no longer taught that Israel has no right to exist.

IT IS TIME TO CHANGE OUR HEALTH CARE SYSTEM

(Mr. KAGEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak out in favor of my constituents, like Jim from Green Bay, who says that every citizen should have health care: I have no insurance. I'm 60 years old.

It is time to fix that problem in a bipartisan way.

I am speaking out today for Sally from Kaukauna, who says: Our prescriptions cost \$1,000 a month. This is a very big issue for our family.

Well, Sally, hope is on the way. We have to pass legislation that allows the people to negotiate for lower prescription drug costs, to guarantee that if you're a citizen you should be in the risk pool, and insurance companies, well, they ought to be processing paper, not practicing medicine.

It is time to change our health care system and to move towards a market-based system that really works for everybody and that guarantees for every citizen that, if they have an opportunity, they should have it at the lowest price. Every business entity should show us their prices and then accept as payment in full the lowest price that is accepted from anybody else.

HONORING THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF AMERICAN TENNIS PLAYER MELANIE OUDIN

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

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the tremendous achievements of 17-year-old American tennis player Melanie Oudin.

Melanie was born on September 23, 1991, in Marietta, Georgia, where I reside; and she captured the heart of America with her inspiring performance at the 2009 United States Open.

Melanie entered the United States Open as the youngest player in the top 100, numbered 67—the number three American behind Serena and Venus Williams. This was Melanie's second U.S. Open, and she played incredibly well. Melanie ousted the number four seed, the number 13 seed and the number 29 seed before losing in the quarterfinals to the number nine player. This series of wins comes on the back of her performance at Wimbledon this summer where she made the fourth round.

Melanie's sneakers, pink and yellow with the word "believe" stamped on the heel, sum up her attitude about life and sports, and she has shown all of us what can be achieved if you only work hard enough.

I know that I and the other residents of Marietta, Georgia, are proud to call her one of our own; and we look forward to watching her continued rise in the sport of tennis and in life.

**APPLAUDING CONGRESS FOR ITS
PASSAGE OF THE AMERICAN RE-
COVERY AND REINVESTMENT
ACT**

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

Ms. MARKEY of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to applaud the critical actions taken by this Congress to create jobs, to cut taxes, and to invest in America's long-term economic growth by passing the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.

With the goal of creating and saving jobs, rushing relief to America's businesses and families and pulling our country back from the brink of catastrophe, the Recovery Act was signed into law by President Obama in my home State of Colorado.

As a member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, I was especially pleased to see that the Colorado Department of Transportation was prepared with shovel-ready projects that would have an immediate and positive impact on the lives of Colorado's businesses and families.

Since the passage of the Recovery Act, 576 jobs have been created or sustained through transportation projects alone in Colorado. These jobs have created a payroll of over \$700,000. Not only have these projects helped reduce unemployment, but they're improving the safety and efficiency of Colorado's highways. With interchange improvements and with the addition of shoulder and bike lanes, the Recovery Act is making Colorado a more multimodal and sustainable place to live.

**PAYING TRIBUTE TO MARINE GUN-
NERY SERGEANT AARON
KENEFICK**

(Mr. LEE of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LEE of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to Marine Gunnery Sergeant Aaron Kenefick, a Williamsville, New York, native who made the ultimate sacrifice earlier this month in Kunar province, Afghanistan.

Sergeant Kenefick followed in his grandfather's footsteps when he signed up for the Marines. Nothing made his grandfather prouder. He was twice named Marine of the Year, and was the Distinguished Honor Graduate at Fort Benning, assigned to Central Command. Just 2 days before he lost his life, Sergeant Kenefick earned a Purple Heart after being hit by shrapnel in a rocket attack.

I want to recognize the courage of Sergeant Kenefick's family: his father, Donnie; his mother, Susan; and his sisters, Jade and Jacquelyn, to whom he was extremely close. They will surely fill the coming days with stories about Aaron, including the Thanksgiving a few years ago when he was pushing to have dinner as quickly as possible because he wanted to get to the VA hospital.

He said, That's where the true heroes are.

Now Aaron stands firmly among our Nation's truest heroes. The example he has set and the sacrifices he has made will always be with us.

**CONGRESS, LISTEN TO THE
VOICES OF PASSIONATE AMERI-
CANS**

(Mr. YARMUTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, across the country, tens of thousands of passionate, boisterous Americans have come to townhall meetings to make their voices heard to Members of Congress.

I welcome that expression of concern. Those concerns have touched a wide range of issues, but there is a common theme running through all of them, and that is that people feel they are not being listened to. While I understand the frustration, I think, maybe, the source of their frustration is not understood. It is that, no matter how loud we scream, there is still a torrent of money that is pouring into the political system on the other side that drowns out those voices.

So, as we debate health care and energy and the reform of our financial system, I hope those same passionate Americans will talk to Congress about the need to reform our campaign finance system, about the need to create public financing so that their voices, as passionate and as intelligent as they may be, are not drowned out by the huge amounts of money that we now see in the political system.

I think this is the cause for the future as the Supreme Court debates a decision which could make this even more compelling need more salient. We need to deal with this important topic.

□ 1215

**THE AMERICAN RESISTANCE
MOVEMENT—PAGE 2**

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the American resistance movement has begun. It was seen in D.C. this weekend when over a million people came to show their displeasure with government. Their grievances: too much government spending, borrowing and taxing, too much bloated government, too much waste and irresponsibility in government.

This is not the 1960s violent antiwar protests led by radical draft-dodging college elites. These are families, working people, business owners, veterans, seniors and the backbone of the American spirit. These people have a stake in America and a concern about the future of a Nation they treasure and love.

Government beware, these people have engaged in that political fight and

are not about to give their country away to those who want to run roughshod over their lives and force more government intrusion upon them. These people don't like the atmosphere that disagreement with government is frowned upon.

This American resistance is not going away. People will not be dismissed and intimidated by those whose only answer to their valid concerns is to say they are "un-American." These Americans want government to listen, and we ignore them at our own peril.

And that's just the way it is.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. BUTTERFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the vast majority of American workers have private health insurance. If you are among those with health insurance, do you really know what you have or what you will have in 5 years? Unfortunately, many people do not understand the limits of their insurance until they get sick.

Without health care reform, insurance companies will continue to deny coverage or increase rates because of preexisting conditions. They will continue to drop people when they get sick or water down coverage when it's needed the most, and they will continue to set caps on the coverage in a given year or over a lifetime.

If you watch your current policy very closely, read the fine print, the American people will see that they are paying more and more for less and less. For Americans with health insurance, these reforms provide stability, affordability, security and peace of mind. Americans should not have to wait for reform.

Congress must get it done this year.

**LISTEN TO WHAT REAL AMERI-
CANS HAVE TO SAY ABOUT
HEALTH REFORM**

(Mr. REHBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Speaker, after 16 listening sessions over August, I heard from thousands of Montanans about health care reform.

Today, I am here to report that away from the influence of powerful special interests and the spin of political operatives, this debate is very different. That's why it's so important to get out of Washington in order to hear Americans, our bosses, what they think.

We haven't yet seen a final bill in either the House or the Senate. Once we get a final bill, but before we vote on it, Congress should adjourn this body for 30 days, not for more vacation. Far from it, we need those days to return home to listen to what real Americans have to say about the new bill. Then we can vote.

Our children and grandchildren won't remember how fast we reformed health care. They will remember how well we fixed it.

HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE

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

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, health insurance is not something we can take for granted. Every day, 14,000 Americans lose their coverage. A recent Treasury Department report noted that approximately half of all Americans under the age of 65 will lose their coverage at some point in the next 10 years.

Thousands are denied coverage because of preexisting conditions, like asthma, pregnancy, arthritis or diabetes. Millions more have no health insurance at all.

In Hawaii, public and private health insurance covers an estimated 92 percent of our population. That means that most of us have health insurance and, because of our Prepaid Health Care Act, our coverage is among the best in the country.

At the same time, Hawaii's economy has been hard hit, and our unemployment rate reached a 31-year high this past May, nearly doubling what it was just last year. Other States are similarly situated. H.R. 3200 will provide affordable health care coverage for those who lose it or never had it.

I urge my colleagues' support for health care reform now.

TAX INCREASE ON MIDDLE-INCOME WORKING AMERICANS

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, as we debate the issue of health care, the administration late last Friday night did something that was 180 degrees from what was promised in last year's campaign. I am referring to a tax increase on middle-income working Americans.

Yes, last Friday night, the administration announced that there will be a 35 percent tariff on inexpensive tires coming in from China. The interesting thing is this was done in response to a petition from the steelworkers union without a single U.S. tire manufacturer signing on in support of this. In fact, they have even gone on so far as to say that if this 35 percent tax is imposed, they will not go into the business of actually manufacturing inexpensive tires.

So what does that mean, Mr. Speaker? It means that we will see not only a 35 percent tax increase on working Americans, but we will not see a single job created here in the United States of America.

We need to realize we also create the potential for great retaliation in a wide range of other areas. This decision is

bad for the American worker and bad for the U.S. economy.

HEALTH CARE PREMIUM INCREASES

(Mr. HALL of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HALL of New York. Mr. Speaker, over the last few weeks, I have heard stories from businesses, nonprofits, individuals, and even health care providers in my district who have received health care premium increases up to 39 percent. These increases are unfair, unsustainable and crippling our economy.

These drastic increases are likely to continue as long as private insurers are allowed to regulate themselves. That's why we must vote soon on a comprehensive plan to improve health care, a plan that will reduce costs for the middle class, end insurance company abuses, and increase stable, quality care and access for all Americans.

We need to get reform done but get it right. We must keep listening and engaging with our constituents to ensure that reform will benefit all Americans. With health care premiums growing three times faster than wages, we can't afford to wait.

AMERICAN JOBS HURT BY PROPOSED HEALTH CARE LEGISLATION

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

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, the American health care system is in need of reform, but the current proposals are not the solution the American public is looking for. The House health care plan will create a surtax on small business, the lifeblood of our economy, to help pay for the \$1.5 trillion reform.

My constituent, Donald Dickey, is a small business owner and is already being forced to cut his workforce by more than 70 percent because of the current economy. Under the proposed health care reform bill, Donald says he will be forced to close his business because of the combination of the new surtax and requirements for employers to provide health coverage for all workers.

We need to work on commonsense solutions that encourage job growth, expand access to affordable health care, and give Americans the ability to choose a plan that fits their needs. I am willing to work with my colleagues to achieve those goals in a final bill.

STATE OF OUR ECONOMY

(Mr. PASCRELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, on a day after the President addressed this

country on the need for regulatory reform in the financial sector, I stand before you to discuss the state of the economy. Unfortunately, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle fail to comprehend the inextricable connection between the economy and the need for comprehensive health care reform.

We must remember that the extraordinary rise in health care costs and insurance premiums has affected several segments of our economy. Surging health care costs slow the rate of job growth by making it more expensive for companies to add new workers.

As health care costs rise, corporate operating margins are cut, which reduces the capacity of firms to grow by investing in research, plant and equipment. Furthermore, high and escalating out-of-pocket costs are forcing families to delay mortgage payments on their homes.

Since enactment of the Recovery and Reinvestment Act, we have prevented the layoff of tens of thousands of teachers, police officers, and other essential public servants, and we have put people to work renovating schools and hospitals without one vote from the other side.

TORT REFORM WILL REDUCE HEALTH CARE COSTS

(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. Mr. Speaker, last week President Obama called for the administration to establish demonstration projects to measure the effectiveness of tort reform. But we don't need to demonstrate that tort reform works; we have already proved that in States where it has been enacted.

In my home State of Texas, for example, health care premiums fell by 30 percent. That means Texans pay less to have better health care and more options. According to a study by the Harvard School of Public Health, 40 percent of medical malpractice suits filed in the U.S. are without merit, 40 percent.

A Department of Health and Human Services study found that unlimited excessive damages add \$70 billion to \$126 billion annually to health care costs. These costs are then passed along to the patient in the price of health care.

Tort reform will reduce health care costs by tens of billions of dollars. We don't need to test tort reform; we need to enact it.

PEOPLE LIKE HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, at my townhall meetings, I was amazed at

how much consensus there was about health care reform. People liked health care reform.

What they didn't like were things that are not actually in the bill. Because of the massive disinformation campaign on this bill, people didn't like things that weren't there.

There were more hallucinations about this from opponents of this bill than there were when Timothy Leary was doing business in Haight-Ashbury in the late 1960s. Take this hallucination that this bill is going to insure illegal immigrants. You look at page 132, it says, "For purposes of this division, the term 'affordable credit individual' means, subject to subsection (b), an individual who is lawfully present in a State in the United States."

Look at page 143, "Nothing in this subtitle shall allow Federal payments for affordability credits on behalf of individuals who are not lawfully present in the United States."

Now, the President was challenged during his joint address to the U.S. Congress. I will tell you what, if there was a deception, it wasn't by the President of the United States.

And it is time for us to call out those people who spread hallucinations, phantoms, boogeymen. People want health care and this reform. We are going to pass it.

SKYROCKETING NATIONAL DEFICIT

(Mr. FLEMING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, the President has claimed that his policies are going to reduce the skyrocketing national deficit, but I would like to spend just a moment to debunk this myth.

Rather than reducing the deficit, the President's budget calls for a \$9 trillion deficit over the next 10 years, 6 trillion higher than the CBO predicted just in January when he took office. Even according to the White House, the national debt will more than double in 10 years. The President's own numbers showed that the national debt will be 107 percent of GDP by 2019.

In the month of August, there were 14.92 million unemployed individuals looking for work, the highest number in history. Since February, when the Democrats passed their stimulus, 2.46 million people have lost their jobs.

And while the President promised that billions of dollars would go into shovel-ready construction projects that would help rebuild infrastructure and employ hundreds of thousands, transportation spending from the stimulus has only trickled out at a snail's pace.

Given this administration's track record, why wouldn't the American people be skeptical about \$1.6 trillion for health care reform?

REFORMING HEALTH INSURANCE

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, reforming health insurance must be our focus for now. The vast majority of Americans already have health insurance.

The question is, what does our health care reform bill mean to them? Just three things. It means an insurance company can no longer decide to deny any coverage or jack up your rates because of preexisting conditions. It means it will be against the law for insurance companies to drop your coverage when you get sick or water it down when you need it most. It also means insurance companies will no longer be able to place some arbitrary cap on the amount of coverage that you receive each year.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the insurance companies to come to the table, spend the millions on corrective measures instead of spending millions to pass out these mistruths and falsehoods, and try to work this problem out. The American people deserve everyone working together to get decent health care reform for the people of this Nation, and they don't deserve all the misinformation that's going around out there.

□ 1230

HONORING THE LIFE OF PATROLMAN JERRY ALAN JONES

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

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Jerry Alan Jones, a police officer in my hometown of Charleston, West Virginia, who died tragically in the line of duty while chasing a suspect early Sunday morning. At just 27, Patrolman Jones truly exemplified what it meant to serve both his local community and as a citizen of our Nation. Before becoming a patrolman with the Charleston Police Department, he was a sergeant with the United States Marine Corps and helped to secure the Kandahar Airport when the U.S. military first went to Afghanistan after September 11. Back at home, he was active in his local church, where he met his wife, Samantha. The couple recently celebrated their first anniversary together. Today the city of Charleston mourns the loss of one of its finest. Patrolman Jones led a life to which we should all aspire. We mourn with his wife, Samantha, with his family, and we offer our prayers of comfort and remembrance.

I urge my colleagues to join me today in recognition of Patrolman Jerry Alan Jones, our friend, protector and hero, for his fearless courage in serving the citizens of Charleston and the entire State of West Virginia.

REMEMBERING MAESTRO ERICH KUNZEL

(Mr. DRIEHAUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DRIEHAUS. Mr. Speaker, on September 1, we lost an artist who helped shape a generation of music in this country. For more than 40 years, Erich Kunzel shared his remarkable talent and passion with music lovers across greater Cincinnati and around the world. His tireless leadership and enthusiasm helped build the Cincinnati Pops into a musical organization without peer. Their many recordings over the years brought classical and contemporary masterpieces into the homes of countless Americans. Whether directing from his podium at Riverbend Music Center or leading the National Symphony Orchestra, as he did here in Washington every year on Memorial Day and the Fourth of July, Maestro Kunzel was a source of pride for Cincinnati and a mainstay of our Nation's musical community. He will be dearly missed by all of us whose lives were enriched by his boundless creativity.

AMERICA'S HEALTH CARE BILL

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

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, all of us had the opportunity to spend 5 weeks at home, listening to our constituents. And in Vermont, when I arrived home, such as with many of you, people were very fearful about a health care bill, a health care bill that was going to establish death panels, a health care bill where the government was going to select your doctor, a health care bill that would have as its primary beneficiaries illegal immigrants.

Of course, that is not a health care bill that anyone in this body is considering. But as we proceeded and pushed back on the misinformation, it became increasingly clear that the health care bill President Obama has outlined, which has been passed by three committees in this House to regulate insurance companies so that they offer real insurance, to extend coverage to 37 million Americans—something good for them but also for those of us with insurance, to reduce our cost shift premium of \$1,100, and a public option to provide competition and choice—that is a health care bill that Americans support, and we must pass.

WE MUST ENSURE THAT THE UNITED STATES IS AT THE FOREFRONT OF THE ENERGY REVOLUTION

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to continue to remind my colleagues about the energy crisis we are

experiencing in our country. While oil is currently trading at some \$69.21 per barrel today, it was at \$147 in July of 2008, when we all remember gas prices at over \$4 a gallon. We must address our energy problems as we continue to address our economic problems. By doing so, we can ensure that while our economy recovers, we will be competitive and secure in the energy sector as well.

As such, I was pleased that my bill, H.R. 3165, the Wind Energy Research and Development Act of 2009, passed this body last week. I would like to thank my colleagues from both sides of the aisle for their support on my first piece of legislation that passed this full body. We must continue to promote energy efficiency, to drill and mine efficiency as we previously drilled for oil and mined coal. We must also enact policies that promote clean energy jobs and the deployment of renewables.

Finally, as my bill did last week, we must continue to invest in research and development to ensure that the United States is at the forefront of the energy revolution.

TOO MANY CRISES IN WASHINGTON

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

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, it is so good to be back on the House floor, doing the people's work. But once again, I hear the word "crisis" used constantly—energy is a crisis, the health care crisis. When will this body deal with the problems in many cases created by government in a way that the American people can have the confidence that, in fact, we view problems as something which gets solved, and it gets solved by having the private sector able to do what it does best and the public sector doing only the minimum necessary?

When I hear my colleagues talk about how we have to make insurance companies do this or that, I recognize that we still don't get it. The crises are created in Washington, and we must change to help solve problems with the American people and not make everything a crisis to justify our pet projects.

WE NEED HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I spent the month of August and the first part of September traveling across my district in upstate New York, listening to my constituents in townhall meetings, tele-townhalls and one-on-one discussions in my office. I've listened to doctors, nurses, hospital administrators in order to build consensus on what my constituents want to see as part of a

health care reform bill. I learned a lot during that time, and I heard stories that would make hearts break regarding denied coverage or loss of coverage because of preexisting conditions and catastrophic illness.

I have promised my constituents that I will keep listening until we have to go to vote on this bill. However, it is crucial to America's financial health that we pass comprehensive health care reform to rid the current system of rampant waste, fraud and abuse, like the inflated costs of prescription drugs. Our economy cannot sustain the high cost of our current system, and it is clear to me that the health care reform in this country is not just the moral imperative for those who don't have health care insurance, but it's also an economic imperative for those that do have health care insurance, to ensure that those individuals can continue the coverage that they have.

OVER 20 PERCENT OF AMERICANS BETWEEN THE AGES OF 18 AND 64 ARE UNINSURED

(Mrs. MALONEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, the Joint Economic Committee heard last week some very sobering findings from the latest Census data on health coverage. The number of Americans between the ages of 18 and 64 who are without health insurance increased significantly last year to over 20 percent. More than one of every five nonelderly adults lacked health insurance in 2008. Those millions are one accident, one major illness away from financial ruin. The majority of those uninsured adults without health coverage worked full time or part time.

At the same time, the share of employment-based health insurance declined significantly to 58.5 percent in 2008. The current expensive, inefficient and indifferent system is failing us. Americans deserve better, and we deserve it now.

CELEBRATING THE 15TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT

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

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 15th anniversary of the Violence Against Women Act. I am so proud of the light that Congress shined on domestic violence 15 years ago this week, of the work that the dedicated staff and advocates have done for the past decade and a half, and of the bravery shown by victims and their families. For 15 years now, the Office on Violence Against Women has served as a safe haven for families everywhere. Through it, we have provided services and counseling during victims' darkest

hours, emergency and transitional shelter in times of need, and legal assistance to help prosecute perpetrators.

Domestic violence is a scourge in this country, one that recognizes no income brackets, no race, no age. Earlier this week, I joined my constituents in Wisconsin for the fourth annual Brides Walk. We donned wedding dresses and marched through the streets of Milwaukee, calling attention to the violent murder of Gladys Ricart. Gladys was in the process of handing her bouquet to her maid of honor 8 years ago in New York when a former lover burst into the church and killed her in her wedding dress.

Domestic violence is not a private matter. Domestic violence against a partner or a child, whether physical or mental, is not okay. On this anniversary, I urge my colleagues to recommit themselves once again to ending this injustice in our country.

REAL COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH CARE REFORM IS A NECESSITY

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

Ms. KILROY. Mr. Speaker, like I've heard from many of my colleagues this afternoon, I also have been listening to constituents in my district throughout the recess and this past weekend about the issue of health care. After church services last Sunday, this is what I heard from one woman who worked for General Motors for 26 years, taking an early retirement a few years ago, thinking she was secure in her retirement: Now she's found that she has lost her investments and her 401(k) because of the GM bankruptcy, and also lost her health care.

She is a breast cancer survivor. Now she is not of the means to buy insurance. No insurance company will insure her because of this preexisting condition. Mr. Speaker, there are too many people in my district and across the country who cannot buy insurance because they are barred because of preexisting conditions. This is one of the many reasons why we need to take action on real comprehensive health care reform.

THE HEALTH CARE LEGISLATION WILL RESULT IN BETTER CARE WITH NO ADDITIONAL COST TO AMERICANS

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

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, the urgency of health care reform comes from the fact that overall, Americans are living sicker, dying younger, and paying more. Not just the poor, not just those without insurance, not just the unemployed. Overall, Americans are living sicker, dying younger, and paying more than they should or more than residents of other countries do. Just minutes ago I came from a meeting with

the heads of the American Medical Association, the American Nursing Association, and the American Hospital Association. Doctors, hospital administrators, nurses—not politicians. The clear consensus is that the health care legislation, as it is taking shape here in Congress, can be expected to result in better patient care while holding costs in check. Let me repeat, the legislation, as it is taking shape in Congress, can result in better care at no more cost for all Americans.

**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.

**UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE
FINANCIAL RELIEF ACT OF 2009**

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 22) to amend chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, to allow the United States Postal Service to pay its share of contributions for annuitants' health benefits out of the Postal Service Retiree Health Benefits Fund, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 22

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "United States Postal Service Financial Relief Act of 2009".

**SEC. 2. GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTIONS FOR
POSTAL ANNUITANTS' HEALTH BENEFITS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Clause (iii) of section 8909a(d)(3)(A) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(iii) \$1,400,000,000, not later than September 30, 2009;"

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if included in the enactment of section 803(a)(1)(B) of the Postal Accountability and Enhancement Act (Public Law 109-435; 120 Stat. 3251).

SEC. 3. TECHNICAL CORRECTION.

The heading for section 8909a of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking "BENEFIT" and inserting "BENEFITS".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS) and the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 22, the United States Postal Service Financial Relief Act of 2009, as amended, would permit the United States Postal Service to lower its 2009 payment into the retirement health benefit fund, \$5.4 billion, reduce it to \$1.4 billion. This bill does not provide any taxpayer funds to the Postal Service. In essence, H.R. 22 is intended to provide the Postal Service with some relief from its current financial crisis by lowering the amount of its 2009 payment due. The measure has been properly vetted and amended by the House Oversight Committee, in line with calls for a more fiscally responsible government. The bill, as amended, does not score.

The bill enjoys the support of 339 Members of the House from both parties. I would like to thank Representatives McHUGH of New York and DAVIS of Illinois for introducing this bill and for their hard work and patience in navigating the bill through the House. Further, I would like to thank the House Democratic leadership and the Budget Committee for working with us to help advance the bill to the floor.

□ 1245

Also I would like to thank and recognize Chairman LYNCH of Massachusetts for his leadership on the subcommittee and being a tireless advocate for the postal service and all of its employees. Unfortunately, Chairman LYNCH could not be with us today, but his statement will be in the RECORD.

Additionally, I would like to thank the gentleman from California, Congressman ISSA, for his support and strong work on this bill. Also Congressman CHAFFETZ for his work as well. I would like to recognize them because this is truly bipartisan support for this important legislation, which I think is so important.

The United States Postal Service is regularly acknowledged to be among the most trusted of the Federal agencies in part due to the positive relationship that its approximately 625,000 employees develop with local communities. The postal service is often the only Federal presence in many of the urban and rural areas throughout the United States, and it is often the face of the Federal Government.

Yet despite the best efforts of its employees, the postal service faces financial challenges unlike at any other time. Mail volumes have declined at a record pace, falling by 7 million pieces during the third quarter of fiscal year 2009, 14.3, compared to the same period last year. In fact, volume continued to fall for all types of mail: first class, standard, periodical, and also package services. The postal service ended the third quarter ending in 2009 with a loss of \$2.4 billion, its year-to-date net loss through the third quarter at \$4.7 billion.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the introduction of this bill on January 6, the first legislative day, was appropriate. This is a problem for an organization, the United States Post Office, which is, in fact, 15 times larger than General Motors. The United States Post Office is not only a constitutional obligation but, in fact, an organization which has existed for the service of the United States of America since our founding.

But since the 1970s, the United States Post Office has had a problem. The problem is our own success. Alternate efficiencies have reduced the need for the United States Post Office to deliver mail. Invoices, payments, and certainly many other emails instead of paper mails are being delivered electronically today. The United States Post Office is also suffering from a recession that we all are suffering under.

Therefore, the committee has worked on a bipartisan basis to recognize that we must reform the post office again. Having just passed the Postal Accountability and Enhancement Act in 2006, we are faced with another crisis; but rather than having that crisis lead to haphazard reductions, the chairman and I have worked together with Members on both sides of the aisle, as the chairman said, 339 cosponsors, to create a soft landing for the post office.

It will not be that soft, Mr. Speaker. It will, in fact, require that they accelerate the reduction in their force. It will require that they look at all costs and services. It will require without a doubt the closing of post offices around our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, these are difficult decisions. They are both financial and they're political. They impact the communities who have for so long allowed people to go to their corner post office to maintain a postal mailbox, to do other services. These services will be further away in the future.

So for that reason, although I would have preferred a major reform, I would have preferred that we were able to do some of these hard steps, I'm supporting an alternate course, one in which we use these last 2 weeks and only these last 2 weeks of the fiscal year to move this bill with a cost, as the chairman said, of zero because there is so little time left in the year. However, we are committed on this side of the aisle and I know the chairman shares this, to work with the postal service to find ways to reduce their costs, their overhead, and many of the legacy items that today make it difficult.

Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat something the chairman said because it's noteworthy for my conservative friends. The post office's money that we are talking about today is the money they have put aside. This is the only agency that works in this way. So

although this could have scored, it does not score, and although people will often say that we are being fiscal conservatives if we vote against this, the truth is the postal service operates within its own funds. The funds that will be used in H.R. 22 are their funds. Ultimately the American people will look to the post office to make the corrections. This committee on a bipartisan basis will oversee the post office to see that they come in line for the future so they continue to operate on their own revenue and not on any revenue provided by Congress.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope my friends are listening. I hope this will go far behind the 339 cosponsors, and I hope that everyone on both sides of the aisle will put down their mark today to make sure that we commit ourselves working with the post office to do the necessary reforms so we will not be back here again in the same way next year.

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

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to first yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY).

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

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding. I want to also thank the chairman and the ranking member as well as the House leadership for shepherding this bill to the floor.

This substitute amendment to H.R. 22 is sorely needed to partially relieve the U.S. Postal Service of an oversize payment of \$5.4 billion to a Retiree Health Benefits Fund. The postal service under this legislation will pay \$1.4 billion.

The postal service is suffering the same effects of this recession as the rest of the Nation. Without legislative relief, the postal service will default on a \$5.4 billion payment due on September 30.

This bill is not a bailout, as no taxpayer funds will be provided to the postal service. The Postal Accountability and Enhancement Act required the postal service to prefund the cost of health care benefits for future retirees. No other government agency or private company is required to prefund retiree benefits on such an aggressive or ambitious schedule.

The postal service operates on revenues from sales of its products and services. The postal service has already embarked on cost-cutting estimated to be \$6 billion in fiscal year 2009, by cutting work hours, freezing hiring, and closing administrative offices.

The postal service has paid \$10 billion into the trust fund over the past 2 years, although it's suffered combined losses of \$7.9 billion during that 2-year period.

This bill is in line with the actions of many large businesses, including their competitors, which have temporarily reduced or suspended payments for retiree benefits or pensions during the recession.

Again, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, at this time it is my honor to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ), a member of the committee.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I want to thank Chairman TOWNS and I want to thank Ranking Member ISSA for the bipartisan support and effort to move this bill forward. It's an important piece of legislation.

H.R. 22 is needed to avoid a taxpayer-funded bailout to the United States Postal Service. The United States Postal Service is the only Federal entity required to prefund its pension and retiree health plans. H.R. 22 would enable the United States Postal Service to use its existing revenues that have been funded over the years through its own operations to pay for retiree health benefits as opposed to using this year's operating revenues.

While the United States Postal Service needs to continue to reduce costs, one of the impressive things that has happened is that they have reduced their workforce by 22 percent since 1999, a 22 percent reduction in their workforce since 1999, compared to a 13 percent increase in the Federal workforce in other parts of the government.

The main driver of the United States Postal Service debt has been the 2006 Postal Accountability and Enhancement Act's requirement to prefund 80 percent of its future retiree health benefit costs, a 75-year liability, in just 10 years. No other business or government entity in the United States does that. Had it not been for this prefunding, the United States Postal Service would actually have shown a profit, and that's why I think you see broad bipartisan support with 339 cosponsors on this bill in support of H.R. 22.

I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this so that we can avoid a taxpayer bailout that would be needed.

Finally, let me just mention the good men and women who work so hard, so diligently, that care so much. My hat's off to them for the good work that they do for this country and the United States Postal Service.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington, D.C. (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. I rise with great thanks to our chairman and our ranking member, who worked so well together on this really essential bill.

Mr. Speaker, we have rescued a lot of private sector agencies, a whole slew of them. But here comes the postal service not asking for a bailout. Understand that we don't even subsidize the postal service, even though it is the only Federal agency mentioned in the Constitution. So it's a Federal agency we must have, mandated by the Constitution.

Yet alone among government agencies, if you want to consider an agency that funds itself out of its own revenue a government agency just because it's

in the Constitution, alone the Postal Service is required to prefund its retiree health benefits. Not us, mind you. No Federal agency has got to do that. And how does the Postal Service prefund? From postal funds.

I don't think you need to read the papers every day to know what has happened to postal funds. These folks have had to put up \$10 billion in prefunding in the past couple of years out of postal funds; yet this is a failing business. It's not a failing business because of its policies or practices. The Postal Service has been overtaken by the fax; overtaken by emails.

They're not like Wall Street, which went into a deliberate mode of greed. I don't care what kind of genius you are, you're going to have a hard time if you're the postal service, which must exist under our Constitution, to figure out how you're going to stay in business.

Yet in the past year alone, look at the kind of hits this institution has taken, not mandated by us: your mail carrier, almost 11,500; rural carriers, 753 gone; mail handlers, 2,938 gone. In the last 10 years, the postal service has lost 175,000 employees. Show me a business that is left standing, having taken those kinds of hits not because it's overspending but for reasons, some of which are beyond its control.

Now the chairman, the ranking member, the whole committee is on their case for even further cuts, but the American people are on our case to make sure that their mail keeps being delivered and that their trusted postal worker is always there.

□ 1300

We shouldn't ask more from the post office in prefunding retiree benefits at a time when I believe you could find nobody in the United States who is prefunding.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

I would like to comment on the Delegate's statement because it is quite true. Just in the last approximately 18 months, we have added almost 200,000 net Federal workers on the Federal side. The post office is continuing to reduce its workforce, anticipating reducing its workforce by about 30,000, or more than 5 percent per year. We have to do better.

I look forward to working with the majority on finding ways that we can integrate more postal workers into other Federal opportunities so we can retain these good Federal servants, but at the same time right-size the post office.

Having said that, it is very clear, as Ms. NORTON said, that only the post office is really cutting itself in the Federal Government, and that is an unusual situation. They are right-sizing themselves, and I hope all of our Members will be sensitive that we have to right-size them at a rate that allows our high quality service to continue.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New

York (Mrs. MALONEY), a member of the committee.

Mrs. MALONEY. Thank you, Chairman TOWNS, for yielding and for your leadership on this important issue and in so many other areas, and I thank the ranking member.

This bill actually saves taxpayers money. This is not a bailout as we have seen before this Congress many times. No taxpayer funds will be provided to the postal service. The service operates on revenues from sales of its products and services, and it receives appropriations only in reimbursement for free services for the blind and other services.

The post office remains the only government agency or private company that is required to prefund retiree benefits on such an aggressive schedule. The fund now currently contains over \$32 billion.

This amendment to H.R. 22 will lower the payment for 2009 to a level that is close to that recommended by the IG, and it will prevent the post office from defaulting on a \$5.4 billion payment due on September 30. Even with the lower payment for 2009, after including the payments for 2007 and 2008, the postal service will be on track to prefund the trust fund through 2016 by over \$9 billion, more than the IG's recommendation.

This bill is long overdue. It is good government, and I strongly support it.

Mr. ISSA. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Chicago, Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to thank the chairman for yielding me this time. I also want to commend him and the ranking member and the members of the subcommittee for the great work that they have done on this bill.

I am very pleased to be a cosponsor, an original cosponsor of H.R. 22. I am basically pleased to have been so because for a number of years we have known that the postal service was operating in a different environment. We have seen the tremendous increase in e-commerce. We have seen the utilization of other means and methods of communicating, and we have always known we were going to have to do something.

The something we have done does not cost the taxpayers any additional money. As Delegate NORTON said, it is not a bailout. It is a sane, rational approach to dealing with the problem, and I want to commend the postal service for their efforts to operate in an environment of diminishing returns.

So, again, I commend the chairman and the ranking member. I strongly support this legislation.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire from the chairman how many more speakers he has.

Mr. TOWNS. I have one more speaker and the right to close.

Mr. ISSA. I reserve the balance of my time to close before the chairman closes.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Houston, Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Let me thank the distinguished chairman for yielding me this time and thank him and the ranking member for what I believe is an astute and important statement on behalf of the United States Postal Service and all of its thousands upon thousands of hardworking postal workers.

H.R. 22 is an effective approach to an organization which has served this Nation for decades, and one which we have respected and has served in many different capacities; the idea of reducing the payment that the postal service has to contribute to the health benefits trust fund from \$5.4 billion to \$1.4 billion, added to their already established resources, allowing them, without taxpayer dollars, to work on some of the new trends that we are facing all over America, new technology and the utilization of email.

No one can doubt the service of the postal service workers and the importance of neighborhood post offices. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I am hoping there will be a modified review of post offices and a respect of neighborhoods and rural communities and urban centers where postal services are very important.

Many people use money orders. I know some of us would probably wonder about the utilization of those kinds of financial documents, but they are important to certain economic levels of our communities. Many people go to the post office to pick up their mail. They have a post office box. Many companies, for other reasons of commerce, use the postal service as opposed to an email. Sometimes a paper written document is necessary.

I would like to thank the committee for looking intelligently at this issue, and I wanted to rise today to support H.R. 22, as amended, and to particularly salute the postal workers of America who have worked with me side by side in Houston who have been part of the postal food giveaway. They do a lot. I am very glad to have been an original cosponsor of this bill.

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

All that need be said has more or less been said. This is necessary. It scores no cost. It is a reality of our recession and the ongoing reduction in the number of pieces of mail being carried by the post office. I might note in closing, the United Parcel Service, FedEx, DHL and others have experienced even greater reductions in their package carrying. That is part of this recession. This recession will end. But when this recession ends, the use of email and advertising over the Internet rather than your mailbox will continue.

So I look forward to working with the chairman. He and I have forged a very good relationship on these bipartisan issues. We need to create the right size postal system. We need to convert and retain postal workers as Federal employees where there are opportunities. That is what we really need the time to do.

As the chairman and I close, I want to urge all of my colleagues to understand, I am putting down a marker here today that I will not be bringing back the exact same bill next year simply to forestall it. We will monitor the usage at the post office and work with them, work with the Postmaster, and we will work with each other to make sure that we begin in a very, very quick order the kinds of reforms that may cost money but ultimately will right-size the post office.

That is a commitment the American people expect us to make and one we will make. But at the same time, I recognize that the postal service is right-sized to perform an incredibly important constitutional duty, one that none of us would want to see go away. Certainly at a time when a number of States have gone to postal voting, they now represent a key element of democracy even beyond what they have historically done.

I thank the chairman for this bipartisan work, and I thank Mr. MCHUGH who could not be here today for his relentless support and work. I urge strong support that we vote this out of the House on a unanimous basis.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Let me just say, I am really proud that we have come to this moment to move this bill forward. I want to thank the ranking member, Congressman ISSA for his work, and thank Congressman LYNCH and Congressman CHAFFETZ and all of the people who have worked so hard on this, and especially the staff on both sides of the aisle for their work, and to say to you, yes, we still have some more work to do. There is no question about it, because the problem has not been solved, but at least we are able to get to this point. We agree to continue to work to try to bring about a solution. Let's face it, we owe it to the postal workers to be able to try to assist them in finding a solution to this problem.

There is a recession. There is no question about it. We need to make some adjustments. What we are doing here is not costing the government any money. This is just being creative, recognizing the fact that something needs to be done, and we are doing that. So here again, on that note, I want to thank all of the committee for working with me on it. We will be back again trying to see how we can come about with a total solution to this problem.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as the proud sponsor of H.R. 22, a bipartisan bill

with 339 cosponsors that would provide immediate but temporary financial relief to the Postal Service. As a Member who has closely followed postal legislative issues for more than 14 years, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation. I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS) and the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) for their work to bring this legislation to the floor today.

As every Member of Congress and most Americans are aware, the Postal Service faces a crisis of huge and historic proportions, despite extensive efforts to reduce costs. This situation is due to the precipitous decline in mail volume brought about by the deepening recession, changes in technology and society, and the economic condition of the agency's largest customer, the financial services industry.

Additionally, the Postal Service is laboring under a crippling cost burden imposed by a statutory requirement that the Postal Service prefund the health benefits of future retirees, while still continuing to pay annual premiums for its current retirees. The payment for current retirees totals about \$2 billion and is growing each year. At the same time, the annual statutorily-mandated prefunding ranges from \$5.4 billion to \$5.8 billion over the 10-year period from 2007 through 2016.

In 2008, the Postal Service's total retiree health benefits costs came to \$7.4 billion, with \$1.8 billion of that amount paid for current retirees and \$5.6 billion deposited into the Postal Service Retiree Health Benefits Fund to prefund future premium payments. Without the mandated payments, the Postal Service would have achieved a positive net income in 2008 rather than its actual \$2.8 billion loss. It is important to note that no other entity—public or private—is required to prepay this health benefit obligation at these extremely high levels.

As amended, H.R. 22 would begin to address this serious situation. It would do so by simply accelerating, for just the remainder of fiscal year 2009, a provision in the law to allow the Postal Service to pay the health premiums for current retirees from the Postal Service Retiree Health Benefits fund; this fund already holds in excess of \$32 billion and will continue to grow. H.R. 22 does not require an appropriation or use of any taxpayer monies, but rather involves merely an intragovernmental transfer of funds. It would not increase the health benefit premiums paid by current or future Postal Service retirees, nor would it affect their benefits. Put simply, it is not a bailout.

The Postal Service is in a dire financial situation, and while H.R. 22 is not the full answer to all of the Service's woes, it is an important solution to alleviate the pressure before the agency risks running out of money at the end of this month. According to the committee, the amended version considered on the floor of the House today does not score based on the Congressional Budget Office's (CBO) evaluation. This is not a budget gimmick because the fact of the matter is that the Postal Service cannot adjust its spending for this fiscal year so late. Any cost cutting the Postal Service would have made for the fiscal year ending September 30 has already taken place and cannot be reversed.

Again, the main driver of the Postal Service's debt has been the 2006 Postal Accountability and Enhancement Act's (P.L. 109-435) requirement to prefund 80 percent of its future

retiree health benefit costs, a 75-year liability, in just 10 years. No other business or government entity does that. As I noted, if it had not been for this prefunding, the Postal Service would have had a profit in 2008, in spite of the economic turnaround. That is why 339 Members of the House have put their name as sponsors on H.R. 22.

Mr. Speaker, there is a consensus that Congress should enact H.R. 22, which is strongly supported by the Postal Service, all of its unions and management associations. It is also supported by the entire \$900 billion mailing industry, which employs 9 million Americans. Accordingly, I ask my colleagues to support this legislation and work with me to enact it into law.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the Subcommittee on Federal Workforce, Postal Service, and the District of Columbia, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I am writing to offer my strong support of H.R. 22, the United States Postal Service Financial Relief Act of 2009, as amended, which would provide short-term relief in the form of a 1-year restructuring of the Postal Service's retiree health benefits payment. The Postal Service, after having overpaid this obligation for the past couple of years, deserves to have this payment restructured, immediately. I need to also mention that the bill before us does not constitute a bailout of the Postal Service, in any form or fashion. Instead, it is intended to provide the Postal Service with some relief from an ill-structured payment schedule that would have required the Postal Service to pay nearly \$5.5 billion into the retiree health benefits fund this year, notwithstanding USPS current financial crisis. The bill before us simply lowers that payment to \$1.4 billion, thereby ensuring that the Postal Service will not default on its financial requirements as defined by the 2006 Postal Accountability and Enhancement Act. Additionally, the bill before us falls in line with calls for a more fiscally responsible government, since the amended version of H.R. 22 does not score.

In 2006, Congress placed an unprecedented burden on the Postal Service by requiring the prepayment of 80 percent of future retiree health benefits—a 75-year liability—in just 10 years. No other Federal agency carries this burden. Our subcommittee has held oversight hearings of the Postal Service in the 111th Congress, and during that time the financial condition of the Postal Service has rapidly gone from bad to worse. The Postal Service is faced with rising costs and unprecedented declines in mail volume. The losses were driven by the nationwide economic recession, diversion of mail to electronic alternatives, and also by the aggressive payment schedule for retiree health benefits required by the 2006 postal reform act. The Postal Service's fiscal year 2008 payment total for current and future retiree health benefits was roughly \$7 billion. It is likely that without these payments last year, the Postal Service would not have reported a net loss of over \$2 billion in fiscal year 2008. The future does not appear to be getting better. Although the Postal Service has targeted \$6.5 billion in savings through closures of administrative offices, an agency-wide hiring freeze, reduction of work hours, and re-adjustment of delivery routes, among other efforts, the Postal Service nonetheless expects losses for this year to exceed \$7 billion.

Again, H.R. 22, as amended, provides the Postal Service some much needed short-term

relief and improves the organization's cash position. As currently structured, the Postal Service is almost entirely self-sustaining. In fact, less than 1 percent of the Postal Service's budget is appropriated by Congress. While the measure being considered today should not be substituted for a longer-term solution to the Postal Service's financial problems, it is, nevertheless a critical component to a mix of strategies to assist the Postal Service in these dismal economic times. In the coming months, our subcommittee will continue to provide oversight of the Postal Service, including an in-depth examination of the Postal Service's business model to help determine what longer-term changes may be necessary to help the Postal Service return to financial viability.

In closing, I would like to thank Representatives JOHN MCHUGH of New York and DENNY DAVIS of Illinois for introducing this bill and for their hard work in advancing this bill through the House. Additionally, I would like to thank Chairman EDOLPHUS TOWNS, the House leadership, and the House Budget Committee for their tireless efforts to bring the bill to the floor. Lastly, I want to recognize Representatives DARRELL ISSA and JASON CHAFFETZ for their ongoing assistance on this important piece of legislation. I again express my strong support, Mr. Speaker, of approving H.R. 22 as amended, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman MCHUGH for his leadership on this bill and I am proud to be a cosponsor of this important legislation. H.R. 22 provides necessary financial relief for the United States Postal Service (USPS) by temporarily allowing it to prefund its future health care obligations out of the Postal Service Retiree Health Benefits Fund instead of its operating funds.

As an ardent supporter of the Post Office, I am deeply concerned about USPS' financial condition and appreciate the difficult decisions the Postal Service must make in order to ensure its survival. I am committed to ensuring the viability of the USPS and to the unique, irreplaceable services it provides to Americans.

It is that commitment that fuels my concerns that the Postal Service is making decisions to close post office branches across the country without full community participation and input. I am concerned that people in my community and communities across the country will face a significant reduction in services that the Postal Service provides. I am concerned that closures of USPS retail branches will mean an increase in the privatization of the same services that Northeast Ohio relies on.

In recent weeks, I have received a number of calls from people voicing concerns regarding the possible closure of their neighborhood postal retail facility. In particular, constituents from vulnerable communities who may not have access to transportation or the internet have raised concerns that they may not be able to easily access another USPS retail facility should the one in their neighborhood close. The Postal Service must ensure that they are given a seat at the table and ensure that universal access to the crucial services provided by the USPS remains.

I will continue to fight for the U.S. Postal Service and the people they serve. I strongly urge passage of this bill.

Mr. TOWNS. On that note, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 22, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

ALLOWING UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE TO ACCEPT DONATIONS FOR PLAQUES

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3137) to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide clarification relating to the authority of the United States Postal Service to accept donations as an additional source of funding for commemorative plaques.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3137

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

SECTION 1. DONATIONS FOR COMMEMORATIVE PLAQUES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 401(7) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking “business;” and inserting “business, including monetary donations made (in such manner as the Postal Service may prescribe) for the funding of plaques in connection with the commemorative designation of postal facilities;”.

(b) DESIGNATIONS.—The donor of a monetary donation described in the amendment made by subsection (a) may specify the postal facility with respect to which such donation is to be used.

(c) REQUIREMENT.—The United States Postal Service shall provide for a suitable plaque, in the case of any postal facility which has been designated by law to commemorate a particular individual, no later than 120 days after the date as of which—

(1) a law has been enacted providing for the designation of the postal facility involved; and

(2) sufficient amounts have been received, in the manner described in subsection (b), to provide for such plaque.

Any donations received by the Postal Service under subsection (b) in excess of the total amount needed in order to provide for a suitable plaque may, with the consent of the donors involved, be used for the funding of a plaque in the case of any other postal facility as to which a law (as described in paragraph (1)) has been enacted.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be considered—

(1) to affect the authority of the United States Postal Service with respect to any requirements concerning the design, placement, and limitation on costs relating to commemorative plaques (as described in the preceding provisions of this section), so long

as such requirements are applied in a uniform manner; or

(2) to limit, supersede, or render inapplicable any other authority or duty which (but for this Act) the United States Postal Service would otherwise have had with respect to the commemorative designation of a facility or the funding, commissioning, or installation of a plaque in connection with such a designation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS) and the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

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

As chairman of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I am pleased to present H.R. 3137 for consideration. This legislation will clarify the authority of the United States Postal Service over the receipt of monetary donations for post office commemorative plaques. I want to commend my ranking member, Congressman ISSA, who really, really brought this idea forth. I think that it goes into what we are doing. We are trying to reserve, we are trying to save money, and I think this legislation is a very creative way of being able to do that.

Congress routinely passes legislation to designate post offices throughout the country and honor deserving individuals, and I think that is a great idea.

Under current practice, the United States Postal Service subsequently purchases dedicatory plaques, at its own expense, out of the agency's operating budget. I think this is something that we will be able to eliminate and save money. I think that is one way to do that.

H.R. 3137 simply seeks to reduce and to eliminate the financial burden imposed on the United States Postal Service with regard to the purchase of commemorative plaques by clarifying current law in this area. Specifically, the legislation would amend the United States Code to make clear that the postal service may accept monetary donations offered for the funding of postal facility commemorative plaques.

□ 1315

In addition, H.R. 3137 provides that monetary donors may specify the postal facility at which their donations will be used. Moreover, when the amount of a donation exceeds the cost of a specified facility's commemorative plaque, H.R. 3137 would also allow, with a donor's consent, for the use of the excess donations towards the purchase of a

plaque needed for another postal facility.

I think that is a great idea. I think it's a very creative way to be able to sort of save money and, at the same time, not to have to cut back on doing what we know is right based on the fact that they do not have the funding.

On that note, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I thank the chairman for bringing this bill to the floor today. The genesis of this bill was in fact a recognition that the Postal Service funds all of its operations out of its own revenue. In no other area would the Federal Government essentially mandate a burden on a government agency over which it provides no funding, and yet here we do.

More importantly, most post offices are either named after fallen heroes in our own district, former Members of the House or Senate, or, in some cases, other notable people, and even, once in a while, a postmaster.

The fact is we make those decisions. We name those post offices. Those plaques cost money to procure and to maintain, and a recognition that in fact communities' involvement should be there, there should be a real upswelling of support.

Myself, I named a post office after the first Indo American Member of Congress, Dalip Singh Saund. I was proud to do it. And on the day that we put the plaque up, I had Members from all over California, and actually a few outside of the Indo American community, proud that the first Indo American—and the only one, except for Bobby Jindal—was being honored at a post office.

The fact is, that community would have been more than happy to not only pay for the plaque, but to help design it and to be more involved in it. That kind of support is something that we're missing because we didn't take this opportunity.

The legislation is relatively small. It perhaps would only save a few hundred thousand dollars a year to the post office, but I think it makes the kind of statement that the post offices and the names on them are important community activities and that in the future the procurement and perhaps the ongoing support will come from the community, with the enabling language here.

It also is a small but meaningful step toward the kind of reform of the post office that they want to do and that we want to help them do, and, that is, if they're going to have to live on their own revenue, Congress should not be adding to their cost of doing business.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, as we all know, the financial condition of the United States Postal Service is dismal, at best, and the agency is faced with a continually

declining mail volume. Accordingly, we should all welcome cost-saving efforts such as those provided in H.R. 3137, that is not a detriment to hardworking postal employees, but rather will only serve to alleviate the financial burden of the Postal Service.

We all name post offices from time to time. I know I named one after Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm, the first black woman to serve in the United States Congress. I thought it was a great thing. But, let's face it, it cost the Postal Service money in order to be able to get the plaque, to get it designed, and to be able to put together an event because, after all, that was an important event for the first black woman who served in the United States Congress.

So these are things that cost money that the Postal Service has to put up the money for. And I want to congratulate Mr. ISSA for introducing this legislation because I really think that you might look at it as not a giant step or big or tremendous saving, but I see it today that every little bit helps. And this, I feel, is really helping.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. I have no further speakers at this time, I would urge all Members to vote for the bill, and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers, but I would like to just close by encouraging and urging all of the Members of this House to support this legislation. I think this is legislation that truly makes a lot of sense, and it sort of does the things that we need to do to sort of tighten our belts and work together to be able to bring about solutions to solve problems.

I think this legislation is legislation that points us in the right direction, and maybe as result of this we can find other ways to be able to bring about savings for the Postal Service.

I yield back the balance of my time and encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3137.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN VETERANS MEMORIAL POST OFFICE

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3386) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1165 2nd Avenue in Des

Moines, Iowa, as the "Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans Memorial Post Office".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3386

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

SECTION 1. IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN VETERANS MEMORIAL POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1165 2nd Avenue in Des Moines, Iowa, shall be known and designated as the "Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans Memorial Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans Memorial Post Office".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS) and the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TOWNS. I now yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I am pleased to present H.R. 3386 for consideration. This legislation will designate the United States postal facility located at 1165 2nd Avenue in Des Moines, Iowa, as the "Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans Memorial Post Office."

At this time I would like to reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this bill designating the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1165 2nd Avenue in Des Moines, Iowa, as the "Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans Memorial Post Office."

Mr. Speaker, this is a particularly appropriate naming. Often we name post offices in honor of one individual whose service may have been in the Postal Service, here in Congress, or perhaps an individual who gave their last full measure to the country.

In this case, we're recognizing a conflict—a conflict that has been difficult and has cost the lives of a great many American men and women—and this broad recognition that we should pay honor to them is particularly noteworthy when you realize that more than 11,000 Iowa National Guard members have been called to Active Duty in the past 8 years and that in fact more than 70 have died in combat.

So I join with Mr. BOSWELL in support for this bill. It's well thought out. It's unusual for a Member to forgo per-

haps the gratification of naming something after a former colleague or after somebody by name in their district and to look beyond that—to look to the brave men and women who have served nobly in this crisis and recognize them in a broader way and one that I think will be enduring in Iowa for generations to come.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL) who has worked very hard to make certain that we are here today.

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

Mr. BOSWELL. I would first like to thank the chairman and ranking member for moving this bill along. I might add, Mr. ISSA, that we did have an individual request for this, and we thought about it long and hard. Then we thought about the multitude, the many that have served, and felt like it was appropriate to do this.

So I do rise today and honor those who have nobly served the Nation in Iraq and Afghanistan, and ask colleagues to support H.R. 3386, which, as has been said, will designate a post office in Des Moines, Iowa, as the "Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans Memorial Post Office."

Having spent some 20 years myself in the Army, and a couple tours in Vietnam, I understand the sacrifices, and so do you, Mr. ISSA, and so do many others, made by our servicemembers.

Our Armed Forces have many assets—whether it's our aircraft carriers, fighter planes, missiles. However, oftentimes one of the greatest military assets is overlooked, and that's our military personnel.

Our servicemen and -women stand ready to defend the freedoms we hold dear. Our all-volunteer force is made up of brave individuals who know all too well the sacrifices that we have asked them to make. Yet time and again, with this knowledge, they continue to put our freedoms above what they give up. These brave young men and women who have fought in these wars, many having lost their lives, deserve recognition for their service and their sacrifice.

Renaming the post office in downtown Des Moines, Iowa, will create a memorial for all Iraq and Afghanistan veterans, and each day Iowans will be reminded of our neighbors who courageously fought on our behalf. By renaming this post office, we honor those who have served, but also those who have given the ultimate sacrifice—their lives. To date, more than 50 Iowans have made that sacrifice.

Those who have or are serving in our Armed Forces are committed to serving our Nation with courage and honor. We must make that same commitment to them.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 3386. We must never forget.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield back the balance of my time and urge full support for this resolution.

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

The legislation before us pays tribute to the brave men and women from the city of Des Moines. Let me say that over 400 have been wounded, 50 have been killed, and I think that this is something that, once it's there, people will always see it and know in terms of what happened.

Let me say that I urge my colleagues to support this legislation because I think it's legislation that's broad and that it recognizes the conflict and, of course, the people that have been involved in it in the local area as well.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3386.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING AMERICAN LEGION DAY

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 679) supporting the goals and ideals of American Legion Day.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 679

Whereas, on September 16, 1919, Congress issued the American Legion a Federal charter;

Whereas the American Legion, a veterans service organization, remains active at the national, State, and local levels;

Whereas American Legion members, known as Legionnaires, donate millions of volunteer hours in Department of Veterans Affairs medical facilities and State veterans homes;

Whereas the American Legion sponsors and supports a number of activities for children and youth, including the National Oratorical Contest, Boy Scouts, American Legion Baseball, Boys State, and Boys Nation;

Whereas the American Legion awards millions of dollars in college scholarships;

Whereas the American Legion National Emergency Fund provides financial assistance to Legionnaires who are displaced by natural disasters;

Whereas the American Legion Family Support Network provides assistance to members of the Armed Forces and their families;

Whereas the American Legion Child Welfare Foundation has provided millions of dollars for programs focused on America's children and youth, such as the Special Olympics and the Children's Miracle Network;

Whereas the American Legion Temporary Financial Assistance program provides grants to veterans who have children and who are experiencing financial hardships;

Whereas the American Legion remains a steadfast supporter of a strong national defense;

Whereas the American Legion supports maintaining a viable but principled foreign affairs agenda;

Whereas the American Legion is a staunch advocate for the principal missions of the Department of Veterans Affairs;

Whereas the American Legion played a principal role in the drafting of the Serviceman's Readjustment Act of 1944, also known as the G.I. Bill of Rights;

Whereas the American Legion supports employment programs and opportunities for veterans;

Whereas Legionnaires believe a veteran's service to the United States goes on long after the veteran is discharged from the Armed Forces; and

Whereas many Americans recognize September 16 of each year as American Legion Day: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of American Legion Day; and

(2) calls upon the people of the United States to observe American Legion Day with appropriate programs and activities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS) and the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1330

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

I rise in support of H. Res. 679, supporting the goals and ideals of American Legion Day, celebrated each year on September 16. This resolution expresses this Chamber's commitment to this important veterans' service group.

The American Legion has nearly 3 million members across the country and worldwide, and of course I think that is so significant.

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

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

I rise to urge passage of this resolution supporting the goals and ideals of American Legion Day.

"For God and country." These four words eulogize and introduce the preamble of the American Legion's constitution, which has been recited by its members at every meeting in its 90-year history.

The history of the American Legion began when it was established as a mutual aid veterans' organization in September 1919. The organization is a congressionally chartered organization and was established so that returning soldiers of World War I would not suffer the same hardships that those from other wars had endured.

Mr. Speaker, they have grown far beyond that original charter, and today

they represent a consolidated organization that looks after veterans from all wars and issues that are so important. Through thick and thin, through popular and unpopular wars, they stay out of the politics of the day and focus on the veterans of yesterday.

So, Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise with the chairman to support this, because the American Legion, in its work in supporting not only veterans, but also youth organizations such as the Boy Scouts, Boys State, Boys Nation, and others, puts together the veterans of yesterday with the youth and future of tomorrow. That is an important issue and one that I think all of us can appreciate.

We have all seen it. Not one Member of Congress can say that they haven't been touched and they haven't seen the work done by the American Legion in their district.

I urge strong support for this resolution.

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

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois, Congresswoman HALVORSON.

Mrs. HALVORSON. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to introduce House Resolution 679, supporting the goals and ideals of the American Legion Day on September 16.

This resolution helps to honor the service and the sacrifice of the nearly 3 million members, men and women, in nearly 15,000 American Legion posts worldwide.

On September 16, 1919, the American Legion was granted their Federal charter by Congress, and 90 years later they have kept their commitment to serve not only as a resource and a voice on behalf of veterans across America, but also as an organization dedicated to the betterment of America through community service.

Since their founding charter, the American Legion has not wavered from the guiding principles and vision that can be found in their four pillars of service.

The first pillar is a steadfast commitment to ensure that America has the best fighting force in the world. Towards this end, the Legion has been a tireless advocate on behalf of the American soldier to make sure that they have the resources and the tools they need in order to do their job.

The second pillar is making sure that we proudly care for our veterans. And whether it is providing one-on-one assistance to veterans through what can be the confusing and frustrating experience of filing for a disability claim or walking the halls of Congress to educate Members like myself on the legislative issues that are important to our veterans, they do an excellent job. The original GI Bill, for example, helped set the standard for the benefits that we provide to veterans and was spearheaded by the Legion.

The American Legion has been there for our veterans for over 90 years,

standing up to serve those who have served.

Caring for our youth is the third pillar in the American Legion vision. The Special Olympics, the Children's Miracle Network, the American Legion Child Welfare Foundation, the American Legion Family Support Network, those are just a short list of the programs that the Legion supports. This is a testament to their belief that taking care of children in America, not just veterans' children, is something that makes our country stronger.

The final pillar comes from the understanding of the word "patriot." Having fought for and defended our freedom, Legionnaires know firsthand that being a patriot means you must take action to preserve America. They know that being a patriot means not just defending our freedoms, but also defending our heritage, culture, and our flag. This pillar has been the foundation for the Legion's support of programs that instill American values in our youth. From Boy Scouts to Boys State, they've been there setting the course for millions of American children as they learn what it means to be an American and why it's so important to preserve our country.

The commitment to the four pillars of service has been the cornerstone of the American Legion ideals and their successes. It serves as a model that all Americans can use to better themselves and to better America. And it has, without question, helped make the country even greater. Millions of Americans have been encouraged, supported, and inspired by Legion programs, and this resolution is just a small way to say thank you.

I would also like to take a moment to recognize and thank the American Legion Auxiliary. Also formed in 1919, the Auxiliary has shown the same devotion to our veterans and our community, and they too deserve to be recognized.

Finally, I would like to congratulate Commander Clarence Hill for his recent election as National Commander. I appreciate his 24 years of service to our Nation in the U.S. Navy and wish him the best of luck during his tenure as Commander.

H. Res. 679 helps to recognize this extraordinary organization whose members have not only fought to protect our country, but chose to continue to serve long after their military service has ended.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentledady from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE).

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the goals and ideals of American Legion Day.

Tomorrow, September 16, marks the 90th anniversary of the American Legion's charter. The American Legion was founded to serve the needs of America's veterans and to promote and protect the rights of those veterans. Ninety years later, the American Le-

gion remains committed to its mission to instill "a sense of individual obligation to the community, State and Nation."

The Legion's nearly 3 million members have given generously of their time in each and every one of our communities. Be it volunteering in veterans hospitals, awarding millions of dollars in college scholarships, or sponsoring activities like Boys and Girls State, Legionnaires continue to devote themselves to the ideal of "mutual helpfulness."

I am so proud to have the highest number of veterans of any Member of Congress. And as I travel throughout Florida's Fifth Congressional District, I get to see firsthand how the American Legion and the American Legion Auxiliary and their members affect the lives of veterans and their local communities.

Today, I am especially pleased that for the first time a Florida veteran has been elected National Commander of the American Legion. I am proud to congratulate Commander Clarence Hill on his achievement and wish him the very best as he leads the American Legion into what I'm positive will be another wonderful 90 years.

I would also like to thank Representative HALVORSON for introducing this resolution. And I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting the American Legion and recognizing September 16 of each year as American Legion Day.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I would like to thank Representative HALVORSON for introducing this bill, as well as the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA), the ranking member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for helping us bring this measure to the floor. And I also want to thank the staff and all the people that have worked to make this a reality.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to support H. Res. 679, a resolution supporting the goals and ideals of American Legion Day.

The American Legion is our nation's largest and oldest veterans' organization, and has been a steadfast supporter of our Armed Forces and veterans since Congress issued the venerable organization a federal charter on September 16, 1919.

The American Legion has always proven itself to be a tremendous national asset that stands by our troops and veterans. The stalwart patriotism, leadership, and faith in our great country of its 2.7 million members are most commendable.

Having grown up in a Legion family, I know firsthand the commendable programs and services The American Legion provides to veterans and communities. My mother is a former Auxiliary President for the Department of Indiana, so I am especially appreciative of the dedication and devotion of the members of The American Legion and its Auxiliary. They have raised millions of dollars for the Amer-

ican Legion Legacy Scholarship Fund to help fund the education of children who have lost a parent in our nation's service.

Another program, Heroes to Hometowns, works as part of the government's seamless transition effort to coordinate with the communities to ensure returning heroes and their families have the resources needed for a successful transition. The American Legion family also has over 6,000 volunteers that provide countless hours of services each year to their fellow veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I offer my full and heartfelt support for this resolution to support the goals and ideals of American Legion Day and to call upon the people of the United States to observe American Legion Day with appropriate programs and activities.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 679.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING THE KANSAS CITY ANIMAL HEALTH CORRIDOR

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 317) recognizing the region from Manhattan, Kansas, to Columbia, Missouri, as the Kansas City Animal Health Corridor, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 317

Whereas 34 percent of the \$16,800,000,000 annual global animal health industry is based in the Kansas City region;

Whereas more than 120 companies involved in the animal health industry are located in Kansas and Missouri, including 4 of the 10 largest global animal health companies and 1 of the 5 largest animal nutrition companies;

Whereas several leading veterinary colleges and animal research centers are located in Kansas and Missouri, including the College of Veterinary Medicine and the \$54,000,000 Biosecurity Research Institute of Kansas State University and the College of Veterinary Medicine, the College of Agriculture, Food and Natural Resources' Division of Animal Sciences, the \$60,000,000 Life Sciences Center, the National Swine Resource and Research Center, and the Research Animal Diagnostic Laboratory of the University of Missouri;

Whereas Kansas City, Missouri, is centrally located in the United States and is close to many of the food animal end customers;

Whereas the Department of Homeland Security selected Manhattan, Kansas, as the future location for the National Bio and Agro-defense Facility (NBAF);

Whereas the \$750,000,000 NBAF project will provide area economic development opportunities by employing 300 people, with an annual payroll of up to \$30,000,000 and over 1,500 construction jobs;

Whereas NBAF enhances Kansas' leadership role in the Nation as the animal health research and biosciences center for the United States;

Whereas more than 45 percent of the fed cattle in the United States, 40 percent of the hogs produced, and 20 percent of the beef cows and calves are located within 350 miles of Kansas City;

Whereas there are nationally recognized publishers in the animal health industry located in Kansas and Missouri;

Whereas Kansas and Missouri have historic roots in the livestock industry, including the cattle drives in the 1860s from Texas to the westward railhead in Sedalia, Missouri;

Whereas Kansas and Missouri are home to many prominent national and international associations within the animal health industry; and

Whereas retaining and growing existing animal health companies, attracting new animal health companies, increasing animal health research capacity, and developing commercialization infrastructure will create quality jobs and wealth for Kansas and Missouri: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the region from Manhattan, Kansas, to Columbia, Missouri, including the metropolitan Kansas City area and St. Joseph, Missouri, as the "Kansas City Animal Health Corridor";

(2) recognizes the Kansas City Animal Health Corridor as the national center of the animal health industry based on the unmatched concentration of animal health and nutrition businesses and educational and research assets; and

(3) expresses its commitment to establishing a favorable business environment and supporting animal health research to foster the continued growth of the animal health industry for the benefit of the economy, universities, businesses, and young people hoping to pursue an animal health career in the Kansas City Animal Health Corridor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOLDEN) and the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on this resolution.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 317. This resolution recognizes the contribution that the Kansas City Animal Health Corridor makes to our Nation's livestock industry. Regional efforts like this encourage businesses to innovate and use best practices developed by the bioscience industry.

Livestock is an important value-added industry that brings in millions of dollars of revenue nationwide. Ensuring that producers have access to cutting-edge products and information to improve animal health is essential to the continuing success of the live-

stock industry. Our entire Nation benefits from having the most competitive livestock industry worldwide.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Res. 317 to recognize the Corridor's outstanding contribution to animal health.

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

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOLDEN) for his comments, and for the leadership of our Committee on Agriculture, Mr. PETERSON and Mr. LUCAS, for their support of this resolution, H. Res. 317.

We consider this resolution today, which recognizes the region between Manhattan, Kansas, and Columbia, Missouri, a great opportunity for two States that are often rivals, to come together in recognition of the Kansas City Animal Health Corridor.

This area of Kansas and Missouri has long been considered our country's headquarters for animal and bioscience. The largest concentration of animal health and nutrition interests in the Nation is located in this corridor, including more than 120 companies that account for nearly \$17 billion in global sales. This amounts to over one-third of the total sales in the animal health industry.

Part of what makes this region unique is its location in one of the largest livestock-producing regions in the country. My own congressional district is the largest livestock-producing district in the Nation. The Kansas City Animal Health Corridor is a benefit to livestock producers in our region and to the country, and to the employment and investments these producers contribute to the local economy.

Biosciences are a tremendous opportunity for our State and its citizens. As the national economy has struggled, the animal health industry continues to expand and experience growth. The businesses, universities, and other interests located in the Kansas City Animal Health Corridor provide an opportunity for our best and brightest young people to stay and work in Kansas and Missouri, the Midwest.

Earlier this year, the Department of Homeland Security named this world-renowned area for animal health research as the home of the National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility, NBAF. This Federal laboratory is urgently needed to develop the vaccines and countermeasures against the threat of foreign animal disease, protecting our food supply and our economy. The Kansas City Animal Health Corridor will provide the workforce expertise and the collaboration opportunities to make NBAF a great success.

I appreciate the House of Representatives recognizing the important role of this region to furthering animal health and nutrition across the Nation and the globe. By supporting this resolution, we are helping to foster support

for crucial research and business development in the animal health and science area.

I urge my colleagues and Members to support this resolution.

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

□ 1345

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I recognize for 5 minutes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK).

Mr. STUPAK. I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 317 designates the region from Manhattan, Kansas, to Columbia, Missouri, as the Kansas City Animal Health Corridor. Manhattan, Kansas, is slated to become the new home of the foot-and-mouth research in the United States as part of the National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility, NBAF as it's called. This is where my problem is with this resolution.

Foot-and-mouth disease is a highly contagious animal disease, infecting nearly 100 percent of the animals exposed to the virus. There have been two outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease in the United Kingdom this decade. The first resulted in the slaughter of more than 6 million animals, and it cost that country more than \$16 billion. The second outbreak is suspected to have come from an accidental release from a government lab. It is estimated that a foot-and-mouth disease outbreak in the United States could cost as much as \$40 billion, and it would devastate the U.S. livestock market.

For more than 50 years, research on foot-and-mouth disease in the United States has been done off Plum Island, which is off the coast of New York's Long Island. The natural water barrier protects our animal population from an accidental or intentional release of the disease from the island research facility.

House Resolution 317 states: "More than 45 percent of the fed cattle—40 percent of the hogs and 20 percent of beef cows and calves produced in the United States—are located within 350 miles of Kansas City."

I am baffled as to why we would want to move the foot-and-mouth disease research into the heart of Kansas given these staggering statistics. An accidental or an intentional release of foot-and-mouth disease in this enormous beef and pork population would bring our livestock industry to its knees.

As chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee's Oversight and Investigation Subcommittee, I held a hearing in the last Congress on the Bush administration's ill-conceived plan to move foot-and-mouth research off of Plum Island and onto the mainland of the United States.

In response to my subcommittee's hearing, Congress required the Department of Homeland Security to conduct a study to determine if foot-and-mouth disease can be done safely on the mainland. DHS's study was then to be evaluated by the Government Accountability Office, GAO. DHS rushed

through a study; and in July, GAO released their analysis of the DHS study. The GAO report found numerous flaws in the study, including that DHS did not use foot-and-mouth disease virus-specific modeling to study the impact of a release into a community. Instead, they used a modeling system for radiation.

DHS's study was based on unrepresentative accident scenarios, outdated dispersion modeling techniques and inadequate meteorological data. The economic analysis did not incorporate market response to the foot-and-mouth disease outbreak, which would have been related to the number of livestock in the site's vicinity. DHS did not effectively characterize the differences in risk between mainland and island sites. DHS did not effectively integrate the components of its risk assessment.

As you can see, the Government Accountability Office has significant concerns about this flawed DHS study. The GAO concluded that DHS did not meet the standards set forth by Congress to prove that foot-and-mouth disease research can be done safely on the mainland. As a result, we've called for an independent third-party study to be conducted. This study would correct the problems outlined in the GAO study.

Mr. Speaker, I have no problem with the gentleman from Kansas and with my friend from Pennsylvania in recognizing the area set forth in House Resolution 317 as the animal health corridor, but I really do have problems with moving foot-and-mouth disease research into the center of livestock production in the United States without any proof that it can be done safely. If the Department of Homeland Security is going to pursue this dangerous tempting of fate, I think the American people should have an accurate assessment of what economic devastation could befall us should there be a release of foot-and-mouth disease from this new facility in Manhattan, Kansas.

Again, I understand where the gentleman is going, and I understand what he is trying to do to promote his State and to promote his area, but let's not rush to judgment here, especially when there are so many unanswered questions about whether this research can be done safely.

If they want to recognize H. Res. 317 as the animal health corridor, I have no problem; but I'd ask that they strike the NBAF language, and then I would be able to support the legislation. As it stands right now, the way the legislation is written, I reluctantly would oppose it.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS).

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 317, recognizing the region from Manhattan, Kansas, to Columbia, Missouri, as the Kansas City Animal Health Corridor.

From the days of cattle drives more than 150 years ago to the DHS selection of Manhattan, Kansas, as the location for the new National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility, Kansas and Missouri have long been leaders in the animal health and livestock industries.

More than 120 animal health companies are located in Kansas and Missouri. The work these companies do enables ranchers to raise the safest and highest quality animals in the world. Not only are the majority of health companies located here, but there are leading veterinary colleges and state-of-the-art research centers, like the Biosecurity Research Institute at K-State, in the region.

At a time when businesses are struggling to make a profit and at a time when our Nation is facing record unemployment, the animal health industry continues to grow. Fourteen animal health companies or organizations have expanded in this region since 2006. The new NBAF will provide hundreds of billions of dollars in economic development opportunities for Kansas. It will create hundreds of full-time jobs and 1,500 construction jobs. That is the kind of economic stimulus our State needs. This resolution recognizes this region as a leader in animal health, and it supports the continued growth for the animal health industry.

Again, I thank my colleagues for their support of this legislation, and I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the dean of the House.

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

Mr. DINGELL. I thank my dear friend from Pennsylvania for making available to me this time.

I would tell my colleagues this is a dangerous bill, and I would urge them to be careful about what you say about it because, if ever the location of this facility in Kansas causes an outbreak of animal disease or human disease, your remarks today will make great quotes by your opponents against you in the following election.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation recognizing the region from Manhattan, Kansas, to Columbia, Missouri, as the Kansas City Animal Health Corridor. It's a nice idea, but none of the work that has to be done under the National Environmental Policy Act or under other proper laws relating to the location of facilities of this kind has been fully and adequately and properly done. So what we're doing is just getting ready to locate what, essentially, could be a fine time bomb in the area to which we refer in the legislation—certainly, a foolish action.

The location of the current facility was picked because of its location off the shore of New York. It's on an island and it's isolated. Indeed, although in 1978 livestock on the island were infected after an accidental release of

animal virus, the virus did not and could not reach the mainland. That is a warning to all here present.

In 2006, the Department of Homeland Security, I must assume in its usual slovenly fashion, proposed to move the animal disease facility to the mainland. Within hearings in the oversight committee, chaired by Mr. STUPAK, in the Energy and Commerce Committee, we learned from the committee that not only did DHS not adequately study the dangers of transferring foot-and-mouth disease onto the mainland but also that an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease would wreak havoc on the livestock industry, potentially costing \$40 billion in economic damage.

An outbreak of this disease in Britain caused \$16 billion in damage, spurring an economic panic that almost shut down the government. Given the hundreds of billions of dollars at which our livestock industry is valued, an outbreak of FMD in the United States would be vastly more destructive.

DHS has since selected Manhattan, Kansas, as the new location for the facility for the National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility. The legislation, H. Res. 317, states that more than 45 percent of the fed cattle in the United States—40 percent of the hogs produced and 20 percent of the beef cows and calves—are located in the Kansas City region.

If you want a good warning as to why this legislation should not be adopted, that is it right there, because right in the middle of the greatest production of these kinds of animals, we are placing a facility that is going to handle—guess what—all manner of animal diseases, especially foot-and-mouth disease.

There is careful, thoughtful work that needs to be done to ensure that the industry is safe and that our people are safe and that they can understand that their government has done the proper work that it has to do to ensure the safety of the facility and the proper design of the facility.

Serious questions remain as to why the government needs to build the new NBAF in the first place; but, significantly, the fact that DHS continues to shirk its responsibilities to understand the risk of transferring the FMD to the mainland means that Congress must be very wary of sanctioning this new proposal regardless of the opportunities of the economic character that it might bring.

I would just warn my colleagues—and I say this with affection for my good friend who is the author of the legislation—that this is an unwise step to take at this particular time. I would urge my colleagues to ask themselves, if they don't ask anything else: Where are we going to bury all of the animals that are going to get FMD that are going to have to be exterminated because we have made an unwise choice in this matter?

I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing the resolution.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I now recognize the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE) for 4 minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, Kansas City has come a long way from the stockyards and animal shipping that put it on the map. Now it's also the hub of America's animal health industry.

The Kansas City stockyards opened in the late 1800s, and quickly became one of the busiest animal ports in the country. The Kansas City Livestock Exchange was built in 1910 and became the largest building in the world dedicated solely to livestock. The tradition continues today as 45 percent of the country's feedlot-raised cattle and 40 percent of its hogs are found within a 350-mile radius of Kansas City.

Over the years, the stockyards have attracted businesses specialized in animal food and medicine. Today, more than 125 companies involved in the animal health industry are located in the Kansas City metro region, including four of the 10 largest global animal health companies and one of the top five largest animal nutrition companies.

Both Kansas State University and the University of Missouri are leading institutions in animal research. The University of Missouri is home to the prestigious National Swine Resource and Research Center and the Research Animal Diagnostic Laboratory. Kansas State is home to the Biosecurity Research Institute, the only facility of its kind in the world, which researches biosecurity hazards to our food supply and the containment of animal illness.

Just this year, the Department of Homeland Security has also selected Kansas State as the future home of the National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility, a \$750 million government investment, adding another component to Kansas' animal health resume. Most impressively, 34 percent of the \$16.8 billion generated each year by the global animal health industry is based in the Kansas City region.

For these reasons, I would ask that people join me in acknowledging the Kansas City metro region—from Manhattan, Kansas, to Columbia, Missouri—as the Kansas City Animal Health Corridor. Kansas City is still a cow town, and we are proud to be the high-tech cow town of the 21st century. I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 317.

□ 1400

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I point out to Members and my colleagues that the resolution before us simply is a resolution on suspension recognizing an area, a part in Kansas, part in Missouri, related to animal science.

The whereas clauses do mention that a facility has been approved for a site

in Manhattan, Kansas, by the Department of Homeland Security, but this legislation before us today does nothing to say that's necessarily a good idea or bad idea.

From my perspective, it is clearly a good idea. As I said earlier, I represent a congressional district in which livestock feeding, livestock raising and livestock producing is the way of life. Perhaps our most important component of our agricultural economy is feeding cattle or raising the feed to feed cattle. Even a rumor of animal disease or food safety causes the price to plummet for what we raise in Kansas.

It is important for us as an industry, and important for us as a State, but important for us as a Nation to develop a facility, a top-notch, latest technology, most scientifically advanced research facility, to make certain that nothing happens to damage the safety of our food supply.

What is happening on Plum Island is insufficient. It is not being rebuilt, it is not being expanded, and technology is not being improved. What we are talking about ultimately, although not in this resolution, what we are talking about is a decision by the Department of Homeland Security, both the Department from the Bush administration and the Department from the Obama administration, reaching a unanimous decision that a new facility to be built in the United States, competitively advanced, narrowed down to five States, a site ultimately chosen, unanimously chosen, and the message has been that the facility must be built, advances must be made, and science must advance the cause of animal safety. And the failure to do this, failure to move forward means that the risk we run is much greater than the risk if we fail to take this action.

So today while we are here, in a sense, in a bit more ceremonial setting in which we are recognizing a set of businesses, industries and producers in a certain region of this country and naming it an animal health corridor, not here necessarily to debate the merits of NBAF, in my opinion, the location that has been chosen is the right one. Where else in the country would you expect us to care more than in the middle of cattle country to make certain that we do it right? And what university would I respect more with their ability to resolve these issues in favor of a safe food supply and protecting the cattle producers of this country than Kansas State University, the companion to the site being selected in Manhattan, Kansas.

So while we are here today on perhaps a different mission, I am happy to have the discussion about the merits of what the Department of Homeland Security decided in the last administration and what the Secretary of Homeland Security in this administration says is a firm commitment that this administration is standing strongly behind.

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

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUMMINGS). The gentleman from Kansas has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT).

Mr. TIAHRT. I thank the gentleman from Kansas for yielding and thank him for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I am a little puzzled why this discussion has come up this afternoon. This has been a long selection process to get NBAF to where it is located today.

Many facilities were researched. They looked at it. They decided the best place in all of America, based on past history, based on facility, based on geography, based on the plan and place was to select Manhattan, Kansas.

Now, we have the same similar lab research going on around America today and also in Canada. In fact, there are facilities at Fort Detrick, Maryland, very close here to Washington, D.C. It's considered safe even though the research there is somewhat as dangerous, if not more dangerous, to humans than what we are discussing today.

We also have CDC laboratories in Atlanta, Georgia, and in other high-population areas, places in Texas have similar research going on. But in Winnipeg, Canada, they have the very same research going on 70 miles from the United States border and in the cattle country of Canada, and yet there are no concerns.

Now, the NBAF facility is going to be the same, whether you locate it in Kansas or Georgia or Texas or whether somebody else here would like to have it in their home district. We are going to have plans in place to make sure that this is a well-protected facility, a level 4 security, BSL 4, as it is referred to. It is going to be safe, it's going to be effective, and it's going to provide the continuation of a low-cost, stable food supply that is marketable worldwide because of the safety research.

So for us to put a red herring out there that this is not a safe facility or that there are some concerns, you know, this has been studied by DHS. They do have a preliminary plan in place, God forbid something should ever happen, but they are satisfied that this level 4 facility is going to meet the requirements.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. TIAHRT. One point I would like to make is that in Kansas State we have been doing similar research for quite some time in the past decade, completely safe in a level 4 facility. We can start the beginning of this research today. The only thing that's really

holding this up is this lack of funding, and there is something critical going on in the funding scheme. The Federal Government has promised to come up with 36 million. It's going to be matched by the State of Kansas.

But if we delay the construction, we delay the protections that would be put in place. And it's very shortsighted for us to question, after the fact, all the research, all the decisions, the fairness in the process and the decision that was made.

It was a good decision. It's the right location. We are going to move forward with this to protect our food supply and protect the people of America and make marketable agricultural products worldwide.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague from Kansas in urging adoption of the resolution.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 317, a bill to recognize the Kansas City Animal Health Corridor.

In 1871, the first stockyard was opened in Kansas City and soon grew into one of the nation's premier livestock facilities. Kansas City's tradition of being a national leader in the agriculture sector continues today with the Kansas City Animal Health Corridor, an area stretching from Manhattan, Kansas through Missouri's Fifth District to Columbia, Missouri.

This region is home to more than 120 companies, including many of the nation's leading and largest animal health businesses. Sales of animal health products from companies located in the Kansas City Animal Health Corridor account for nearly a third of the global \$16.8 billion dollar animal health and nutrition industry.

Activities in the Animal Health Corridor are not limited to the commercial aspects of animal health. Four of our nation's top veterinarian schools are located within 350 miles of the Animal Health Corridor. In addition to these premier veterinarian programs, other schools in the Corridor offer programs focused on animal health training and specialized degrees such as a Masters in Business Administration in Animal Health. Animal health research is greatly advanced in the Corridor by the Kansas City Area Life Sciences Institute which offers grants of up to \$50,000 for researchers to study diseases that have the ability to infect both humans and animals.

The businesses, schools, and organizations in and around the Kansas City Animal Health Corridor are the national, if not global, leaders in the animal health research and production sectors and I am proud to have these institutions in my district and to support the Kansas City Animal Health Corridor. Mr. Speaker, please join me in recognizing the area of Manhattan, Kansas to Columbia, Missouri as the Kansas City Animal Health Corridor.

Mr. HOLDEN. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOLDEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 317.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

RECOGNIZING FOREST SERVICE EXPERIMENTAL FORESTS

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 95) recognizing the importance of the Department of Agriculture Forest Service Experimental Forests and Ranges.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 95

Whereas the general provisions of the Act of June 4, 1897 (commonly known as the Organic Administration Act of 1897; 16 U.S.C. 551) and section 4 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Research Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 1643) authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to designate experimental forests and ranges;

Whereas, in 2008, the Department of Agriculture celebrated the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the first experimental forest at Fort Valley, Arizona, which eventually led to the creation of 77 additional experimental forests and ranges within the National Forest System;

Whereas the network of experimental forests and ranges provides places for long-term science and management studies in major vegetation types of the 195 million acres of public land administered by the Forest Service;

Whereas research at these experimental forests and ranges has provided critical information to the public, such as recognition of acid rain based on long-term precipitation chemistry data at Hubbard Brook, New Hampshire, characterization of old-growth Douglas-fir forests and ecology of the northern spotted owl, which set the stage for conservation planning in the Pacific Northwest, improved understanding of the science of forest hydrology, which was derived from long-term studies in experimental forests, especially Coweeta, and the forest and rangeland management systems built from foundation studies at many experimental properties; and

Whereas experimental forests and ranges provide opportunities to study the resources of the United States, including knowledge of forest and stream ecosystems, long-term records of climate, forest dynamics, hydrology, and other ecosystem components, information about long-term field experiments and opportunities to participate in them, access to a cadre of knowledgeable scientists, and access to thousands of publications about natural resource management and ecosystem science: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress recognizes the important contributions that the 77 experimental forests and ranges within the National Forest System have made in understanding and conserving the environment and ensuring that natural resources in the United States remain a source of pride and enjoyment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOLDEN) and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on this resolution.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H. Con. Res. 95 recognizes the 100th anniversary of the first experimental forest established by the United States Department of Agriculture in Fort Valley, Arizona, and recognizes the importance of these living laboratories.

Today there are 77 experimental forests and ranges within the National Forest System. Experimental forests and ranges are valuable and dynamic resources that serve as long-term research sites.

As part of the U.S. Forest Services' research and development efforts, these experimental forests and ranges provide valuable data about various climates, forest types, vegetation, soils, ecosystems, glaciers and watersheds and other essential components of our Nation's vast natural terrain.

I want to congratulate the United States Forest Service for their outstanding work to establish and maintain this nationwide network of experimental forests and ranges over the past 100 years and encourage my colleagues to support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the resolution offered by the gentleman from Mississippi. This resolution recognizes the 100th anniversary of the first experimental forest, which was created in 1908, at Fort Valley, Arizona. Today, there are 78 of these forests in 30 States contributing valuable research and knowledge to help us better manage one of our most precious natural resources, our 750 million acres of forests across America.

Experimental forests allow the Forest Service to engage in important research on the threats that our forests face such as invasive species and diseases. These forests allow for Federal research to be conducted on plant and wildlife communities in controlled settings. We know about how best to ensure the health of our forests, rangelands and watersheds, and share their knowledge with States, localities and private landowners.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. CHILDERS).

Mr. CHILDERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to recognize the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the first experimental forest at Fort Valley, Arizona, by the Department of Agriculture Forest Service. Experimental forests and ranges provide places for long-term science and management studies in many of the major vegetation types across the country.

Fort Valley, the first experimental forest research station, established in 1908, as was mentioned earlier, was used to study how the ponderosa pine regenerates as the entire forest was being decimated through extensive logging, yet was not regrowing. Recommendations derived from research at Fort Valley were the basis of many U.S. Forest Service management practices that now allow us to responsibly log our forests so that they continue to produce.

The 80 experimental forests and ranges in existence today play an integral role in our Nation's ability to maintain healthy forests and establish responsible forestry practices. Thirty-five States have one or more experimental forests, including three in my home State of Mississippi.

Experimental forests and ranges provide samples of many ecological and environmental conditions across the United States. They support many forms of multisite research, monitoring and data sharing that address questions at regional and national scales.

As a tree farmer, I understand the vital role that experimental forests and ranges play in keeping myself and other tree farmers at the forefront of forestry research. As we continue to face challenges such as new diseases and invasive species in the forestry industry, experimental forests and ranges will be the key to finding solutions to these challenges and ensuring America's tree farmers continue to be competitive and profitable.

So I ask my colleagues, Members on both sides of the aisle today, to join me in recognizing the 100th anniversary of the establishment of experimental forests and support the passage of this resolution.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I join the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. LUCAS from Oklahoma, in urging adoption of this resolution and yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOLDEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 95.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1415

TERMINATING CERTAIN EASEMENTS IN CASEYVILLE, ILLINOIS

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 511) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to terminate certain easements held by the Secretary on land owned by the Village of Caseyville, Illinois, and to terminate associated contractual arrangements with the Village.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 511

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

SECTION 1. TERMINATION OF NRCS EASEMENTS AND ASSOCIATED CONTRACTUAL ARRANGEMENTS, VILLAGE OF CASEYVILLE, ILLINOIS.

(a) **TERMINATION AUTHORIZED.**—The Secretary of Agriculture may terminate any easement held by the Secretary on land owned by the Village of Caseyville, Illinois, and terminate associated contractual arrangements with the Village.

(b) **CONSIDERATION.**—As consideration for the termination of an easement and associated contractual arrangements under subsection (a), the Village of Caseyville, Illinois, shall enter into such compensatory arrangements with the Secretary as determined to be appropriate by the Secretary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOLDEN) and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on this bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

H.R. 511 would provide a limited authorization regarding the administration of a flood plain easement in the village of Caseyville, Illinois. The village of Caseyville and the United States Department of Agriculture executed a warranty easement deed in 1999 under the Emergency Watershed Protection Program. However, differences in approach on how to best protect and restore the flood plain led Caseyville to seek termination of the easement, including paying back the entire easement purchase price of \$60,000 to the United States Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 511 would allow the National Resource Conservation Service the flexibility to release the terms of the easement so that the village can use the land for flood prevention. This bill passed the House Agriculture Committee by voice vote earlier this year, and I encourage my colleagues to support it today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 511. This bill will allow the Secretary of Agriculture to terminate certain flood easements in the village of Caseyville, Illinois, in return for compensation. Termination of easements is essential for flood protection projects in Caseyville. This bill has passed the House Agriculture Committee with no opposition. I ask my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 511, a bill I introduced to correct a problem in Caseyville, Illinois, which is part of the congressional district I represent. I appreciate the efforts of Chairman PETERSON and Ranking Member LUCAS to bring this bill to the floor today.

H.R. 511 simply gives the USDA the authority to terminate an easement it entered into with the Village of Caseyville on September 20, 1999, due to a disagreement over how the land could be used. The Village received \$60,000 and the easement covered 44 acres.

The Village believed that the Warranty Easement Deed under the "Emergency Watershed Protection Program" allowed the 44 acres to continue to be used for flood control. However, the National Resource Conservation Service began referring to the easement as a "Wetlands Reserve Program" property—that program is not concerned with flooding, but rather protecting and restoring wetlands.

The differences in approach led the Village to seek a termination of the easement, including paying back all of the \$60,000 to the Department of Agriculture. After a great deal of discussion, the Department of Agriculture stated that it did not have the authority to terminate the easement, and suggested this legislative approach.

I again, thank the Committee for its attention to this matter and urge my colleagues to support the bill.

I have no further speakers and will yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman from Oklahoma in encouraging our colleagues to pass this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOLDEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 511.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MIAMI-DADE COUNTY LAND CONVEYANCE

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3175) to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to Miami-Dade County certain federally owned land in Florida, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3175

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

SECTION 1. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act:

(1) COUNTY.—The term “County” means Miami-Dade County in the State of Florida.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(3) PROPERTY.—The term “Property” means approximately 2.0 acres, more or less, of the federally owned land comprising the Subtropical Horticulture Research Station in Miami-Dade County, Florida, as described in section 2(b).

SEC. 2. LAND CONVEYANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Upon receipt of the consideration and cost reimbursement provided herein, the Secretary shall convey and quitclaim to the County, all right, title, and interest of the United States in the Property, subject to easements and rights-of-way of record and such other terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe.

(b) PROPERTY DELINEATION.—Of the federally owned land comprising the Subtropical Horticulture Research Station, the Secretary and the authorized representative of the County shall mutually delineate 2.0 acres, more or less, fronting on SW 67th Avenue for conveyance as the Property.

(c) CONSIDERATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As consideration for the conveyance of the Property, the County shall pay to the Secretary an amount in cash equal to the market value of the property.

(2) DETERMINATION OF VALUE.—To determine the market value of the property, the Secretary shall have the Property appraised in conformity with the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions. The approved appraisal shall at all times be the property of the United States.

(d) SURVEY.—The County shall, at its cost, survey the exterior boundaries of the Subtropical Horticulture Research Station and the Property to Federal survey standards to the satisfaction of the Secretary, and shall provide to the Secretary certified originals with signature and raised seal.

(e) RELEASE.—The County, by a recordable instrument satisfactory to the Secretary, shall release the United States Department of Agriculture from that instrument dated September 8, 2006, titled “Unity of Title”.

(f) TIME OF CONVEYANCE.—The Secretary shall convey the Property to the County not later than 120 days after the date on which the County deposits the consideration with the Department of Agriculture.

(g) CORRECTIONS.—With the agreement of the County, the Secretary may make minor corrections or modifications to the legal description of the Property.

SEC. 3. COSTS.

(a) TRANSACTION COSTS.—At closing for the conveyance of the Property under this Act, the County shall pay or reimburse the Secretary, as appropriate, for the reasonable transaction and administrative personnel costs associated with the conveyance authorized by this Act, including the transaction costs of appraisal, title, hazardous substances examination, and closing costs.

(b) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—In addition to transaction costs under subsection (a), the County shall pay administrative costs in the liquidated amount of \$50,000.

(c) ATTORNEYS’ FEES.—The County and the Secretary shall each bear their own attorneys’ costs.

SEC. 4. RECEIPTS.

The Secretary shall deposit the consideration and receipts for costs into the Treasury of the United States to be credited to the appropriation for the Agricultural Research Service, and such sum shall be available to the Secretary until expended, without further appropriation, for the operation, upkeep, and maintenance of the Subtropical Horticulture Research Station.

SEC. 5. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS.

(a) SECURITY FENCING.—On or before closing for the conveyance of the Property under this Act, the County shall, at its cost, contract for the construction of a security fence located on the boundary between the Property and the adjacent land administered by the Secretary. The fence shall be of materials and standards approved in advance by the Secretary. The Secretary may approve temporary security structures for use during construction phases.

(b) OTHER TERMS.—The Secretary and the County may otherwise effect the purpose of this Act on such additional terms as are mutually acceptable and which are not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOLDEN) and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on this bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

H.R. 3175 was introduced by Congressman LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida to facilitate the sale of 2 acres of land at the USDA Agricultural Research Service’s Subtropical Horticulture Research Station in Miami-Dade County, Florida. The land would be sold at market value to the county for the purpose of building a fire station in the village of Palmetto Bay, a community of 25,000 people. This area currently faces below-average firefighting response times when compared to other municipalities in the region.

This ARS station was established in 1898 as a plant introduction garden on 6 acres, and it has grown to about 200 acres today. The ARS station has worked with the county and the village to identify land that could be used for the fire station, and I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Today I rise in support of H.R. 3175. This bill will allow the Ag Research Service (ARS) to sell 2 acres of land in southeast Florida to the local government of Miami-Dade County, Florida, for the purpose of constructing a new fire station. Current response times for firefighters in the village of Palmetto Bay and South Coral Gables have fallen below the district-wide average, and there is a safety concern for local residents and neighborhoods. ARS has no current use for the land and supports the sale of the fire station, as does local government and local residents. Miami-Dade County will pay market

price for the land along with all associated costs.

The Congressional Budget Office has scored H.R. 3175 at no cost to the Federal Government. This bill passed the Agriculture Committee with no opposition, and I ask my colleagues to support this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 4 minutes to Congressman LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I thank my dear friend, Ranking Member LUCAS, for the time as well as Mr. HOLDEN, and they’ve summarized the legislation well. I introduced this bill, H.R. 3175, to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to sell approximately 2 acres to Miami-Dade County so that a fire station can be built. It is an issue of great importance to the community. The southern portion of the district that I’m honored to represent, covering the village of Palmetto Bay and the city of Pinecrest, continues to grow rapidly. Due to the population growth, public services have been stretched, and fire response times, as Mr. LUCAS pointed out, have fallen below the district average.

This morning I met with distinguished leaders from the village of Palmetto Bay. They reiterated to me the urgent need for this fire station in our south Miami-Dade County community. So this problem really deals with the issue that new construction for public services in Miami-Dade is confronting a lack of available land. The USDA station currently occupies, as Mr. HOLDEN pointed out, approximately 200 acres in southeast Florida with plenty of land to spare.

So, Mr. Speaker, the citizens of my community were not asking for a hand-out, as Mr. LUCAS was pointing out. The county is going to pay fair market value for the land, along with all associated fees, and they have committed to completely funding the construction of the fire station. The CBO has scored the bill at no cost to the taxpayer. So again, I would like to thank Chairman PETERSON and Ranking Member LUCAS for their prompt action on the bill. I also wish to thank my dear colleagues from south Florida who have cosponsored the bill, Congresswoman ROS-LEHTINEN, who will shortly address the House, Congresswoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Congressman MARIO DIAZ-BALART, and KENDRICK MEEK. I urge passage of the legislation.

Mr. HOLDEN. I will continue to reserve, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the Congresswoman from Florida, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I thank my colleague from Oklahoma for the time, and I thank my friend and colleague from Florida, LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART, for introducing this important bill and for getting it to the floor today in such

a prompt manner. Our congressional districts share a border, and this piece of land to be conveyed to Miami-Dade County actually sits just about on that very border.

But regardless of congressional districts, the conveyance of this property will be of great benefit to all of the residents in south Florida, particularly for the families living in Pinecrest, Palmetto Bay and Cutler Bay. This land will soon bring them increased safety and important peace of mind. Miami-Dade County expects to build the only fire station that would be equipped to swiftly address emergency situations in these communities. I'm a local resident of this area myself, so I can say that we have all too long needed this fire station.

I commend Congressman DIAZ-BALART as well as the House for swiftly moving this bill to make the lands available for its creation. I must point out that the fire station would be nothing without the brave men and women who will serve there. Our firefighters put their lives on the line for us each and every day, and I know that all of south Florida thanks them for their supreme dedication.

Along with my colleague Congressman LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART, I also had the opportunity of meeting with the leaders of the Palmetto Bay community, and they strongly support this bill that will go a long way to ensuring the safety and well-being of all of our residents. I thank Mr. LUCAS for the time, and I thank Mr. DIAZ-BALART for his leadership.

Mr. HOLDEN. I continue to reserve, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, we have no further speakers. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the bill and yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOLDEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3175.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOUISIANA FOREST LAND CONVEYANCE

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 940) to provide for the conveyance of National Forest System land in the State of Louisiana.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 940

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

SECTION 1. FINDINGS AND DEFINITIONS.

(a) FINDING.—Congress finds it in the public interest to authorize the sale of certain

federally owned land in the Kisatchie National Forest in Louisiana for market value consideration.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this Act:

(1) The term “Collins Camp Properties” means Collins Camp Properties, Incorporated, a corporation existing under the laws of the State of Louisiana.

(2) The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION TO SELL LAND.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Subject to valid existing rights and subsection (b), the Secretary is authorized to sell by quitclaim deed the following lands in the State of Louisiana at public or private sale, including by competitive sale by auction, bid or otherwise:

(1) All federally owned lands within section 9, Township 10 North, Range 5 West, in Winn Parish, Louisiana.

(2) A parcel of land consisting of 2.16 acres situated in the SW¼ of section 4, Township 10 North, Range 5 West, Winn Parish, Louisiana, as more specifically depicted on a certificate of survey dated March 7, 2007, by Glen L. Cannon, P.L.S. 4436.

(b) FIRST RIGHT OF PURCHASE.—Subject to valid existing rights and the provisions of section 4, for a period of one year after the date of enactment of this Act, upon tender of consideration from the Collins Camp Properties, the Secretary shall sell and quitclaim to said corporation all right, title and interest of the United States in—

(1) up to 47.92 acres within section 9, Township 10 North, Range 5 West, in Winn Parish, Louisiana, as generally depicted on a certificate of survey dated February 28, 2007, by Glen L. Cannon, P.L.S. 4436, said land comprising the Collins Campsites; and

(2) the 2.16 acres described in subsection (a)(2).

(c) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may configure the lands to maximize marketability or achieve management objectives, and may prescribe such terms and conditions on the land sales authorized by this Act as the Secretary deems in the public interest.

(d) CONSIDERATION.—Land sales authorized by this Act shall be for cash consideration equal to the market value of the land.

(e) MARKET VALUE.—The market value of the land sold under this Act shall be as determined by an appraisal approved by the Secretary and done in conformity with the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions; or, if sold by means other than that provided in subsection (b), market value may be determined by competitive sale.

(f) HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES.—(1) In any disposal of lands authorized by this Act, the Secretary shall meet disclosure requirements for hazardous substances, but shall otherwise not be required to remediate or abate those substances.

(2) Nothing in this section shall otherwise affect the application of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (“CERCLA”, 42 U.S.C. 9601, and following) to conveyances of lands out of Federal ownership.

SEC. 3. PROCEEDS FROM THE SALE OF LAND.

(a) DEPOSIT OF RECEIPTS.—The consideration received by the Secretary for the sale of land under this Act shall be deposited into the account in the Treasury of the United States established by Public Law 90-171 (commonly known as the Sisk Act; 16 U.S.C. 484a).

(b) USE OF FUNDS.—Monies deposited pursuant to subsection (a) shall be available to the Secretary until expended, without further appropriation, for the acquisition of lands and interests in land in the Kisatchie National Forest in Louisiana.

SEC. 4. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS.

(a) COSTS.—The Secretary shall require the Collins Camp Properties to pay at closing the reasonable costs of appraisal and any administrative and environmental analyses required by law or regulation.

(b) PERMITS.—An offer by Collins Camp Properties shall be accompanied by written statements from holders of Forest Service special use authorizations agreeing to relinquish their authorizations upon a sale to Collins Camp Properties. For any holder not providing such written authorization, the Secretary shall require the Collins Camp Properties to administer such authorization according to its terms until the date of expiration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOLDEN) and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on this bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

H.R. 940 was introduced by Congressman RODNEY ALEXANDER of Louisiana. This bill would authorize the Forest Service to sell certain residential parcels of land in the Kisatchie National Forest, located in Winn Parish, Louisiana. The total land sold would be just over 50 acres, and a local nonprofit group already living in residence on the site would have the right of first refusal to purchase the land at fair market value. H.R. 940 has the bipartisan support of all seven members of the Louisiana congressional delegation as well as the support of the U.S. Forest Service, and I urge its passage.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 940, a bill which gives the Secretary of Agriculture the authority to sell 50 acres of national forest land along the Lower Saline Lake in the State of Louisiana. The bill, drafted with the assistance and support of the Forest Service, gives the first option to purchase this tract to a group of residents who already own cabins on the land.

The sale of 50 acres relieves the Forest Service from the burden of performing maintenance and cleanup of the land and gives the task to private citizens who are ready and willing to assume this responsibility. CBO has scored this bill, and it will not have a cost for the taxpayers. The purchaser of the land will be responsible for all costs and fees associated with the transaction, further ensuring that the taxpayers will not be forced to pay for this legislation. This bill passed out of

the House Agriculture Committee unanimously, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. ALEXANDER) for whatever time he may consume.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Thank you for yielding to me. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the ranking member, the chairman and the members of the committee for passing this important piece of legislation. The entire Louisiana delegation are cosponsors of this. The National Forest Service is in support of it. In fact, they provided the language that is in this bill. As it's been said, CBO has scored it as zero. From the sale of this land, the proceeds will go back to the National Forest Service for money that they have spent over the years, providing maintenance for this 50 acres of land that will be sold to this not-for-profit group.

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, the minority has no further speakers; therefore, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOLDEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 940.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1430

RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE AND SUSTAINABILITY OF THE UNITED STATES HARDWOODS INDUSTRY

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 81) recognizing the importance and sustainability of the United States hardwoods industry and urging that United States hardwoods and the products derived from United States hardwoods be given full consideration in any program directed at constructing environmentally preferable commercial, public, or private buildings.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 81

Whereas hardwood trees grown in the United States are an abundant, sustainable, and legal resource, as documented by annually by the Forest Inventory and Analysis Program of the United States Forest Service;

Whereas, despite development pressure and cropland needs, Department of Agriculture data shows that the inventory of United States hardwood has more than doubled over the past 50 years;

Whereas the Department of Agriculture reports that annual United States hardwood growth exceeds hardwood removals by a significant margin of 1.9 to 1, and net annual growth has exceeded removals continuously since 1952;

Whereas the World Bank ranks the United States in the top 10 percent of all countries for government effectiveness, regulatory quality, and rule of law with respect to hardwood resources;

Whereas United States hardwoods have been awarded the highest conservation crop rating available under the Department of Agriculture Environmental Benefits Index;

Whereas United States hardwoods are net absorbers of carbon and are widely recognized to be critical to reducing the United States carbon footprint;

Whereas United States hardwoods are a valuable raw material which, when utilized properly, provide an incentive for landowners to maintain their land in a forested condition rather than clearing the land for development or other alternative land use;

Whereas United States hardwoods are a renewable resource and bio-based material;

Whereas United States hardwoods are recyclable, and hardwoods used in construction can often be restored and reused in later construction;

Whereas United States hardwoods are grown primarily in those States located along or east of the Mississippi River and in the Pacific Northwest, but, with a presence in every State, the hardwood industry is one of the major sources of economic activity and sustenance in many rural communities;

Whereas United States hardwoods are grown by thousands of small family landowners who may harvest trees only once or twice in a generation; and

Whereas United States hardwoods and the products derived from United States hardwoods are prized throughout the world as a superior and long-lasting building material: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes that United States hardwoods are an abundant, sustainable, and legal resource under the United States rule of law; and

(2) urges that United States hardwoods and products derived from United States hardwoods should be given full consideration in any program directed at constructing environmentally preferable commercial, public, or private buildings.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOLDEN) and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on this resolution.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 81 recognizes the importance of the U.S. hardwoods

industry and recognizes the value of sustainable, abundant hardwoods as an important building material.

In the United States hardwood trees are grown primarily by small-family forest landowners who use long-term sustainable practices to grow and manage their trees.

I encourage my colleagues to support this resolution recognizing the important role of hardwood producers in the United States of America.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution offered by the gentleman from Indiana. The hardwood industry is an important industry for many rural communities across the country, employing more than 500,000 people in all 50 States. The products of this industry are a part of our daily lives. Indeed, we can see the products of their labor in this very Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution calls for any future green building programs to give full consideration to the inclusion of hardwood material. This is a commonsense idea to allow the clean, renewable resources to be included in any program that promotes environmentally friendly construction of public and private buildings.

The hardwood industry is of vital economic importance to hundreds of thousands of families across rural America, and I believe it's important to show these families that we appreciate the work they do and the responsible manner in which they cultivate their natural resources.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ELLSWORTH).

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 81, which recognizes the importance and sustainability of the United States hardwoods industry. I introduced this resolution along with Congressman Geoff Davis of Kentucky and a group of our colleagues from across the country. This bipartisan support demonstrates the national importance of our domestic hardwood lumber industry, and I am pleased this Congress is recognizing the contributions the hardwood industry makes to both our economy and our environment.

Hardwood forest owners are stewards of a valuable national resource, and their efforts to conserve hardwood forests have been a remarkable success. Over the last 50 years, hardwood lumber stocks have more than doubled and hardwoods continue to grow almost twice as fast as they are harvested. The U.S. Forest Service analysis supports the evidence of this strong conservation record: the Forest Service's forest

inventory and analysis program has documented hardwood trees to be an “abundant, sustainable, and legal resource.”

Our hardwood forests are managed by thousands of small landowners and families who take care of this resource. Constituents of mine in southwest Indiana play a role in maintaining our hardwood stocks, and the same is true both throughout Indiana and across this country. Americans should be proud of this strong environmental record, and as Members of Congress, we ought to keep this fact in mind as we look for opportunities to support best practices in stewardship and environmental management.

For example, environmentally preferable construction programs are increasingly important to the building and trade industry; and should Congress direct support for these programs, we should remember domestic hardwoods and their potential to contribute to an environmentally friendly future. I was proud the House passed an amendment I offered to H.R. 2187 earlier this year to preserve sustainable hardwood lumber as a green construction resource for local school districts.

I thank my colleagues for their support of this resolution and of the domestic hardwood lumber industry.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 81, a resolution that recognizes the importance and sustainability of the United States hardwood industry and urges that the United States hardwoods and the products derived from U.S. hardwoods be given full consideration in any program that’s directed at constructing environmentally preferable commercial, public, or private buildings.

As the title of the resolution indicates, we feel it’s important that Congress recognizes the importance and sustainability of U.S. hardwoods and the industry as a whole. This is especially imperative as Congress considers changes to existing or new programs and standards that include green building requirements or guidelines. Green buildings are designed to cut down on energy costs and encourage the use of sustainable or renewable resources to protect our environment. What better renewable resource than American-grown hardwood? Hardwoods meet both of these criteria and must be included in any congressional initiative that encourages or requires the construction of environmentally friendly buildings.

In addition to playing a key role in green building, the hardwood industry is one that has created thousands of jobs in nearly every State and in hundreds of congressional districts. In Kentucky we have over 1,200 hardwood businesses alone, as well as over 100 in Kentucky’s Fourth District. Two that I would point out would be GreenTree Forest Products in Fleming County,

Kentucky, which employs hundreds of local people in the Buffalo Trace counties of central Kentucky and also harvests plants, sustains and renews its fiber hardwood products in that area; and Northland Corporation, a finishing operation that produces very high-quality hardwoods from the State and the region that are exported to the entire world as part of the global economy.

At a time when unemployment has increased to a staggering 11 percent in Kentucky and 9.6 percent nationwide, it’s crucial that we support the many small hardwood industry businesses that keep our communities going, create local jobs, and keep people employed.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ELLSWORTH) for working with me on this bipartisan resolution. I would also like to thank our 51 cosponsors for helping us to get this resolution to the floor, including my fellow Kentuckians, Congressmen Rogers, Whitfield, Chandler, and Guthrie.

H. Res. 81 is an important statement acknowledging the environmental attributes of hardwoods, as well as the importance of this industry for jobs in our communities. I urge support for the resolution.

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. CHILDERS).

Mr. CHILDERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, today I am also proud to be a cosponsor of House Resolution 81 and see this important measure brought to the floor for a vote.

I represent Mississippi’s First Congressional District, a district strong in forestry and timberland. This industry is dominated by small-based, family-owned businesses which will benefit from the passage of this resolution. These small landowner businesses often have fewer than 50 acres, much of which may at one time have been crop or cattle farm. Many landowners have rededicated these lands solely to the production of timber. These timber stands are valuable long-term investments which expand to job opportunities in a myriad of related businesses: sawmills, logging, trucking, insurance, and many others.

Hardwood lumber growers and manufacturers in Mississippi’s First District are valuable members of the communities in which they live and, like many others in Mississippi, have children and grandchildren who hope to stay in these businesses and continue to enjoy all that life offers closer to home. Hardwood timber stands are a critical part of savings and investment for many of my First District families. Without strong markets for lumber, those investments would plummet.

House Resolution 81 will help ensure stronger markets without government intrusion. Instead, we are offering a strong statement from the House that this private enterprise industry is one

which should continue to reap the rewards of decades of good business decisions and stewardship of the land.

The benefits of Mississippi hardwoods are much the same as the benefits enjoyed in nearly every State of the union, from the sheer beauty these forests offer to the hundreds of good jobs tied to them. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting “yes” on this important measure.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. PERRIELLO).

Mr. PERRIELLO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of recognizing the importance of sustaining the United States hardwoods industry.

As an Eagle Scout growing up in the shadow of the Blue Ridge Mountains, I developed a deep respect for our country’s great natural resources. Today we will recognize that our hardwood industry also plays a crucial role in sustaining not just the local economies of our Nation but many of the counties in central and Southside, Virginia. Across the Commonwealth of Virginia, over 180,000 jobs are provided in the forest products industry, a number that must be maintained during these tough economic times.

The impact of hardwood as an industry in Southside, Virginia, includes businesses like Columbia Forest Products, which produces a formaldehyde-free hardwood plywood, and also Swedwood, the first Ikea manufacturing plant in the United States. I am committed to continuing my work to put Southside, Virginia, at the forefront of advanced wood products manufacturing. This includes the Danville Community College’s Center for Advanced Manufacturing in Wood Products Technology and ensuring that forestry is given its due consideration in carbon offsets and efforts for this country’s energy independence. Products from our forestry industry provide innovative ways to continue on the path to energy independence while maintaining American jobs.

I thank Mr. ELLSWORTH and other colleagues and other allies for their support of the hardwood industry.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOLDEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 81.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PISGAH NATIONAL FOREST
BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT ACT
OF 2009

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1002) to adjust the boundaries of Pisgah National Forest in McDowell County, North Carolina.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1002

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Pisgah National Forest Boundary Adjustment Act of 2009”.

SEC. 2. BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT, PISGAH NATIONAL FOREST, NORTH CAROLINA.

(a) **BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.**—The boundaries of Pisgah National Forest in McDowell County, North Carolina, are hereby modified to include a parcel of land consisting of approximately 301 acres, of which approximately 213 acres are owned by the United States and administered by the Forest Service, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Proposed Proclamation Boundary Change, Grandfather Ranger District, Pisgah National Forest” and more particularly delineated and described according to the final boundary adjustment map and boundary description prepared by the Forest Service.

(b) **AVAILABILITY AND CORRECTION.**—The maps referred to in subsection (a) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Regional Forester, Atlanta, Georgia. The Secretary of Agriculture may make minor corrections to the maps.

(c) **LAND ACQUISITION.**—Subject to the appropriation of funds to carry out this subsection and the consent of the owner of the private land included within the boundaries of Pisgah National Forest by subsection (a), the Secretary of Agriculture may acquire the private land.

(d) **MANAGEMENT OF ACQUIRED LAND.**—Any federally owned lands that have been or hereafter may be acquired for National Forest System purposes within the boundaries of Pisgah National Forest, as modified by subsection (a), shall be managed as lands acquired under the Act of March 1, 1911 (commonly known as the Weeks Act), and in accordance with the other laws and regulations pertaining to the National Forest System. Nothing in this subsection shall limit the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to adjust the boundaries of Pisgah National Forest pursuant to sections 10 and 11 of such Act (16 U.S.C. 519, 521).

(e) **RELATION TO LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND ACT.**—For purposes of section 7 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 4601–9), the boundaries of Pisgah National Forest, as modified by subsection (a), shall be considered to be boundaries of Pisgah National Forest as of January 1, 1965.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOLDEN) and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on this bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1002 was introduced by Congressman HEATH SHULER of North Carolina. This bill would authorize the Forest Service to purchase privately held land and modify the boundaries of the Pisgah National Forest in McDowell County, North Carolina. This will improve access to Catawba Falls, a prime recreational and tourist site in the region. The Forest Service has already purchased adjacent land for preservation, and this purchase would allow for parking and trailhead expansion in the falls area. A fiscal year 2010 appropriations request was made for the funds needed to purchase this land, and the money was included in the Interior appropriations bill that passed the House on July 7.

H.R. 1002 has the bipartisan support of the entire North Carolina congressional delegation, as well as the support of the U.S. Forest Service, and I support its passage today.

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

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 1002. This bill expands the boundary of the National Forest in North Carolina. The expanded boundary will make it possible for the Forest Service to purchase a privately owned parcel of land for the purpose of creating a parking area and trail access. As my colleague has noted, the Forest Service supports this bill and funding is included in the fiscal year 2010 Interior appropriations bill to purchase the land. The bill passed out of committee unanimously. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

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

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the author of the legislation from North Carolina, Mr. SHULER.

Mr. SHULER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1002, the Pisgah National Forest Boundary Adjustment Act of 2009. I would like to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their hard work and their support.

This bill would simply extend the current boundary of the Forest Service to include 213 acres of land that is already owned and maintained by the U.S. Forest Service, as well as 88 acres currently owned by a regional non-profit land trust.

□ 1445

This bill has bipartisan support from the entire North Carolina delegation, for which I am very grateful.

This bill will help the Federal Government meet several objectives. First,

it will clarify the boundary that identifies parcels of land that are already owned by the Forest Service. Secondly, it will help to guarantee the conservation of pristine acreage that promotes water quality as well as tourism in the region of western North Carolina. Third, it will help thousands of visitors each year access Catawba Falls, a uniquely beautiful cascade that is already on Forest Service property.

H.R. 1002 explicitly protects the rights of private property owners. This bill will preserve the natural treasures and make sure that the public has adequate access to publicly owned land. In addition to being cosponsored by the entire North Carolina delegation, this bill has received unanimous and bipartisan support in the House Committee on Agriculture.

I am grateful to all of my colleagues for their support, as well as to the staff of the Committee on Agriculture for all of their hard work.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me this time, and I offer my support to my colleague from North Carolina for the bill he has put forward.

I rise today to speak on issues of forestry, and specifically to House Resolution 81 which recognizes the importance and sustainability of the U.S. hardwoods industry.

My rural district in Pennsylvania is comprised of sprawling forest lands and the Allegheny National Forest. For generations, the economic engine of this region has been oil and gas production and the harvesting of some of the finest hardwoods in the country.

American hardwoods are valued here and around the world for their natural beauty, long life, sustainability, and many applications from furniture to flooring to musical instruments.

There are more than 100 privately owned businesses in my district. Most are family owned, whose well-being and the well-being of their employees are dependent upon the American hardwoods. More than a billion dollars in hardwoods and hardwood products are exported from the United States each year. Even with this growing market demand, the supply of hardwood resources has continued to grow as forests, both public and private, are managed for growth and harvest.

In addition to the enormous economic benefits which the timber industry has on our rural economy, timber harvesting in Pennsylvania is an essential part of forest health and management efforts. For example, when decaying timber or wood waste is removed from the forest floor, it creates a much fuller and more vibrant forest in the long run. Forest management helps to create a stronger carbon sink than an unmanaged forest.

In addition, the U.S. Forest Service spends \$2 billion per year, half their

budget, fighting wildfires. I believe that better and increased management will help to reduce the regularity and severity of these all-too-frequent disasters. In short, the timber industry is an important component in forest management and health.

As a cosponsor of the legislation, House Resolution 81, I ask my colleagues to join me in voting "yes" on that piece of legislation and honor an industry which benefits our economy and our forest health.

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, having no additional speakers, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOLDEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1002.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

21ST CENTURY FHA HOUSING ACT OF 2009

Mr. ADLER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3146) to make improvements to the FHA mortgage insurance programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3146

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "21st Century FHA Housing Act of 2009".

SEC. 2. MORTGAGE INSURANCE FOR CONDOMINIUMS.

Section 203 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1709) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(y) INAPPLICABILITY OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROVISIONS.—In insuring, under this section, any mortgage described in section 201(a)(C), the Secretary shall not be subject to the conditions of, or review under, the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 or any other provision of law that furthers the purposes of such Act."

SEC. 3. ENERGY EFFICIENT MORTGAGES.

Section 106(a)(2)(C) of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 12712 note) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by inserting "(i)" after "(A)" each place such term appears; and

(2) in clause (ii), by striking "203(b)(2)(B)" and inserting "203(b)(2)(A)(ii)".

SEC. 4. MODERNIZATION OF WORKFORCE AND RESOURCES.

Section 202 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1708) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsections:

"(g) PERSONNEL.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 502(a) of the Housing Act of 1948 (12 U.S.C. 1701c(a)), the Secretary may appoint and fix

the compensation of such officers and employees of the Department as the Secretary considers necessary to carry out the functions of the Secretary under this Act and any other functions of the Federal Housing Administration. Such officers and employees may be paid without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

"(2) COMPARABILITY OF COMPENSATION WITH FEDERAL FINANCIAL REGULATORY AGENCIES.—In fixing and directing compensation under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall consult with, and maintain comparability with compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

"(3) PERSONNEL OF OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES.—In carrying out the functions referred to in paragraph (1), the Secretary may use information, services, staff, and facilities of any executive agency, independent agency, or department on a reimbursable basis, with the consent of such agency or department.

"(4) OUTSIDE EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.—The Secretary may procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, to assist the work of the Department in carrying out the functions referred to in paragraph (1).

"(h) INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out any program under this Act or any other program of the Federal Housing Administration, the Secretary may utilize any amounts as may be made available for such programs to ensure that an appropriate level of investment in information technology is maintained in order for the Secretary to upgrade the technology systems of the Department used in carrying out the functions referred to in subsection (g)(1).

"(2) USE OF PREMIUM-GENERATED INCOME.—To the extent that income derived in any fiscal year from premium fees charged under section 203(c) is in excess of the level of income estimated for that such year for such premium fees and assumed in the baseline projection prepared by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget for inclusion in the President's annual budget request and subject to approval in advance in an appropriation Act, not more than \$72,000,000 of such excess amounts may be used from such amounts for the purpose of carrying out this subsection.

"(i) TRAINING AND EDUCATION PROGRAM.—

"(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall carry out a comprehensive training and education program to improve the service provided by personnel of the Department carrying out functions referred to in subsection (g)(1) to users of the mortgage insurance programs under this Act and any other FHA mortgage insurance programs.

"(2) TOPICS.—The training and education program under this subsection shall—

"(A) have as its primary goal improving the quality and consistency of responses provided by such personnel of the Department headquarters and other offices and centers of the Department regarding regulations, handbooks, mortgagee letters, and other guidance; and

"(B) be designed to—

"(i) ensure that lenders participating in the FHA programs may rely on information provided by one office or center of the Department when doing business with a different office or center; and

"(ii) prevent such lenders from soliciting answers to the same question from different offices or centers of the Department in an at-

tempt to obtain an answer that is satisfactory to the lender, by ensuring consistent responses from different offices and centers."

SEC. 5. RISK MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENTS.

(a) REVIEW OF DELINQUENCIES AND LENDER MONITORING.—Section 202 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1708), as amended by the preceding provisions of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(j) RISK MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT.—

"(1) REVIEW OF DELINQUENCIES AMONG RECENT ORIGINATIONS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct an ongoing review of mortgages on single family housing originated during the preceding 12 months and insured pursuant to this Act under which the mortgagor has become 60 or more days delinquent with respect to payment under the mortgage during the first 90 days of the term of the mortgage to determine which mortgages should not have been originated or insured and the characteristics of such mortgages, and which lenders have relatively high incidences of such delinquent mortgages;

"(B) REPORTING TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the 21st Century FHA Housing Act of 2009, the Secretary shall make available to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate any information and conclusions pursuant to the review required under subparagraph (A).

"(C) SUFFICIENT RESOURCES.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for each of fiscal years 2010 through 2014 the amount necessary to provide 90 additional full-time equivalent positions for the Department, or for entering into such contracts as are necessary, to conduct reviews in accordance with the requirements of this section.

"(2) LENDER MONITORING.—In conducting monitoring and analysis of the performance of lenders for mortgages on single family housing insured under this Act, the Secretary shall utilize a one-year period for such monitoring and analysis, to promote earlier identification of problem lenders and allow earlier intervention and sanctions."

(b) ANALYSIS OF MORTGAGE PERFORMANCE.—Section 203(g)(2) of the Helping Families Save Their Homes Act of 2009 (12 U.S.C. 1708 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking "and" at the end;

(2) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(3) analyze the portion of mortgages randomly reviewed pursuant to subparagraph (B) on the basis of performance."

SEC. 6. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING ADEQUATE CAPITAL FLOW FOR MORTGAGE LOANS.

(a) CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) warehouse lending, which provides short-term lines of credit to non-depository lenders for mortgage loans that are eventually sold into the secondary market to Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac and Ginnie Mae, is a critical link in the housing finance chain;

(2) according to data obtained pursuant to the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975, nondepository lenders that utilize warehouse lines of credit account for as much as 40 percent of all residential mortgage loans in the United States, and nearly 55 percent of FHA loans, which are increasingly popular;

(3) it is estimated that since 2006 warehouse lending capacity available to the mortgage lending industry has declined by

nearly 90 percent to the current level of approximately \$20 billion to \$25 billion;

(4) based upon projected 2009 lending volume, there could be a shortfall of hundreds of billions of dollars in home mortgage availability caused by a lack of warehouse lending capacity; and

(5) unless Federal regulators promptly address the issue, borrowers seeking to take advantage of today's low interest rates will face rising costs and reduced credit access, which could undermine the housing market recovery.

(b) SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and the Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency should use their existing authorities under the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008, the Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008, and other statutory and regulatory authorities to provide financial support and assistance to facilitate increased warehouse credit capacity by qualified warehouse lenders;

(2) such financial support and assistance should—

(A) be used only to expand the amount of credit or lending capacity made available to qualified mortgage lenders by qualified warehouse lenders for the purpose of funding residential mortgage loans;

(B) be provided in such form and manner as such Secretaries or the Director, as applicable, consider appropriate, which might include direct loans, guarantees, credit enhancement, and other incentives; and

(C) comply with other requirements established by such Secretaries or the Director, as applicable.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section, the following definitions shall apply:

(1) QUALIFIED MORTGAGE LENDER.—The term “qualified mortgage lender” means an entity that—

(A) is engaged in the business of making mortgage loans for one- to four-family residences that are—

(i) insured under title II of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1707 et seq.);

(ii) guaranteed, insured, or made under chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code;

(iii) made, guaranteed, or insured under title V of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1471 et seq.); or

(iv) eligible for purchase by the Federal National Mortgage Association or the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation; and

(B) is not a depository institution.

(2) QUALIFIED WAREHOUSE LENDER.—The term “qualified warehouse lender” means an entity that extends credit to qualified mortgage lenders for the purpose of originating mortgage loans described in paragraph (1)(A), or that otherwise facilitates the origination of such loans by a qualified mortgage lender.

SEC. 7. FORECLOSURE AVOIDANCE INITIATIVES.

Section 230 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715u) is amended by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

“(e) FORECLOSURE AVOIDANCE DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS.—The Secretary may carry out such demonstration programs as the Secretary from time to time determines are appropriate to demonstrate the effectiveness of alternative methods of avoiding foreclosure on mortgages insured under this title, including methods involving short sales and deeds in lieu of foreclosure, and such methods may involve partial or full payment of insurance benefits to the mortgagee.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ADLER) and the gen-

tleman from New York (Mr. LEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ADLER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and to insert extraneous material thereon.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ADLER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to start by thanking the Republican lead on this bill, the gentleman from New York (Mr. LEE) for his hard work on this important issue. This is the sort of example of bipartisanship that I think the American people expect from us, and I am happy that in this case Mr. LEE and I could work together to try to bring some good relief to the American people.

I introduced H.R. 3146, the 21 Century FHA Housing Act earlier this year with bipartisan support to provide the Federal Housing Administration with the necessary tools to serve taxpayers during these challenging economic times.

FHA is currently one of the primary sources for safe, affordable mortgage financing for American families. During recent years, as private lenders have fled the market, the demand for FHA markets have grown exponentially. Its market share has ballooned from less than 3 percent of the market in 2006 to 23 percent of all mortgages today. We need to ensure that the FHA is able to meet this need efficiently and honestly.

Like most Americans, I am tired of hearing about more waste, fraud, and abuse in Washington or around the country. That is why the 21 Century FHA Housing Act is so very important. The bill will take steps to fix these problems and protect American taxpayers. It gives the FHA the authority to attract personnel with the skills and experience necessary to manage the increase in business. In addition, the FHA must be given sufficient resources to maintain the ability to enforce high underwriting and oversight standards and operate safely and effectively.

Enforcing high underwriting standards will yield safer products and protect the American taxpayer. We need to ensure that government programs are efficient and working on behalf of hardworking middle class families. With this increase in market share, comes an increase in risk. That is why this bill directs the Housing and Urban Development secretary to conduct an ongoing review of at-risk mortgages and provide a report to Congress on ways to improve at-risk management. This report will also make it easier to identify rogue predatory lenders and eliminate waste, fraud, and abuse in the FHA system.

Mr. Speaker, the FHA is helping to provide credit to eligible homeowners within a marketplace where many credit lines are frozen. But it is imperative that these loans are good for families, our economy, and taxpayers. Failure to pass this bill may open the door for more of the mortgage fraud and abuse that helped cause the recent economic recession from which America is still suffering.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 3146, the 21 Century FHA Housing Act of 2009. I want to thank my colleague from New Jersey (Mr. ADLER) for helping to drive this legislation. It will get the job done, and it is about time we start doing what the American people want. I think this is a wonderful piece of bipartisan legislation that will take important steps towards restoring the stability of our housing market and helping our overall economic recovery.

While western New Yorkers never had a housing boom to bust, I still often hear from my constituents who have been responsible homeowners and who are increasingly frustrated by the level of fraud and abuse in our mortgage system. Western New Yorkers understand you cannot take risks without accepting the consequences. We have all seen the aftereffects of irresponsible lenders, and Congress has rightfully looked at outdated mortgage structures to ensure responsible homeowners have access to safe and affordable mortgages without burdening them with the mistakes of others. That's why we have crafted legislation to address this pressing need in the current mortgage market.

In order to ensure a stable housing market and help first-time home buyers, we need to modernize the Federal Housing Administration, which is now one of the primary sources of mortgage financing. It is imperative that the FHA has the resources it needs to effectively oversee mortgages and ensure that no bad actors are allowed to function in this marketplace.

During recent years, as private lenders have fled the market, the demand for FHA mortgages grew exponentially. FHA mortgages tripled in 2008, and in 2009 the amounts are expected to exceed \$290 billion.

In order to effectively meet the new influx of work, several legislative changes are needed to modernize the system. H.R. 3146 will address concerns about proper review and oversight of FHA lenders and loans by improving target reviews of loan performances.

In addition, this legislation ensures that FHA has the staff, the technology, and risk management processes in place to protect American taxpayers from unacceptable losses.

Finally, the measure provides the HUD Secretary with the authority to implement new and innovative ideas to minimize foreclosures going forward.

We cannot keep this dream of homeownership alive and within reach of working families unless we have an FHA that works better.

Again, I want to express my appreciation to my friend and colleague from New Jersey for his cooperation in crafting this measure. It is important for the American people to see that both parties are working together on this vital issue. I urge immediate passage of H.R. 3146.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ADLER of New Jersey. Does the gentleman yield back?

Mr. LEE of New York. I have no more speakers, but I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

When I looked at this piece of legislation going back several months ago, it was very important that we found a solution for this. I talked to constituents in my district, and they are so hard-pressed dealing with other forms of lending and getting FHA stable, it was incredibly important, as was the idea of making sure that we use taxpayer dollars wisely.

We were fortunate enough from the hearings to understand some of the challenges that FHA has had in terms of technology, and the fact that we really haven't funded this program to its fullest extent by not having enough staff in support of FHA, thereby the potential for fraud or waste or abuse has risen, and that's why, again, taking a piece of legislation like this and moving it forward is incredibly important.

As I look forward to trying to move this along, I know people in our district will be pleased, not only in my district but throughout the country, that we are pushing this type of bipartisan legislation.

Mr. ADLER has taken a very firsthand approach in trying to ensure that this happens.

At this time, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ADLER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I want to echo the comments of my friend, Mr. LEE from New York. We really did work in a bipartisan way to address a problem to save taxpayers from the waste, fraud, and abuse that I think frustrates so many Americans.

Many of America's economic problems are due to problems experienced within the housing market. The 21 Century FHA Housing Act of 2009 will make significant enhancements to FHA and will enable the administration to better manage the portfolio of loans and eliminate some of that waste, fraud, and abuse that frustrates us so very, very much.

As FHA steps into the void created by the predatory lenders, these improvements will be increasingly important. I urge all of my colleagues to support this important bill.

SEPTEMBER 14, 2009.

Hon. JOHN ADLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ADLER: The undersigned organizations, representing the real estate industry, urge your support of H.R.

3146, the "21st Century FHA Housing Act of 2009." This bill will modernize the Federal Housing Administration (FHA), allowing it to continue to offer safe, affordable mortgages to American families, at no cost to taxpayers.

Despite FHA's growing role in the market, FHA's technology and infrastructure are far behind the times. To better serve American consumers and protect taxpayer interest, immediate changes need to be made. Computer systems must be upgraded, and sufficient staff be hired to handle all the responsibilities of an agency that is meeting the needs of so many American homebuyers.

Additionally, we support efforts to strengthen warehouse lending in ways that would allow the marketplace to continue to meet the demand for single-family and multifamily mortgage products. Consumers benefit the most when there is competition in the market and full access to credit.

H.R. 3146 will allow FHA to continue its modernization, utilize all of its mortgage programs, and assure that homeowners have affordable safe options for homeownership. We urge you to quickly pass this important legislation to update FHA's programs to address the pressing needs of the current mortgage market.

Sincerely,

Mortgage Bankers Association, National Association of Homebuilders, National Association of REALTORS®.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ADLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3146, 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.

□ 1500

FHA MULTIFAMILY LOAN LIMIT ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 2009

Mr. ADLER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3527) to increase the maximum mortgage amount limitations under the FHA mortgage insurance programs for multifamily housing projects with elevators and for extremely high-cost areas, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3527

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "FHA Multifamily Loan Limit Adjustment Act of 2009".

SEC. 2. FHA MORTGAGE AMOUNT LIMITS FOR ELEVATOR-TYPE STRUCTURES.

(a) AMENDMENTS.—The National Housing Act is amended in each of the provisions specified in subsection (b)—

(1) by inserting "with sound standards of construction and design" after "elevator-type structures" the first place such term appears; and

(2) by striking "to not to exceed" and all that follows through "sound standards of construction and design" each place such terms appear and inserting "by not more

than 50 percent of the amounts specified for each unit size".

(b) PROVISIONS AMENDED.—The provisions of the National Housing Act specified in this subsection are as follows:

(1) Subparagraph (A) of section 207(c)(3) (12 U.S.C. 1713(c)(3)(A)).

(2) Subparagraph (A) of section 213(b)(2) (12 U.S.C. 1715k(d)(3)(B)(iii)(D)).

(3) Subclause (I) of section 220(d)(3)(B)(iii) (12 U.S.C. 1715k(d)(3)(B)(iii)(D)).

(4) In section 221(d) (12 U.S.C. 1715l(d))—

(A) subclause (I) of paragraph (3)(ii); and

(B) subclause (I) of paragraph (4)(ii).

(5) Subparagraph (A) of section 231(c)(2) (12 U.S.C. 1715v(c)(2)(A)).

(6) Subparagraph (A) of section 234(e)(3) (12 U.S.C. 1715y(e)(3)(A)).

SEC. 3. FHA MORTGAGE AMOUNT LIMITS FOR EXTREMELY HIGH-COST AREAS.

Section 214 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715d) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence—

(A) by inserting ", or with respect to projects consisting of more than four dwelling units located in an extremely high-cost area as determined by the Secretary" after "or the Virgin Islands" the first place such term appears;

(B) by inserting ", or to construct projects consisting of more than four dwelling units on property located in an extremely high-cost area as determined by the Secretary" after "or the Virgin Islands" the second place such term appears; and

(C) by inserting ", or with respect to projects consisting of more than four dwelling units located in an extremely high-cost area as determined by the Secretary" after "or the Virgin Islands" the third place such term appears;

(2) in the second sentence—

(A) by inserting ", or with respect to a project consisting of more than four dwelling units located in an extremely high-cost area as determined by the Secretary," after "or the Virgin Islands" the first place such term appears; and

(B) by inserting ", or in the case of a project consisting of more than four dwelling units in an extremely high-cost area as determined by the Secretary, in such extremely high-cost area," after "or the Virgin Islands" the second place such term appears; and

(3) in the section heading, by striking "AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS" and inserting "THE VIRGIN ISLANDS, AND EXTREMELY HIGH-COST AREAS".

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this Act shall apply to mortgages insured under title II of the National Housing Act after September 30, 2009.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ADLER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY G. MILLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ADLER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ADLER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to pass H.R. 3527, the FHA Multifamily Loan Limit

Adjustment Act of 2009. By increasing the FHA loan limits to elevator properties in extremely high-cost areas, H.R. 3527 will allow the FHA to facilitate the construction and rehabilitation of apartments, particularly in urban areas, where financing is not readily available in the current economic environment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

SEPTEMBER 14, 2009.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER AND MINORITY LEADER BOEHNER: The undersigned groups are writing to urge the House to pass H.R. 3527, the FHA Multifamily Loan Limit Adjustment Act of 2009. By increasing the FHA loan limits for elevator properties and in extremely high-cost areas, H.R. 3527 will allow FHA to facilitate the construction and rehabilitation of apartments, particularly in urban areas where financing is not readily available in the current economic environment.

The FHA multifamily loan limits are severely restricting the ability to use FHA insurance programs to finance rental housing in many urban areas. HUD data shows that, in fiscal years 2007 and 2008, only three non-subsidized high-rise construction/rehabilitation projects—nationwide—have been endorsed for insurance with FHA. We believe this is largely due to the maximum loan limits imposed by statute on the FHA insurance programs, which is being addressed in H.R. 3527.

A recent survey of major lenders shows that there are more than 11,000 units in elevator structures with a mortgage amount of more than \$3 billion that are on hold and, when H.R. 3527 is passed, should be able to move forward using the FHA programs. These properties are in many urban areas across the country, from Seattle and Los Angeles, to Houston, Columbus and Chicago, to Boston and New York.

Decent affordable rental housing allows working families to live in stable environments and within their means and also allows seniors to live in communities with appropriate amenities to permit aging in place. Well-maintained and attractive rental housing in turn contributes to neighborhood stability.

We urge the House to pass H.R. 3527 to provide FHA with the tools it needs to facilitate the construction and rehabilitation of apartments.

Sincerely,

American Association of Homes and Services for the Aging; Enterprise Community Partners; Institute of Real Estate Management; Mortgage Bankers Association; National Apartment Association; National Affordable Housing Management Association; National Association of Home Builders; National Association of Local Housing Finance Agencies; National Association of Realtors; National Housing Conference; National Leased Housing Association; National Low Income Housing Coalition; Nation Multi-Housing Council; New York Housing Conference; Stewards of Affordable Housing for the Future.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the FHA Multifamily Loan Limit Adjustment Act. I see that Mr. WEINER is just walking in the door right now, so we're going to be able to have a very nice conversation. Welcome, Mr. WEINER. I'm very glad to have you. I'm honored

to support your bill. This addresses the need for new construction or substantial rehabilitation to multifamily units in extremely high-cost areas of the country.

The FHA multifamily mortgage insurance program works with private sector partners to expand the supply of rental housing. FHA's multifamily mortgage insurance programs enable qualified buyers to obtain long-term, fixed-rate, nonrecourse financing for multifamily properties that are affordable to low- and moderate-income families. These families include police, firefighters, teachers, entry and mid-level service workers, among others.

In our most expensive cities it is very difficult for these workers, particularly those starting out in the workforce, to find affordable rental housing where they work. While the FHA multifamily mortgage insurance program could help, because of its loan limits there were only three FHA-insured multifamily loans for high-rise construction or rehabilitation approvals in the Nation in fiscal year 2007 and 2008.

According to the Mortgage Bankers Association, MBA, while the base loan limits and high-cost factors have been raised over the past 8 years to address issues in most parts of the country, there's still problems concentrated in major cities where high-rise construction is involved. In fact, the data shows that while elevator buildings cost 45 percent more than non-elevator structures, the current loan limits for these structures are less than 10 percent higher than non-elevator structures.

Developers are simply unable to provide affordable housing units in high-cost areas because the current statutory limits for FHA mortgage insurance are too low for these types of structures.

The slowdown in affordable rental housing production that is being enhanced by the credit crisis has resulted in a significant gap between the demand for and the supply of affordable rental housing.

There is no private sector alternative to this program. The market served by FHA multifamily insurance does not overlap with competing private sector insurance.

This bill would increase the multifamily loan limit for elevator buildings by up to 50 percent and give the Secretary of HUD the authority to increase the limit in extremely high-cost areas to 305 percent of the base rate; similar to insurance of mortgages on property in States like Alaska, Guam, Hawaii, and the Virgin Islands. And I think Mr. WEINER and I agree—if it's good enough for Alaska, Guam, Hawaii, and the Virgin Islands, it's good enough for the rest of the United States.

This program has a positive budgetary impact. Now this does not cost the Federal Government any money. Making money for the taxpayers is what we're looking at.

Looking at the President's fiscal year 2010 budget, the multifamily in-

surance programs that relate to these loans limits is projected to make a profit—I repeat, a profit—on new loans insured in the fiscal year budget of \$93 million. In fact, over the years, FHA multifamily loans have consistently made a profit for the taxpayers.

Under the bill, 52 projects with over 11,000 units valued at \$3 billion that are on hold will be able to move forward by using the FHA program. In Los Angeles alone, five multifamily projects for 1,700 units that are stalled due to the loan limits would be able to move forward. The National Home Builders Association has predicted that with the passage of this bill, 12,000 new construction jobs will be created.

Over the past 74 years, the FHA multifamily mortgage insurance program has operated successfully, working with private sector parties to expand the supply of housing. This public-private partnership has leveraged billions of dollars in private sector investment to provide rental housing for millions of families and the elderly throughout the country.

The bill is endorsed by the Mortgage Bankers Association, the National Association of Home Builders, the National Association of Realtors, the Institute of Real Estate Management, and 10 others.

I want to commend Chairman FRANK and Ranking Member BACHUS for sending this bill to the floor.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ADLER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the sponsor of the bill, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER).

Mr. WEINER. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey and my good friend from California, who has done an excellent job in explaining the bill. Let me just make a couple of general points that my colleagues can understand.

You know, unlike a lot of the housing market, FHA loans have actually performed remarkably well. Some people may look to the floor today and say, Why would you want to do anything to expand lending when we have already seen some of the problems that we've had? Well, frankly, FHA only has a serious delinquency rate of about .3 percent, compared to nearly 8 percent in the rest of the marketplace.

But to understand how FHA has worked so well, what they essentially do is take people who are essentially developing rental housing. They say, You're having trouble getting credit elsewhere, like it was when they were created after the Great Depression. We'll go ahead and provide you credit to provide rental housing that you can rent to middle-class residents all around the country.

Unfortunately, what was never truly acknowledged by the program until now is that some parts of the country have rental housing that doesn't go side-to-side, but goes north and south, up and down. Congressman MILLER has instances like that. I know I do in New York City.

By definition, elevator buildings, combined with the fact that they are in big cities, make them more expensive. And so what we're saying here is, let's make sure the program keeps up with the real demand that we have for housing.

Now it is imperative that we do this because, despite the best efforts of this Congress and the President, the banks are simply not doing what we wanted them to do, which is extend more credit so people who have good enough credit can go ahead and find apartments that they can rent, homes that they can buy.

FHA is going to, under this piece of legislation—and I thank my colleague from New Jersey for quarterbacking it—is going to have the opportunity now to change their standards to reflect the way different things are regionally.

I should say to all of my colleagues, if you're doing things to perfect farm programs, just because they don't benefit me in New York City doesn't mean I don't support them. This is a way to make housing programs reflect what truly is going on in the marketplace.

Let me make one other point about this. It is true what my colleague says about Guam and Alaska and Hawaii. They're high-cost areas for different reasons. They're high-cost areas because getting building supplies to Guam, getting building supplies to Alaska and Hawaii, those are expensive.

One of the things that makes housing expensive in areas like New York City is that you have got to install elevators in any building that's north of six stories. And if you wind up getting into that place, you wind up adding a great deal to the amount per square foot that is required to do the building.

Nothing, I should say to my colleagues, does anything here to put taxpayers in any more jeopardy. The FHA program is entirely self-funded. It's the premiums that are collected from people who benefit from the program. All we're doing now is stopping what is a bottleneck in the program that has said we've got a lot of moribund programs—which is a word my assistant, Mr. Beckelman, who has developed this legislation, coined—these moribund programs that are ready to go but simply can't get the financing.

So this House will be doing what desperately needs to be done. I thank the chairman of the Financial Services Committee for quarterbacking it and for getting it—tailbacking it; you quarterbacked, he tailbacked it—and for Mr. MILLER of California, who has helped see the importance of this, and want to thank him for the great work he has done.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. I thank Mr. WEINER for bringing this bill forward. It's very reminiscent of what happened to California with FHA and with conforming loan limits to high-cost areas. And I represent a high-cost area.

My FHA loans from 2000 to 2005 dropped by 99 percent. Today, we've raised conforming loan limits in high-cost areas for FHA for conforming, and over 90 percent of the loans made in my area today of California, and most of California, are conforming in FHA loans.

This, again, addresses a loophole that has existed for years. If it's good enough for Alaska, Guam, Hawaii, and the Virgin Islands, which I think it is, it's good enough for the other high-cost areas of this country.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. ADLER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ADLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3527, 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.

SECURITIES LAW TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS ACT OF 2009

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2947) to amend the Federal securities laws to make technical corrections and to make conforming amendments related to the repeal of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2947

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Securities Law Technical Corrections Act of 2009".

SEC. 2. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

(a) SECURITIES ACT OF 1933.—The Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77a et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 3(a)(4) (15 U.S.C. 77c(a)(4)), by striking "individual;" and inserting "individual,";

(2) in section 18(b)(1)(C) (15 U.S.C. 77r(b)(1)(C)), by striking "is a security" and inserting "a security";

(3) in section 18(c)(2)(B)(i) (15 U.S.C. 77r(c)(2)(B)(i)), by striking "State, or" and inserting "State or";

(4) in section 19(d)(6)(A) (15 U.S.C. 77s(d)(6)(A)), by striking "in paragraph (1) of (3)" and inserting "in paragraph (1) or (3)"; and

(5) in section 27A(c)(1)(B)(ii) (15 U.S.C. 77z-2(c)(1)(B)(ii)), by striking "business entity;" and inserting "business entity,".

(b) SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934.—The Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 2(1)(a) (15 U.S.C. 78b(1)(a)), by striking "affected" and inserting "effected";

(2) in section 3(a)(55)(A) (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)(55)(A)), by striking "section 3(a)(12) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934" and inserting "section 3(a)(12) of this Act";

(3) in section 3(g) (15 U.S.C. 78c(g)), by striking "company, account person, or entity" and inserting "company, account, person, or entity";

(4) in section 10A(i)(1)(B)(i) (15 U.S.C. 78j-1(i)(1)(B)(i)), by striking "nonaudit" and inserting "non-audit";

(5) in section 13(b)(1) (15 U.S.C. 78m(b)(1)), by striking "earning statement" and inserting "earnings statement";

(6) in section 15(b)(1) (15 U.S.C. 78o(b)(1))—

(A) by striking the sentence beginning "The order granting" and ending "from such membership," in subparagraph (B); and

(B) by inserting such sentence in the matter following such subparagraph after "are satisfied,";

(7) in section 15 (15 U.S.C. 78o), by redesignating subsection (i), as added by section 303(f) of the Commodity Futures Modernization Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2763A-455), as subsection (j);

(8) in section 15C(a)(2) (15 U.S.C. 78o-5(a)(2))—

(A) by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively;

(B) by striking the sentence beginning "The order granting" and ending "from such membership," in such subparagraph (B), as redesignated; and

(C) by inserting such sentence in the matter following such redesignated subparagraph after "are satisfied,";

(9) in section 16(a)(2)(C) (15 U.S.C. 78p(a)(2)(C)), by striking "section 206(b)" and inserting "section 206B";

(10) in section 17(b)(1)(B) (15 U.S.C. 78q(b)(1)(B)), by striking "15A(k) gives" and inserting "15A(k), give"; and

(11) in section 21C(c)(2) (15 U.S.C. 78u-3(c)(2)), by striking "paragraph (1) subsection" and inserting "Paragraph (1)".

(c) TRUST INDENTURE ACT OF 1939.—The Trust Indenture Act of 1939 (15 U.S.C. 77aaa et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 304(b) (15 U.S.C. 77ddd(b)), by striking "section 2 of such Act" and inserting "section 2(a) of such Act";

(2) in section 313(a)(4) (15 U.S.C. 77mmm(a)(4)) by striking "subsection 311" and inserting "section 311(b)"; and

(3) in section 317(a)(1) (15 U.S.C. 77qqq(a)(1)), by striking "(1)," and inserting "(1)".

(d) INVESTMENT COMPANY ACT OF 1940.—The Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-1 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 2(a)(19) (15 U.S.C. 80a-2(a)(19)) by striking "clause (vi)" both places it appears in the last two sentences and inserting "clause (vii)";

(2) in section 9(b)(4)(B) (15 U.S.C. 80a-9(b)(4)(B)), by inserting "or" after the semicolon at the end;

(3) in section 12(d)(1)(J) (15 U.S.C. 80a-12(d)(1)(J)), by striking "any provision of this subsection" and inserting "any provision of this paragraph";

(4) in section 13(a)(3) (15 U.S.C. 80a-13(a)(3)), by inserting "or" after the semicolon at the end;

(5) in section 17(f)(4) (15 U.S.C. 80a-17(f)(4)), by striking "No such member" and inserting "No member of a national securities exchange";

(6) in section 17(f)(6) (15 U.S.C. 80a-17(f)(6)), by striking "company may serve" and inserting "company, may serve"; and

(7) in section 61(a)(3)(B)(iii) (15 U.S.C. 80a-60(a)(3)(B)(iii))—

(A) by striking "paragraph (1) of section 205" and inserting "section 205(a)(1)"; and

(B) by striking "clause (A) or (B) of that section" and inserting "section 205(b)(1) or (2)".

(e) INVESTMENT ADVISERS ACT OF 1940.—The Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b-1 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in each of the following sections, by striking “principal business office” or “principal place of business” (whichever and wherever it appears) and inserting “principal office and place of business”: sections 203(c)(1)(A), 203(k)(4)(B), 213(a), 222(b), and 222(c) (15 U.S.C. 80b-3(c)(1)(A), 80b-3(k)(4)(B), 80b-13(a), 80b-18a(b), and 80b-18a(c)); and

(2) in section 206(3) (15 U.S.C. 80b-6(3)), by inserting “or” after the semicolon at the end.

SEC. 3. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS FOR THE REPEAL OF THE PUBLIC UTILITY HOLDING COMPANY ACT OF 1935.

(a) SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934.—The Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 3(a)(47) (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)(47)), by striking “the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 (15 U.S.C. 79a et seq.)”; and

(2) in section 12(k) (15 U.S.C. 78l(k)), by amending paragraph (7) to read as follows:

“(7) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘emergency’ means—

“(A) a major market disturbance characterized by or constituting—

“(i) sudden and excessive fluctuations of securities prices generally, or a substantial threat thereof, that threaten fair and orderly markets; or

“(ii) a substantial disruption of the safe or efficient operation of the national system for clearance and settlement of transactions in securities, or a substantial threat thereof; or

“(B) a major disturbance that substantially disrupts, or threatens to substantially disrupt—

“(i) the functioning of securities markets, investment companies, or any other significant portion or segment of the securities markets; or

“(ii) the transmission or processing of securities transactions.”.

(3) in section 21(h)(2) (15 U.S.C. 78u(h)(2)), by striking “section 18(c) of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935.”.

(b) TRUST INDENTURE ACT OF 1939.—The Trust Indenture Act of 1939 (15 U.S.C. 77aaa et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 303 (15 U.S.C. 77ccc), by amending paragraph (17) to read as follows:

“(17) The terms ‘Securities Act of 1933’ and ‘Securities Exchange Act of 1934’ shall be deemed to refer, respectively, to such Acts, as amended, whether amended prior to or after the enactment of this title.”;

(2) in section 308 (15 U.S.C. 77hhh), by striking “Securities Act of 1933, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, or the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935” each place it appears and inserting “Securities Act of 1933 or the Securities Exchange Act of 1934”;

(3) in section 310 (15 U.S.C. 77jjj), by striking subsection (c) (including the preceding heading);

(4) in section 311 (15 U.S.C. 77kkk) by striking subsection (c);

(5) in section 323(b) (15 U.S.C. 77www(b)), by striking “Securities Act of 1933, or the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, or the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935” and inserting “Securities Act of 1933 or the Securities Exchange Act of 1934”; and

(6) in section 326 (15 U.S.C. 77zzz), by striking “Securities Act of 1933, or the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, or the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935,” and inserting “Securities Act of 1933 or the Securities Exchange Act of 1934”.

(c) INVESTMENT COMPANY ACT OF 1940.—The Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-1 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 2(a)(44) (15 U.S.C. 80a-2(a)(44)), by striking “Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935.”;

(2) in section 3(c) (15 U.S.C. 80a-3(c)), by amending paragraph (8) to read as follows: “(8) [Repealed]”;

(3) in section 38(b) (15 U.S.C. 80a-37(b)), by striking “the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935.”; and

(4) in section 50 (15 U.S.C. 80a-49), by striking “the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935.”.

(d) INVESTMENT ADVISERS ACT OF 1940.—Section 202(a)(21) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b-2(a)(21)) is amended by striking “Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY G. MILLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 2947, the Securities Law Technical Corrections Act of 2009, drafted by my colleague from Kansas, Congresswoman LYNN JENKINS. I commend her work on this bill, Mr. Speaker.

During the 110th Congress, a nearly identical bill, H.R. 3505, sponsored by Congressman PETER ROSKAM of Illinois, passed the House by a vote of 396-0. The Senate never acted on the measure.

This bill would effectively exclude companies that were subject to regulation under the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, which was repealed in 2005, from the definition of investment company and from the definition of securities laws.

Again, I commend Congresswoman JENKINS for sponsoring this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill. I commend Mr. MOORE for bringing it forward. This has passed Congress twice in the last Congress. It's been noncontroversial. It amends the Federal securities laws to make technical corrections and make conforming amendments related to the repeal of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935.

It's a reasonable approach. I don't know of any controversy or any opposition to this.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1515

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

(Mrs. MALONEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MALONEY. I thank the gentlemen for their leadership on this bill, and I rise in support of it.

Also, I just missed the FHA Multifamily Loan Limit Adjustment Act of 2009. This would create jobs, address the issue of affordable rental housing, and fix the lingering problems with better financing and liquidity. It would turn the hopes of homeownership into a reality and raise the limits on FHA loans that will help build more housing.

I rise today in support of a bill that will: Help create jobs in the hard-hit construction trades; address the longstanding issue of affordable rental housing in major urban and rural centers; and help fix lingering problems with better financing and liquidity.

H.R. 3527, the FHA Multifamily Loan Limit Adjustment Act of 2009 does all that and more, so I am proud to be a cosponsor along with my colleagues, Representatives WEINER, MILLER and FRANK.

The FHA's current limits on multifamily loans were certainly well intentioned, but they significantly restrict the ability of developers to use FHA insurance programs to finance badly needed affordable rental housing in high-cost areas such as New York City and State. In 2007 and 2008, HUD data shows that only 3 non-subsidized high rise construction or rehabilitation projects received FHA insurance approval in the whole country!

That's in part because the current FHA multifamily loan maximum of \$68,070 per two-bedroom unit is simply not high enough in high-cost areas. This puts a damper on new construction and badly needed rehabilitation in urban and suburban areas—where construction costs are higher.

But by simply increasing the loan limit as this bill does to \$93,029, FHA can facilitate construction and rehabilitation of apartments where financing is not available. I am told that there are currently 11,000 units in elevator structures across the country on hold with a combined mortgage amount of more than \$3 billion. In New York City, there are a total of 14 projects worth \$628 million stalled in NYC. This would build 2088 rental units in Brooklyn, Manhattan, and Queens.

When this bill becomes law these construction projects can move forward, create jobs and build new and more affordable homes.

In order to thrive our major cities depend on a supply of decent rental housing in buildings that are well maintained. Let's give the FHA the tools they need to move forward and enable these projects, these jobs, these American dreams.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. I want to thank Mrs. MALONEY for coming forward late, but she is my dear friend, and we have worked for years on issues together, and this is one of them. She has always been diligent about recognizing the errors that might exist in this country and how we could be more productive and be fair to everybody on these issues. I applaud you for your efforts and for being my colleague.

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

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS) may be able to control my time and may be able to yield time, as required.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I claim time in opposition to the bill, although I am not opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Kansas is recognized.

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise today in support of H.R. 2947, the Securities Law Technical Corrections Act. This legislation, which passed the House under suspension last year, makes technical corrections to various securities laws, and I thank Mr. KANJORSKI for his support on the measure.

This body passed identical legislation last year 404-0. In the aftermath of the stock market crash of 1929, Congress enacted the Federal securities laws of the 1930s and the 1940s. Over the decades since that time, Congress has amended these laws to adapt to a rapidly changing securities industry.

Congressional intent for these laws is to protect investors and maintain orderly and efficient markets. As Members of Congress, we have a responsibility to review laws from time to time to ensure that they are up-to-date so as to reduce unnecessary confusion to market participants. H.R. 2947 makes necessary technical corrections to the Federal securities laws that the Securities and Exchange Commission supports, including punctuation errors, spelling inaccuracies, and references to statutes which Congress previously repealed.

Again, I thank my colleague, Mr. KANJORSKI, along with Ranking Member BACHUS and Chairman FRANK, for their support of this bill and I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2947.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2947.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONGRATULATING THE MINORITY BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT AGENCY ON ITS 40TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and

agree to the resolution (H. Res. 215) congratulating the Minority Business Development Agency on its 40th anniversary and commending its achievements in fostering the establishment and growth of minority businesses in the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 215

Whereas the success of minority businesses is a critical component of a robust economy in the United States;

Whereas minority businesses employ 4,700,000 people, benefit minority communities, and contribute to local, State, and national economies;

Whereas minority businesses are twice as likely to generate revenues through exports compared to nonminority businesses due to their language capabilities, cultural competencies, ancestral ties, and business agility;

Whereas in 1969, there were only 322,000 minority businesses with \$11,000,000,000 in gross receipts and the number of minority businesses continues to grow, currently estimated at more than 4,000,000 with \$661,000,000,000 in gross receipts;

Whereas minority groups represent 26.1 percent of the population, but own only 11.6 percent of the Nation's businesses and receive only 6.2 percent of total sales;

Whereas the Minority Business Development Agency was established by Executive Order 11458 on March 5, 1969;

Whereas the Minority Business Development Agency has operated for the last 40 years as the only Federal agency created specifically to serve minority entrepreneurs;

Whereas the Minority Business Development Agency operates a network of business development centers throughout the United States to assist with the start-up, expansion, and development of minority businesses;

Whereas the Minority Business Development Agency supports the Gulf Coast Recovery through its five centers located in Louisiana, Alabama, and Mississippi;

Whereas in fiscal year 2008, the Minority Business Development Agency assisted more than 25,000 minority businesses producing over \$1,000,000,000 in contracts and over \$1,100,000,000 in financial packages, which contributed in excess of 5,300 new jobs created for its clients;

Whereas since 1969, the Minority Business Development Agency has served more than 625,000 minority businesses and assisted in securing more than \$25,000,000,000 in loans and bonding; and

Whereas the Minority Business Development Agency's long-term strategic direction is achieving entrepreneurial parity so that minority business enterprises are in proportion to the minority population: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) congratulates the Minority Business Development Agency on its 40th anniversary;

(2) commends the Minority Business Development Agency for its achievements in fostering the establishment and growth of minority businesses; and

(3) encourages the Minority Business Development Agency to continue its efforts to assist minority businesses as such enterprises continue to strengthen communities, create jobs, and contribute to the health of the economy in the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from In-

diana (Mr. CARSON) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and to insert extraneous material thereon.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 215, which congratulates the Minority Business Development Agency for its 40 years of commendable service to America's minority-owned businesses.

The Minority Business Development Agency has had a large presence in Indiana and continues to promote growth and achievement in this economic crisis.

Since its establishment, the Agency's mission has been to foster the creation of minority-owned businesses in the U.S. In fact, this organization has operated as the only Federal agency created specifically to serve minority-owned businesses through its network of over 40 centers nationwide.

Since its inception in 1969, over 3.6 million minority-owned businesses have been opened, creating over 4.7 million jobs. This amazing growth has accounted for \$661 billion in revenue. Over the last 40 years, these businesses have flourished as a result of consulting services provided by the Agency to over 625,000 firms.

During this economic crisis, the Minority Business Development Agency's services are more critical than ever. As minority-owned businesses continue to struggle, this organization provides a lifeline to an essential component of our Nation's economy.

In 2008, despite the ongoing recession, the Agency assisted more than 25,000 minority-owned businesses. As a result, thousands of Americans are now gainfully employed. Today, the Agency continues to work diligently to assist minority-owned businesses by identifying opportunities available through the Recovery Act.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Minority Business Development Agency for its four decades of admirable successes in fostering our Nation's minority-owned businesses. I urge my colleagues to vote in support of House Resolution 215.

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

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

I rise today in support of House Resolution 215 to commemorate the 40th anniversary of the Minority Business Development Agency.

It was nearly half a century ago that President Nixon recognized the need to stand by minority businessmen and businesswomen advancing the ability of minority businesses to compete financially on a national level. With approximately 40 business centers around the country, the MBDA set up a national network providing minorities access and support to the resources necessary to compete in a global business environment.

Access to capital is the primary focus of the MBDA. Since its creation, this Agency has worked alongside more than 25,000 minority business owners to generate \$1.85 billion in contracts and financial awards for minority businesses.

Mr. Speaker, MBDA also provides minority entrepreneurs with one-on-one assistance in writing their business plans, writing their marketing plans, management and technical assistance, and the financial planning that's necessary to assure adequate funding for business ventures.

Since its inception, the MBDA has expanded the scope of its initiatives internationally by participating in the very first U.S. trade mission to Bahrain as well as additional International Trade Administration missions to South America, Asia, Africa and the Caribbean.

As we observe this anniversary, we do need to applaud its continued commitment to the growth of minority businesses by providing access to capital.

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

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield to Mr. HONDA, the sponsor of this resolution, as much time as he may consume.

Mr. HONDA. I want to thank Mr. CARSON for this opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 215, congratulating the Minority Business Development Agency on its 40th anniversary and its achievements in fostering minority businesses in the United States.

Since its inception in 1969 by President Richard Nixon's Executive Order 11458, the MBDA has operated as the only Federal agency created to serve minority-owned businesses through its nationwide network of more than 40 business development centers and hundreds of strategic partners.

Over that time, MBDA has served over 625,000 minority-owned businesses and assisted in securing more than \$25 billion in loans and bonding, greatly contributing to the growth of our minority-owned businesses and the welfare of our communities in general.

I would like to share a couple of success stories of minority-owned businesses and companies from my 15th Congressional District of California in San Jose. First, Mr. and Mrs. Pradeep Aswani, immigrants from India, founded Securematics in Santa Clara, California. In 2002, this IT network solution distributor started with \$4 million in

revenue. In just 6 years, they grew their company sales to nearly \$115 million by exploiting opportunities found while participating in MBDA's forums, facilitated by the Northern California Minority Business Development Center.

Another success story, Central Computers, was established in 1986 from very humble beginnings in Santa Clara, California, by Saul and Sherry Yeung, two Chinese Americans who immigrated from Hong Kong. Through their perseverance and resourcefulness, including taking advantage of the services provided by the Northern California Minority Business Enterprise Center, the Yeung family successfully transformed their home apartment operation into the largest independent computer retailer and servicer in the Bay Area, grossing nearly \$30 million annually. Last September, MBDA recognized Central Computers as the National Minority Retail Firm of the Year for 2008.

The Northern California Minority Business Enterprise Center contributed to both of these successes. Funded by the MBDA and operated by Asian Inc., a nonprofit technical assistance and research organization that aims to strengthen minority communities, this center has assisted many of my district's minority-owned businesses. In fact, the Center participated in my Small Business Resource Fair held last May.

Now, these two stories are also prime examples of how successful minority-owned companies can give back to their local communities. Mr. Aswani finds time to mentor many local small business enterprises by providing free business strategy counseling. Saul and Sherry Yeung are significant contributors to local charities, community organizations, and educational institutions, including a \$1 million donation to the University of California Berkeley's new Tien Center for East Asian Studies.

As Chair of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, I appreciate the support in introducing this resolution from my fellow Chairs of the congressional minority caucuses—Hispanic Caucus, Black Caucus, and Native American Caucus. We recognize the importance of minority-owned businesses not only as critical economic contributors to our communities but also their significant influence on the well-being of the U.S. economy.

Minority groups represent 26.1 percent of the population but only own 11.6 percent of the Nation's businesses and receive only 6.2 percent of total sales. This disparity between minority-owned businesses compared to those nonminority-owned represents a significant loss of economic opportunity for the Nation. If economic parity was achieved, minority-owned businesses would create 16 million jobs, generate \$2.5 trillion in gross receipts and an unrealized tax base of more than \$100 billion per year.

Despite the MBDA's admirable services to foster the growth of minority-owned businesses, many more resources are needed to achieve economic parity now and in the future. By 2050, the U.S. Census Bureau predicts that minorities will comprise more than half of the U.S. population. It is easy to foresee the increased reliance our Nation's economy will have on minority communities and businesses.

As difficult as this mission is, I believe the MBDA and its new national director, David Hinson, are up to the challenge. David Hinson brings to the Agency over 20 years of business expertise and academic excellence. Among Director Hinson's new priorities are the creation of a new generation of \$100 million revenue-producing minority-owned businesses and fostering the growth of minority-owned businesses in clean energy, in green technology, health care, and information technology.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Minority Business Development Agency for its 40 years of dedicated work, fostering the growth and development of our Nation's minority-owned businesses, and I look forward to continuing to work with the MBDA to ensure the success of its noble endeavors.

I would like to thank the Chairs of the congressional minority caucuses for introducing this resolution with me. I appreciate the support of the cosponsors, and I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting H.R. 215.

Before I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to express again the local impact that this program has had in my community, not only because I know the two companies and the folks who had done it, but there are many, many more success stories that go untold. And there are yet more potential success stories out there with the continuation of this project.

□ 1530

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, we have no additional speakers. I would urge passage of the resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CARSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 215.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SIG TARP SMALL BUSINESS AWARENESS ACT OF 2009

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3179), to amend the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 to require the Special Inspector

General for the Troubled Asset Relief Program to include the effect of the Troubled Asset Relief Program on small businesses in the oversight, audits, and reports provided by the Special Inspector General, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3179

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as “SIG TARP Small Business Awareness Act of 2009”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds as follows:

(1) Small businesses are going to be the driving force behind revitalizing our economy.

(2) Small financial institutions are a primary financial resource for small businesses.

(3) In a hearing of the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives, witnesses testified that smaller financial institutions are having difficulty receiving funds from the Troubled Asset Relief Program.

(4) In a hearing of the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives, witnesses also testified that small businesses are having trouble receiving credit and financial products from banks and other financial institutions.

SEC. 3. DUTIES OF THE SPECIAL INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR THE TROUBLED ASSET RELIEF PROGRAM RELATING TO SMALL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS AND BUSINESSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 121(c) of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 (12 U.S.C. 5231(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) EFFECTS OF PROGRAM ON SMALL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS AND SMALL BUSINESSES.—

“(A) SMALL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.—In conducting audits and providing oversight of the Troubled Asset Relief Program in accordance with this section, the Special Inspector General shall examine how smaller financial institutions are being affected by—

“(i) expenditures under the Program (including the adequacy of financial assistance provided to or on behalf of such smaller financial institutions); and

“(ii) the considerations and determinations of—

“(I) the Secretary under this title; and

“(II) the regulators of such smaller financial institutions, with respect to capital adequacy and troubled assets.

“(B) SMALL BUSINESSES.—In conducting audits and providing oversight of the Troubled Asset Relief Program, the Special Inspector General shall examine the effects the provision of financial assistance under this title has had on small businesses, including both positive and negative effects and the extent of such effects on small businesses generally and by type and region.

“(C) REPORTS.—Any report prepared by the Special Inspector General under this section shall include the results of the activities of the Special Inspector General under paragraphs (1) and (2).”.

(b) REPORT ON INCLUSION AND UTILIZATION OF WOMEN AND MINORITIES.—Section 121(i) of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 (12 U.S.C. 5231(i)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(6) REPORT ON INCLUSION AND UTILIZATION OF WOMEN AND MINORITIES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Special Inspector General shall include in each quarterly report to the Congress under paragraph (1) in-

formation on the activities of the Secretary and any financial institutions receiving financial assistance under this title to include and utilize minorities (as such term is defined in section 1204(c) of the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989 (12 U.S.C. 1811 note)) and women, and minority- and women-owned businesses (as such terms are defined in section 21A(r)(4) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act), in any solicitation or contract, including any contract to asset managers, servicers, property managers, and other service providers or expert consultants.

“(B) INFORMATION TO BE INCLUDED.—The quarterly report shall include information on the levels of inclusion and utilization of women, minorities, and women- and minority-owned businesses, including the type of such contracts or solicitations, the dollar amount of such contracts or solicitations, the total number of such contracts or solicitations, and any other information on the activities of the Secretary and any financial institutions receiving financial assistance under this title to increase the participation of women, minorities, and women- and minority-owned businesses including recommendations related to increasing such participation.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and to insert extraneous material thereon.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3179, the SIG TARP Small Business Awareness Act of 2009, drafted by my colleague from Minnesota, Congressman ERIK PAULSEN. I commend his work on this important legislation.

This bill was originally offered as an amendment by Congressman PAULSEN to S. 383, the Special Inspector General for the Troubled Asset Relief Program Act, that was approved by the House on April 25, 2009, by a vote of 423-0, and was later signed into law.

During the markup, I commended Congressman PAULSEN for offering his amendment, and I supported the substance of the amendment; but to get S. 383 quickly to the President's desk to equip the SIG TARP with the resources and with the authority he desperately needed, we did not add the amendment to the bill. I am glad Congressman PAULSEN has offered this proposal again as a standalone bill so that the SIG TARP can closely monitor how TARP has affected small businesses and can report back to Congress.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3179.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PAULSEN. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I first want to thank Mr. MOORE, the leader of the subcommittee, for his leadership on this issue as well and on the subcommittee in general.

The legislation before us requires that the Special Inspector General report to Congress on how smaller financial institutions are faring under the TARP program and whether they are gaining access to needed funding. It would also require the Special Inspector General to examine the impact of TARP funding on small businesses.

During the August recess, I met with community bankers throughout my district. They outlined their desire to increase their lending to local small businesses that have been frozen out by the credit crunch. Similarly, I met with dozens of small business owners who expressed concerns over access to credit and to capital, key components of their ability to create jobs.

This problem was echoed in a recent article in the Minneapolis Star Tribune. The article outlined the problems that smaller financial institutions are having in trying to obtain TARP funds. They were primarily local banks that wanted to obtain TARP funds, but they had not received them or had not been given permission to receive them.

Mr. Speaker, in hearings held by the Financial Services Committee, we heard concerns that the large institutions may not be increasing their lending and that it was going to be the smaller institutions that would ultimately help revitalize our economy. The problem is the small businesses are not receiving the funds they need to help maintain and to grow their businesses. The reason is simply that those funds are not available.

When I asked about the assistance the community bankers, in particular, are getting from TARP, the representatives from the community banks responded by saying, All community banks have lost the trust of the Federal Government's ability to negotiate with them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that concerns me especially if we are looking to get out of the financial and economic mess that we are facing. Community banks make the bulk of their loans to small businesses, and it's the small businesses that have created two of every three net new jobs in the United States since the early 1970s. We need to expand lending so we can create jobs and can grow our economy. The government's “too big to fail” approach, which has been the guiding principle for a long time in Washington, also implies “too small to save.”

This premise is shortsighted; it's inaccurate and it's unfair to smaller institutions and to small businesses. By requiring the Special Inspector General to also examine now and to report the impact on smaller financial institutions as well as on small businesses, this will result in recommendations to both the U.S. Treasury and to Congress on how to improve the TARP program

so we can focus on job growth. Above all else, job growth needs to be our number one priority for each of us in Congress.

I ask for support, and I urge passage of H.R. 3179.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to also raise a point that Congressman WATT had raised in the committee markup in which Congressman PAULSEN's proposal was debated.

Congressman WATT offered an amendment that was accepted by voice vote to make sure that, in addition to small businesses, the SIG TARP should review how TARP has affected minority- and women-owned businesses. This is a good idea, and we should make sure TARP is being administered fairly and equally across the board.

I appreciate Congressman PAULSEN for working on a bipartisan basis to address this concern and for revising his bill to include it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, just to follow up again, I want to thank Mr. MOORE for his leadership on the subcommittee.

I want everyone to know that, with the country's current financial state, now more than ever we do need to help our Nation's job creators and small businesses.

With that, I would urge passage of H.R. 3179.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3179, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3179, 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.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIERNEY). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1617

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TIERNEY) at 4 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.).

RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 744

Whereas on September 9, 2009, during the joint session of Congress convened pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 179, the President of the United States, speaking at the invitation of the House and Senate, had his remarks interrupted by the Representative from South Carolina, Mr. Wilson; and

Whereas the conduct of the Representative from South Carolina was a breach of decorum and degraded the proceedings of the joint session, to the discredit of the House: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives disapproves of the behavior of the Representative from South Carolina, Mr. Wilson, during the joint session of Congress held on September 9, 2009.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution presents a question of the privileges of the House.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule IX, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, none of us, none of us is happy to be here considering this resolution. I know I am not.

At the same time, my colleagues, what is at issue here is of importance to this House and to our country, and that issue is whether we are able to proceed with a degree of civility and decorum that our rules and our democracy contemplate and require.

The House Code of Official Conduct requires that each Member, every one of us, each and every one of us "conduct himself," and I'm quoting from the rule, "at all times in a manner which shall reflect creditably on the House of Representatives."

There seems to be little or no disagreement that Mr. WILSON did not so conduct himself on the evening of September 9. Senator JOHN MCCAIN was quoted as saying that Mr. WILSON's behavior was "totally disrespectful." He went on to say, "There is no place for it in that setting, or any other, and he should apologize for it immediately."

Mr. WILSON did, in fact, apologize to the President through Mr. Emanuel, the President's Chief of Staff.

However, it was the House itself whose rules were offended. And as Mr. INGLIS, Mr. WILSON's colleague, a Republican colleague from South Carolina, observed, and again I quote, "He should apologize to the House," to the House, "for the rule violation." Mr. INGLIS went on to add, "That would end the matter."

I had made a similar representation to the Republican leader, and I believe that would have ended the matter. I know that is what the Republican leaders of the House thought would be appropriate and what the Republican leader talked to Mr. WILSON about doing. He said so to the press.

Indeed, last Thursday, based upon what a Republican leader told me, not Mr. BOEHNER, that morning, it was what I expected Mr. WILSON to do. As a result, I held open the time between the next-to-the-last vote and the very last vote to give Mr. WILSON an opportunity to express an apology to the House. As all of us know, many Members have done that in the past, reflecting upon conduct they thought was not appropriate; and as a result, they came to this floor. That has happened on both sides of the aisle where Members have done things that they thought brought discredit to the House and they came to this floor, to that rostrum and to this, to say, I apologize. Mr. INGLIS is correct: that would have ended the matter.

However, for whatever reason, Mr. WILSON has decided not to take any further action. In light of that, this resolution simply states the House's disapproval of Mr. WILSON's words and actions.

As Republican Whip CANTOR is quoted as saying, "Obviously the President of the United States is always welcome on Capitol Hill and he deserves respect and decorum." Surely all of us believe that's correct. Surely all of us, hopefully all of us, believe that when we invite a President of either party to come to this House and address a joint session of Congress that he ought to expect and we ought to expect that we will accord to him the decorum and courtesy of which Mr. CANTOR spoke.

The Republican leader of the Senate, MITCH MCCONNELL, added, "I think we ought to treat the President with respect, and anything other than that is not appropriate." That's what this resolution is about. It's a resolution of disapproval.

This resolution is not about the substance of an issue, but about the conduct we expect of one another in the course of doing our business. Senator JOHN CORNYN, the chairman of the Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee, stated this: "There's a time and a place for everything, and that was not the time or the place for that kind of comment."

In the absence of Mr. WILSON's expressing his regret for acting in a manner that almost all agree, every Republican that I have talked to as well as every Democrat that I have talked to, was inappropriate and contrary to the spirit of the rules of the House and the common courtesy that we should extend to all, and particularly to the President of the United States of America, our President, we have brought forward this resolution. I expected to extend that same courtesy with every President with whom I have served, be they Republican or Democrat.

We consider this resolution as a result of Mr. WILSON's failure to follow the advice of his leadership and a number of his Republican and Democratic colleagues who have told me that they have talked to him.

I want to say personally that I know Mr. WILSON. We've had a good relationship. I expect to continue to have a good relationship. I found him a man of measured conduct. I was surprised. I think he was probably surprised as well. A simple apology to this House would have ended the matter.

But this House ought not to stand silent in the face of conduct that almost universally, and by Mr. WILSON himself, was felt to be inappropriate. It is an expression of the people's House that neither Presidents nor any of us ought to expect to be subjected to such conduct in the course of our business in this, the people's House.

The resolution says simply what hopefully all of us feel, that we disapprove of the conduct cited and let others know that such conduct is neither welcome nor approved by the House of Representatives.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), and I ask unanimous consent that he control the balance of that time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON).

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Thank you, Mr. Leader. I appreciate your service for America, and I further respect the majority leader, Mr. HOYER.

Mr. Speaker, I am humbled and grateful for the support and prayers of my wife, Roxanne, my four sons, my staff, the people of South Carolina, my colleagues, and the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is clear to the American people that there are far more important issues facing this Nation than what we are addressing right now.

The President said, "The time for games is over." I agree with the President. He graciously accepted my apology, and the issue is over.

However, this action today will have done nothing for the taxpayers to rein in the growing cost and size of the Federal Government. It will not help more Americans secure jobs, promote better education, ensure retirement, or reform health insurance.

It is the Democrat leadership, in their rush to pass a very bad government health care plan, that is bad medicine for America. It has muzzled the voices we represent and provoked partisanship.

When we are done here today, we will not have taken any steps closer to helping more American families afford health insurance or helping small businesses create new jobs.

The challenges our Nation faces are far bigger than any one Member of this House. It is time that we move forward and get to work for the American people.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, this resolution addresses an issue of great importance to current and future Members of this august body: the proper conduct of its Members.

Despite statements made by various leaders of the other party, this is not about partisan politics or inappropriate comments. To the contrary, this is about the rules of this House and reprehensible conduct.

□ 1630

I stand here as a former schoolteacher and the proud father of a current public schoolteacher who teaches in the congressional district represented by Congressman WILSON. My grandchildren attend schools in that district.

But, Mr. Speaker, this Hall is the most prominent classroom in this great country, and all of us are teachers. We are bound by duty and the offices we hold to conduct ourselves as such. Classroom teachers and schoolchildren across the country and around the world looking in on our proceedings should see proper decorum and hear civil discourse. Our teachers are expected to teach our children to learn proper behavior. All of us are expected to give appropriate support and deference to the institutions that help us develop and maintain a civil and orderly society.

Our three separate branches of government have defined roles to play in this process, and those of us who hold positions within these branches are expected and are duty bound to treat each other with proper dignity and respect. Whether we like it or not, teachers and students see us as role models.

But none of us is perfect. We all make mistakes, and we sometimes fall short of expectations. But when we do, proper contrition is expected. When one of us, while seated in a formal session, severely violates the rules of this body by shamelessly hurling accusations of mendacity towards a President of these United States, our Commander in Chief, and refuses to formally express remorse, we, at a minimum, are duty bound to express our disapproval. Our teachers, our students, and constituents deserve no less.

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

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I recognize myself for as much time as I may consume.

I think this is a sad day for the House of Representatives. I think that this is nothing more than a partisan stunt aimed at trying to divert people's attention from the real issue that the American people want to talk about, and that is health care.

The gentleman from South Carolina made it clear the other night when he told the President's Chief of Staff that his behavior was inappropriate, and that is why he was calling to apologize to the President. The President graciously accepted his apology.

And last Friday, none other than the Speaker of the House, herself, said it is

time for us to talk about health care and not Mr. WILSON. Now, the Speaker and I don't see eye to eye on every issue, but on this issue I think I am in full agreement with her.

JOE WILSON is a decent human being. He did the right thing. He called the President and apologized, and the President was gracious enough to accept it. And I just believe that a man who has spent 25 years of his life in public service in the State senate and here in Congress, who has four sons, all of whom were in the military, three of whom served in Iraq, we all know JOE WILSON. He is a decent man, and to put him through this on the floor of the House I think is unacceptable and it is a partisan stunt.

There has been behavior that has gone on around here far more serious than this, and it didn't bring a resolution to the floor to condemn someone's behavior.

Yes, people have made mistakes. Some have come down to the floor and apologized, others have not. But none of it, none of it required a resolution. And to think that the precedent that is being set here today, the precedent, think about it, never has this happened before, that we are going to bring a resolution of disapproving of his behavior. My goodness, we could be doing this every day of the week.

The American people sent us here to work together to solve the problems of our country. They didn't send us here to talk about our behavior. They didn't send us here to do that. What they want us to do is to deal with the issue of health care.

The President said we ought to work in a bipartisan fashion to get health care reform accomplished. I agree with the President. I'm here. I'm willing. I'm able. Set the time and the place, and we will be there with our solutions to the health care problems in the country.

But to divert the Nation's attention from the issues they care about, health care, trying to make sure that we get jobs back into our economy, trying to do something about record deficits and record debt, no, no, no, we are not doing any of that. We are here on some witch hunt, some partisan stunt that the American people are not going to respect.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House, and any manifestation of approval or disapproval of the proceedings or other audible conversation is in violation of the House.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I want to first of all say to my friend, the leader, that before coming to this Congress I spent 18 years running a State agency in South Carolina. In those 18 years, I worked for four Governors—two Democrats and two Republicans. Many of you remember that one of

those Republicans for whom I worked for 8 years was Carroll Campbell, a former Member of this body. We were good friends. We often consulted with each other in the evenings, but we always respected each other even though we were poles apart politically.

This is not a partisan stunt. I do not participate in partisan stunts, and I think every Member here knows that. This is about the proper decorum that should take place on the floor of the United States House of Representatives.

And I would like to say to the leader, and I think he knows, that he has not represented the facts correctly. On October 23, 2007, a Member of this body, Representative STARK, came to this floor and apologized for behavior, as I read, "I want to apologize to first of all my colleagues, many of whom have been offended," and then he went on to say to the President, to his family, to the troops. That took place on this floor in 2007 on October 23.

Then I would remind the leader on July 23, which incidentally happens to be Carroll Campbell's birthday, on July 23, Chairman Thomas came to this floor and he offered an apology: "Because of my poor judgment, the stewardship of my party as majority party in the House has been unfairly criticized," and he went on to apologize.

And so all we have ever asked is that this body, this House, receive from Mr. WILSON a similar statement of contrition. It is all about the decorum of this House.

And I will reiterate, I have never stood on the floor of this House in my 17 years and participated in any kind of partisan stunt, and I think the other side knows that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the Republican whip, Mr. CANTOR.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the leader.

Mr. Speaker, I am having some difficulty understanding how it is that we are on the floor today debating this resolution. I would like to first speak to the claims made by my colleague on the other side of the aisle, the majority whip, in pointing out what are alleged to be precedents for this resolution.

As he knows, those instances that he referred to, whether it be the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) or the gentleman from California (Mr. Thomas) when they came to the well of this body to speak to our colleagues, it was as a result of conduct displayed, number one, in the case of Mr. STARK, during debate on the floor of this House, and number two, on the part of Mr. Thomas, conduct that took place among members in a committee on which I sit, the Ways and Means, two very distinct situations from the one we have here at hand.

Again, I don't understand how it is a priority that we are here on this particular resolution. The resolution, as has been pointed out, creates no job.

The resolution does nothing to do anything to increase access to quality health care. The resolution does nothing to address the issues of national security. Plain and simple, this resolution does not reflect the priority of the American people.

Now, President Obama came to this Chamber last week and he admonished us, Mr. Speaker. He admonished us to stop with the partisan bickering. In fact, he echoed the sentiments that he expressed during his inaugural address when he said, "We may still be a young Nation, but it is time to set aside childish things."

Now, as the leader said, as the gentleman from South Carolina himself said, he admits that what he did was inappropriate. He was on national television indicating he shouldn't have done it. He wouldn't do it again. He also said to the Nation, he called the President. As the leader indicated, the President graciously accepted the apology. I am told the Vice President has also accepted the apology. What more does the gentleman want? That's why I am at a loss as to what this is if it is not a partisan stunt.

So I believe we ought to accept what the President and the Speaker and others have said: Let's get on with the business of the people. Let's try and get over the divide and stick to the course of trying to work on things we agree on, or things that we have a potential to do away with the disagreements, not the partisanship.

Now, this is the bill. This is the famed H.R. 3200, Mr. Speaker, and there are several issues in here the American people have spoken out on. The first is the claim that we ought to be able to keep what we have if we are talking about health insurance. On page 16 of the bill, there is a section entitled, "Protecting the Choice to Keep Current Coverage." That's what we all are trying to do for the 85 or some percent of this country who has health insurance.

You know what, our side says despite that title, there are provisions in there which begin to require individuals and their insurers to do certain things which make it somewhat difficult if not impossible to allow for folks to keep what they have.

The next issue that is of import certainly to the American people and to this body is the question of access to Federal benefits by those who are here illegally.

Now, the President stood on this floor in this body, Mr. Speaker, and said that he did not believe that there was any access for those here illegally to Federal benefits. In fact, on page 143, there is a section which speaks to the issue that there should be no Federal benefit for those here illegally.

The problem that we have on this side is there is no requirement of verification of legal status. And in fact the White House, in fact Senator BAUCUS and others have since come out and said, You know what, you're right.

These are the kinds of things we could be doing right now to try and accomplish what it is that the American people have sent us here to do, and they expect us to do that in a deliberate manner that produces a positive result, which means we all have got to do that living within our means and to ensure that we do not break the bank in passing this health care reform measure.

□ 1645

So I implore this House, Mr. Speaker, let's try and get back to the business of the people.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOEHNER. I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS).

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in opposition to this resolution. I think the facts are clear. Congressman JOE WILSON admitted himself that his actions were wrong and that he shouldn't have done it and that he won't do it again. Mr. Wilson apologized to the President, and that was the right thing to do.

Mr. Speaker, how much longer does this go on? What are we really accomplishing here today? The President accepted Mr. WILSON's apology. Both the President and Mr. WILSON agreed it was time to move on. Just late last week, the Speaker of this House said, "It's time for us to talk about health care and not Mr. WILSON." I couldn't agree more.

Americans expect their elected officials to put aside partisan differences and work to solve the problems that are facing American families. Just last week, we were told, Let's put aside the partisan bickering.

Instead of pursuing this petty partisanship, now is the time to work together on behalf of the American people. Hardworking families back home are worried about the economy. They're worried about losing their jobs. Hardworking American families all across this country want us to stop a government takeover of health care.

Let's stop wasting time. Let's focus on tackling the challenges that face our country.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE).

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. I know JOE WILSON. I've worked with him in the halls of this Congress in committees and I have traveled with him to Iraq. A retired Army colonel, all four of his sons followed JOE into military service.

In the 7 years that I have known him, I have never known JOE WILSON to say an unkind word about anyone. JOE is a good and honest man. He is the kind of person who, if he disagrees with you, does it without being disagreeable.

Just as it was wrong for my Democrat colleagues to boo former President Bush in this Chamber, it was wrong for JOE WILSON to speak out of turn. The difference is that JOE WILSON apologized and the President very graciously accepted his apology.

Every Member in this Chamber has uttered words they wish they could have said differently. I know JOE made his comment out of frustration because there seems to be a large gap between health care rhetoric and reality.

What the President said did not match up with the bill that came before the House. This is the same bill that was discussed last month in many town hall meetings across our country. His comment provided Americans with an opportunity to discuss the differences between the bill they've seen and the ideas that the President mentioned in Wednesday's speech.

On the issue of illegal immigrants in health care reform, in three committees here in this very House Republicans offered up amendments to clarify to ensure that illegal aliens would not be included in the health care reform bill. In all three committees, those amendments were resoundingly defeated by my Democrat colleagues.

All Americans heard the President say, if you like your plan, you can keep it. But those words directly conflict with the CBO's findings that cuts to Medicare Advantage plans in H.R. 3200 would result in millions of seniors losing their current plan. That's not keeping the plan that they like.

Further still, we heard the President say that his plan would not add one dime to our deficits. Again, that's contrary to CBO's findings that say that H.R. 3200 would increase deficits by \$239 billion over 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, there's a lot of frustration in our districts and throughout America about H.R. 3200. We need to stop wasting time and get down to the business of drafting a bipartisan health care bill that addresses the needs of all Americans.

Think of how many Americans lost their jobs and lost their health care coverage during this 1 hour of debate that we're having today. We need to get down to the serious business that our constituents sent us here for. That's the very least that we can do. That's our job.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, last week, the President came to this House for a joint session of Congress to discuss how we as a Nation will reform health care. The debate over health care has made clear that the American people are actually paying attention to what is happening here.

During the President's speech, our colleague, JOE WILSON, made a mis-

take—a mistake that I believe was driven by both the substance and the emotion involved in this debate.

Immediately after he made that mistake, Congressman WILSON did the appropriate thing. He immediately apologized to the President. President Obama very graciously accepted his apology.

Mr. Speaker, recently, President Obama made a mistake when referring to actions of the Cambridge police while acknowledging that he did not have all the facts. In the national uproar that ensued, he called it a teachable moment. I thought that was a very human response to an incident that was blown totally out of proportion, in my opinion, and some actually inferred that it had racial overtones.

I think what we have here today, Mr. Speaker, is a teachable moment, and it has nothing to do with race.

JOE WILSON is a patriotic American who has defended our freedom in uniform as well as here in the United States Congress. He is the father of four sons who also served this Nation in uniform to defend our liberty, our freedom, our democracy. And we have all heard JOE WILSON speak on this floor, and he ends every floor statement with the same following words: God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th.

JOE WILSON simply made a mistake and was forgiven by the person who was harmed by that mistake. Case closed. So why are we here? What can we be taught by forcing a vote on this resolution?

Well, I believe what is going on here, Mr. Speaker, today, is a reflection of the unease among the American people as they have watched this Congress enact a \$700 billion Wall Street bailout, a \$787 billion economic stimulus bill, a \$1.8 trillion deficit, this year alone, placed on the backs of their children and their grandchildren.

They have been watching as Congress works on health care legislation that would fundamentally alter one of the most personal factors in their lives, and that is how to care for themselves and their families.

During the August recess we saw the frustrations of the American people when they came out in large numbers to exercise their rights guaranteed under the First Amendment—the right to free speech, the right to peaceably assemble, and the right to redress their grievances before government. And how were they treated when they did this? Some leaders of this House called them un-American, or an angry mob. All of this for simply making their voices heard.

I understand that democracy is sometimes difficult and it can instill passion. That passion, that love for our Nation and the belief in the idea that every American deserves to be heard is what makes America great. And we who are honored to serve here have a duty to listen.

The acrimony that has developed here is what needs to be stopped. We

need to stop and we need to listen to one another. We need to focus on the needs of the people and do the work that they sent us here to do. Most importantly, get our economy moving.

I come from Michigan, where countless of my fellow citizens have lost their jobs and many have also lost their health care. The resolution that we are considering today will not create one job. It will not help one person get health care for their family. It will do nothing to allay the concerns of seniors who are worried about their Medicare. It will do nothing to get our economy moving again. It will simply inflame a debate that should have been over when President Obama accepted JOE WILSON's apology.

We can do better. The American people can do better. And, hopefully, in this teachable moment, we will learn.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the Republican Conference chairman, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

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

Mr. PENCE. I rise today in opposition to the resolution of disapproval of Mr. WILSON. A friend of mine back in Indiana likes to say that Washington, D.C., is 100 square miles surrounded by reality. That never felt truer than it does today.

Think about it. Our economy is struggling, families are hurting, and Congress is poised to demand an apology from a man who has already apologized. Extraordinary.

First, let me stipulate that JOE WILSON is a good man and a man of integrity. He is a devoted husband to his beloved Roxanne, a proud father of four American servicemen.

I have traveled with JOE into some pretty tight spots, like many of my Democrat colleagues have. I have seen his devotion to our soldiers. I have never failed to be inspired by his love for the men and women of this country in uniform, his love of his country, and his constituents.

The Old Book tells us a harsh word stirs up anger. We might have seen a little bit of that last week. In the midst of a highly partisan speech by the President of the United States, JOE made a mistake. Immediately after the speech was over, JOE recognized his mistake and he offered his sincere apology to the President and the President's staff. And he was right to apologize. But it's important to note that, despite his admitted error, the broader national interest was actually served.

The American people didn't send us here just to get along. They sent us here to get it right. Ironically, because of JOE WILSON's outburst, we have been engaged in nearly a week-long debate about what's really in H.R. 3200. In fact, now the American people know there's nothing in the Democrat's bill

in the House that requires an individual to verify their identity or citizenship, leaving open the very possibility of undocumented workers receiving health care benefits. This was concurred in by the Congressional Research Service that noted in the absence "of a provision in the bill specifying the verification procedure, undocumented immigrants could receive taxpayer-subsidized health benefits."

If you need any further proof, the White House clarified their position last Friday, stating their support for verification expressly of an individual's citizenship.

Despite the controversy and the sound and the fury, Congress has a shot to get it a little more right than they would have otherwise.

Let me speak, as I close, about the broader issue of bringing this resolution to the floor of the Congress today. I was home in Indiana yesterday. Hoosiers were shocked with the news that one of our most storied companies, Eli Lilly and Company, was announcing 5,500 layoffs.

I was in Evansville, Indiana, in August, on the very day that Whirlpool announced they were closing a factory and sending more than a thousand jobs out of that city and out of this country forever.

More than 2 million jobs have been lost since the so-called stimulus bill was passed. Fifteen million Americans were out of work. Yet here we are, taking time in the people's House to demand an apology from a man who has already apologized.

The American people want better. The American people want less politics and more jobs. They want Congress to set aside petty partisan politics and come together to take action to get this economy moving again.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

□ 1700

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BOEHNER. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. PENCE. Last Wednesday was not a good day in the House, but today is worse. Today we see politics overwhelming this institution. The American people are tired.

So let me say again, without the din of the gavel, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this resolution, put attention back on the work that the American people sent us here to perform, and that is to serve the interests of their families and the interests of this Nation with everything we've got. I'm with JOE; vote "no."

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of our time.

Mr. Speaker, over the month of August, when Members were home in their districts, the American people were speaking loudly, and both Democrats and Republicans heard the mes-

sage, I think, loud and clear. But as we stand here today, I would think the American people are probably looking at us wondering, do they really understand?

The American people are saying enough is enough; enough of the politics here in Washington, enough of the spending, enough of the big government takeover. And yet, here we are on the floor of the House today debating a resolution that should not be here, putting a man's name in the record books of disapproving of his behavior.

The gentleman from South Carolina admitted that he had made a mistake; he called the President and apologized. And yet, here we are on the floor of the House of Representatives debating a resolution describing his behavior. I think it's wrong. And I think we will rue the day that we set this precedent and brought this resolution to the floor.

I would just ask all my colleagues to remember what it is that we're doing here and the precedent that's being set. It's wrong. So I would ask all my colleagues to do the right thing, to stand up and to vote "no" on this resolution. Let's all respect our colleague who admitted his mistake and apologized. Let's all respect him. And the way that we do that is to vote "no" on this resolution.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to close this discussion today using the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican leader earlier referenced the great preacher whose reference can be found in the third chapter of the Book of Ecclesiastes. He said there's a time and a place for everything. I agree with that. I believe very seriously that there is going to be a time for us to discuss health care, a time for us to discuss energy policies, education, and the economy. But Mr. Speaker, the rules of this House provide the vehicle by which we carry out those discussions. If the rules are not honored, if the rules of this House are not there to maintain order, we can never get to these discussions and do so in a way that would make the people of our great country proud.

The gentlelady from Michigan indicated that this is a teachable moment. Yes, it is. This is a time for us to teach—not just by precept, but by example—that which we say to our children, that which we say to our constituents, that there are certain things that you do and certain things that you don't do. And when you do those things that you don't do, the proper thing to do is to show proper contrition, not the way that you may think is proper, but the accepted form of contrition. And the accepted form of contrition when the rules of this body are violated is to come to this floor and to request the apology of these Members. And until that is done, Mr. Speaker, proper contrition has not been made.

My father used to teach me all the time, Son, he would say, The first sign of a good education is good manners. I

took that to heart. And I would hope that this body today would demonstrate to all of those schoolchildren who are looking in on these proceedings that we are here to demonstrate what is proper decorum for you to follow in your classrooms. We must here today support our teachers and help them educate our children.

Silence gives consent. We cannot be silent in this matter, because we do not consent to the conduct of Mr. WILSON.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Resolution.

Congressman WILSON'S outburst was a clear violation of the House rules.

How will we serve as a model of democracy—around the globe, and to our children here at home—if we cannot be the change we seek?

That said—we must focus on the most important issue at hand.

That issue is not the insulting, disrespectful and inappropriate remarks of a single congressman.

It is the lack of hope for 18,000 people in this nation who die each year for one reason: They lack health insurance.

It is the future faced by my neighbor who chooses between paying for his chemotherapy or paying for his groceries.

The debate over Congressman WILSON'S disgraceful remarks does not help one child in Baltimore get treatment for diabetes.

It does not help one senior citizen in Columbia, Maryland, pay for the prescription drugs that Medicare Part D left behind.

This episode has not stopped working, insured Americans from lying awake at night, frightened beyond belief because in the blink of an eye, both their job and insurance could disappear.

Our children are too precious.

Our families are too important.

Our nation is at too critical a crossroads for us to fall prey and be distracted from our goal.

So, I rise in support of this Resolution, not because what Representative WILSON did was reprehensible—though it was—but because all 435 Members have to live by the rules of the House.

I ask that my colleagues join me in support of this resolution and uphold the dignity of this great institution by voting yes.

More importantly, I ask that as soon as we finish this matter, and we join together again, that we finally pass meaningful healthcare reform.

Because nothing could be worse than one more American suffering or dying because they cannot afford the care they need to live.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, Representative JOE WILSON'S outburst at the joint session of Congress last week was inappropriate. However, Representative WILSON has already apologized for his actions. He was right to apologize, and President Obama graciously accepted his apology. Now it's time to move on to the substance of the health care reform bill.

Even President Obama has called for an end to the partisan bickering over the health care bill. However, with the introduction and consideration of this resolution, it is clear that the Democrat leadership has rejected this call.

A majority of Americans oppose the Government-run healthcare plan that the House Democrat leadership is pushing. However, instead

of debating the substance of the bill and addressing the concerns of the American people, it is clear that the majority would rather reopen old wounds with this resolution and divert attention back to an incident that is over.

What is it that the Democrats are trying to divert attention away from? Is it the fact that the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office has declared that their current health care reform proposal, H.R. 3200, "Does not contain any restrictions on noncitizens—whether legally or illegally present, or in the United States temporarily or permanently—participating in the [taxpayer-subsidized health insurance] exchange?" Is it the fact that Republican amendments to make clear that no benefits would be given to illegal aliens were defeated by the Democrats on party-line votes?

Regardless, Speaker PELOSI and the Democrat majority's insistence on demanding an apology from a man who has already apologized is a waste of time at best and a purposeful diversion at worst. The American people deserve better.

We do not have time for these partisan tactics when we should be addressing the grave concerns of the American people about the merits of the current health care reform proposal.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this Resolution of Disapproval. As members of the House of Representatives, it is our responsibility to set an example of civility in our deliberations. We have a diversity of views and we do not always agree. But it is incumbent upon us to respect people and their office, even when we disagree with their views.

Representative WILSON's outburst demonstrated a lack of civility and decorum. It set a poor example for those who have entrusted us with this office. It is worth pointing out that this type of behavior has been increasing in recent months throughout the country. We've seen it on display all summer in town halls and in the disrespectful tone reflected by some radio and television commentators. As members of Congress, we must set an example. We must set the standard for respectful dialogue and disagreement.

Today's resolution is an opportunity for us to come together and reject incivility. Let's turn the page.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adopting House Resolution 744 will be followed by 5-minute votes on motions to suspend the rules with regard to House Resolution 317, if ordered, H.R. 22, and H.R. 3137.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 240, nays 179, answered "present" 5, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 699]

YEAS—240

Abercrombie	Green, Gene	Napolitano
Adler (NJ)	Griffith	Neal (MA)
Altmire	Grijalva	Nye
Andrews	Gutierrez	Oberstar
Baca	Hall (NY)	Obey
Baird	Halvorson	Oliver
Baldwin	Hare	Ortiz
Barrow	Harman	Pallone
Bean	Hastings (FL)	Pastorell
Becerra	Heinrich	Pastor (AZ)
Berkley	Hersteth Sandlin	Payne
Berman	Higgins	Pelosi
Berry	Hill	Perlmutter
Bishop (GA)	Himes	Perriello
Bishop (NY)	Hinojosa	Peters
Blumenauer	Hirono	Peterson
Boccheri	Holden	Petri
Boren	Holt	Pingree (ME)
Boswell	Honda	Polis (CO)
Boucher	Hoyer	Pomeroy
Boyd	Inglis	Price (NC)
Brady (PA)	Insee	Quigley
Bralley (IA)	Israel	Rahall
Bright	Jackson (IL)	Rangel
Brown, Corrine	Jackson-Lee	Reyes
Butterfield	(TX)	Richardson
Cao	Johnson (GA)	Rodriguez
Capps	Johnson, E. B.	Rohrabacher
Capuano	Jones	Ross
Cardoza	Kagen	Rothman (NJ)
Carmahan	Kanjorski	Roybal-Allard
Carney	Kaptur	Ruppersberger
Carson (IN)	Kennedy	Rush
Castor (FL)	Kildee	Ryan (OH)
Chandler	Kilpatrick (MI)	Salazar
Childers	Kilroy	Sanchez, Linda
Chu	Kind	T.
Clarke	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Sanchez, Loretta
Clay	Kissell	Sarbanes
Cleaver	Klein (FL)	Schakowsky
Clyburn	Kosmas	Schauer
Cohen	Kratovil	Schiff
Connolly (VA)	Langevin	Schrader
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Schwartz
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Scott (GA)
Costa	Lee (CA)	Scott (VA)
Costello	Levin	Serrano
Courtney	Lewis (GA)	Sherman
Crowley	Lipinski	Shuler
Cuellar	Loeb sack	Sires
Cummings	Lofgren, Zoe	Slaughter
Dahlkemper	Lowey	Smith (WA)
Davis (AL)	Lujan	Snyder
Davis (CA)	Maloney	Space
Davis (IL)	Markey (CO)	Speier
Davis (TN)	Markey (MA)	Spratt
DeFazio	Marshall	Stark
DeGette	Matheson	Stupak
DeLauro	Matsui	Sutton
Dicks	McCarthy (NY)	Thompson (CA)
Dingell	McCollum	Thompson (MS)
Doggett	McGovern	Tierney
Donnelly (IN)	McIntyre	Titus
Doyle	McMahon	Tonko
Driehaus	McNerney	Towns
Edwards (MD)	Meeke (FL)	Tsongas
Edwards (TX)	Meeke (NY)	Van Hollen
Ellison	Melancon	Visclosky
Ellsworth	Michaud	Walz
Emerson	Miller (NC)	Wasserman
Eshoo	Miller, George	Schultz
Etheridge	Minnick	Watson
Farr	Mitchell	Watt
Fattah	Mollohan	Waxman
Filner	Moore (KS)	Weiner
Flake	Moran (VA)	Welch
Fudge	Murphy (CT)	Wexler
Gonzalez	Murphy (NY)	Wilson (OH)
Gordon (TN)	Murphy, Patrick	Woolsey
Grayson	Murtha	Wu
Green, Al	Nadler (NY)	Yarmuth

NAYS—179

Aderholt	Blackburn	Burgess
Akin	Blunt	Burton (IN)
Alexander	Boehner	Buyer
Arcuri	Bonner	Calvert
Austria	Bono Mack	Camp
Bachmann	Boozman	Campbell
Bachus	Boustany	Cantor
Bartlett	Brady (TX)	Capito
Barton (TX)	Broun (GA)	Carter
Biggett	Brown (SC)	Cassidy
Bilbray	Brown-Waite,	Castle
Bilirakis	Ginny	Chaffetz
Bishop (UT)	Buchanan	Coble

Coffman (CO)	Kline (MN)	Price (GA)
Cole	Kucinich	Putnam
Crenshaw	Lamborn	Radanovich
Culberson	Lance	Rehberg
Davis (KY)	Latham	Reichert
Deal (GA)	LaTourette	Roe (TN)
Delahunt	Latta	Rogers (AL)
Dent	Lee (NY)	Rogers (KY)
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lewis (CA)	Rogers (MI)
Diaz-Balart, M.	Linder	Rooney
Dreier	LoBiondo	Ros-Lehtinen
Duncan	Lucas	Roskam
Ehlers	Luetkemeyer	Royce
Fallin	Lummis	Ryan (WI)
Fleming	Lungren, Daniel	Scalise
Forbes	E.	Schmidt
Fortenberry	Mack	Schock
Fox	Maffei	Sensenbrenner
Franks (AZ)	Manzullo	Sessions
Frelinghuysen	Marchant	Shadegg
Gallegly	Massa	Shimkus
Garrett (NJ)	McCarthy (CA)	Shuster
Gerlach	McCaul	Simpson
Giffords	McClintock	Smith (NE)
Gingrey (GA)	McCotter	Smith (NJ)
Gohmert	McDermott	Smith (TX)
Goodlatte	McHenry	Souder
Granger	McKeon	Stearns
Graves	McMorris	Sullivan
Guthrie	Rodgers	Taylor
Hall (TX)	Mica	Teague
Harper	Miller (FL)	Terry
Hastings (WA)	Miller (MI)	Thompson (PA)
Heller	Miller, Gary	Thornberry
Hensarling	Moore (WI)	Tiahrt
Herger	Moran (KS)	Tiberi
Hinchee	Murphy, Tim	Turner
Hodes	Myrick	Upton
Hunter	Neugebauer	Walden
Issa	Nunes	Wamp
Jenkins	Olson	Westmoreland
Johnson (IL)	Paul	Whitfield
Johnson, Sam	Paulsen	Wilson (SC)
Jordan (OH)	Pence	Wittman
King (IA)	Pitts	Wolf
King (NY)	Platts	Young (AK)
Kingston	Poe (TX)	Young (FL)
Kirk	Posey	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—5

Engel	Frank (MA)	Skelton
Foster	Shea-Porter	

NOT VOTING—10

Ackerman	Lynch	Velázquez
Barrett (SC)	McHugh	Waters
Conaway	Sestak	
Hoeakstra	Tanner	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1732

Mr. BRADY of Texas and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts and Ms. KOSMAS changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING THE KANSAS CITY ANIMAL HEALTH CORRIDOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 317.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOLDEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 317.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 312, nays 108, answered “present” 1, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 700]
YEAS—312

Abercrombie	Dent	Klein (FL)
Adler (NJ)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Kline (MN)
Akin	Diaz-Balart, M.	Kosmas
Alexander	Dicks	Kratovil
Andrews	Donnelly (IN)	Kucinich
Arcuri	Dreier	Lance
Austria	Driehaus	Langevin
Bachmann	Duncan	Larsen (WA)
Baird	Edwards (MD)	Larsen (CT)
Baldwin	Ellison	LaTourette
Bartlett	Ellsworth	Latta
Bean	Emerson	Lee (CA)
Becerra	Engel	Levin
Berkley	Eshoo	Lewis (CA)
Berman	Etheridge	Lipinski
Berry	Fallin	LoBiondo
Biggert	Farr	Loebsack
Bilirakis	Fattah	Lofgren, Zoe
Blackburn	Filner	Lowe
Blunt	Fleming	Lucas
Bocchieri	Forbes	Luetkemeyer
Boehner	Foster	Lujan
Bonner	Fox	Mack
Bono Mack	Frank (MA)	Maffei
Boozman	Frelinghuysen	Maloney
Boren	Gallely	Manzullo
Boswell	Garrett (NJ)	Markey (CO)
Boucher	Gerlach	Markey (MA)
Boustany	Giffords	Massa
Boyd	Goodlatte	Matheson
Brady (PA)	Gordon (TN)	Matsui
Braley (IA)	Graves	McCarthy (CA)
Bright	Grayson	McCarthy (NY)
Brown (SC)	Green, Al	McClintock
Brown, Corrine	Griffith	McCollum
Brown-Waite,	Guthrie	McDermott
Ginny	Gutierrez	McHenry
Buchanan	Hall (NY)	McIntyre
Burton (IN)	Hare	McKeon
Butterfield	Harman	McMorris
Calvert	Hastings (FL)	Rodgers
Campbell	Hastings (WA)	McNerney
Cantor	Heinrich	Meek (FL)
Cao	Heller	Melancon
Capito	Herger	Mica
Capps	Herseth Sandlin	Michaud
Capuano	Higgins	Miller (FL)
Cardoza	Hill	Miller (NC)
Carnahan	Himes	Miller, Gary
Carney	Hinche	Miller, George
Carson (IN)	Hirono	Minnick
Cassidy	Hodes	Mitchell
Castle	Holden	Mollohan
Castor (FL)	Holt	Moore (KS)
Chandler	Hoyer	Moore (WI)
Childers	Hunter	Moran (KS)
Chu	Inglis	Moran (VA)
Clarke	Inslee	Murphy (NY)
Clay	Israel	Murphy, Tim
Cleaver	Jackson (IL)	Murtha
Clyburn	Jackson-Lee	Myrick
Cohen	(TX)	Nadler (NY)
Cole	Jenkins	Neal (MA)
Connolly (VA)	Johnson (GA)	Nye
Conyers	Johnson (IL)	Oberstar
Cooper	Jones	Olver
Costa	Jordan (OH)	Pallone
Costello	Kagen	Pascarell
Crenshaw	Kanjorski	Paulsen
Dahlkemper	Kaptur	Payne
Davis (AL)	Kennedy	Pence
Davis (CA)	Kildee	Perlmutter
Davis (IL)	Kilpatrick (MI)	Peters
Davis (KY)	Kilroy	Peterson
Davis (TN)	Kind	Pingree (ME)
DeFazio	Kirk	Pitts
DeGette	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Platts
Delahunt	Kissell	Polis (CO)

Pomeroy	Schiff	Tiahrt
Posey	Schmidt	Tiberi
Price (NC)	Schock	Tierney
Putnam	Schrader	Titus
Quigley	Schwartz	Tonko
Rangel	Scott (VA)	Towns
Rehberg	Serrano	Tsongas
Reichert	Shea-Porter	Turner
Richardson	Sherman	Van Hollen
Roe (TN)	Shimkus	Van Hollen
Rogers (KY)	Shuler	Visclosky
Rohrabacher	Shuster	Walden
Ros-Lehtinen	Simpson	Walz
Roskam	Skelton	Wamp
Ross	Slaughter	Wasserman
Rothman (NJ)	Smith (NE)	Schultz
Roybal-Allard	Smith (NJ)	Watson
Royce	Smith (WA)	Watt
Ruppersberger	Snyder	Welch
Rush	Souder	Wexler
Ryan (OH)	Speier	Wilson (OH)
Salazar	Spratt	Wilson (SC)
Sanchez, Linda	Stark	Wittman
T.	Sullivan	Wolf
Sanchez, Loretta	Sutton	Woolsey
Sarbanes	Terry	Wu
Scalise	Thompson (CA)	Yarmuth
Schakowsky	Thompson (PA)	Young (AK)

NAYS—108

Aderholt	Gohmert	Ortiz
Altmire	Gonzalez	Pastor (AZ)
Baca	Granger	Paul
Bachus	Green, Gene	Perriello
Barrow	Hall (TX)	Petri
Barton (TX)	Halvorson	Poe (TX)
Bilbray	Harper	Price (GA)
Bishop (GA)	Hensarling	Radanovich
Bishop (NY)	Hinojosa	Rahall
Bishop (UT)	Honda	Reyes
Blumenauer	Issa	Rodriguez
Brady (TX)	Johnson, E. B.	Rogers (AL)
Broun (GA)	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (MI)
Burgess	King (IA)	Rooney
Buyer	King (NY)	Ryan (WI)
Camp	Kingston	Schauer
Carter	Lamborn	Scott (GA)
Chaffetz	Latham	Sensenbrenner
Coble	Lee (NY)	Sessions
Coffman (CO)	Lewis (GA)	Shadegg
Courtney	Linder	Shade
Crowley	Lummis	Sires
Cuellar	Lungren, Daniel	Smith (TX)
Culberson	E.	Space
Cummings	Marchant	Stearns
Deal (GA)	Marshall	Stupak
DeLauro	McCaul	Taylor
Dingell	McCotter	Teague
Doggett	McGovern	Thompson (MS)
Doyle	McMahon	Thornberry
Edwards (TX)	Miller (MI)	Upton
Ehlers	Murphy (CT)	Waxman
Flake	Murphy, Patrick	Weiner
Fortenberry	Napolitano	Westmoreland
Franks (AZ)	Neugebauer	Whitfield
Fudge	Nunes	Young (FL)
Gingrey (GA)	Olson	

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Obey

NOT VOTING—12

Ackerman	Hoekstra	Sestak
Barrett (SC)	Lynch	Tanner
Conaway	McHugh	Velázquez
Grijalva	Meeks (NY)	Waters

□ 1744

Messrs. DOGGETT, MCMAHON, HARPER, HENSARLING, KING of Iowa and LAMBORN changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. CHILDERS changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

Mr. PRICE of Georgia changed his vote from “present” to “nay.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE FINANCIAL RELIEF ACT OF 2009

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 22, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 22, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 388, nays 32, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 701]
YEAS—388

Abercrombie	Clyburn	Guthrie
Aderholt	Coble	Gutierrez
Adler (NJ)	Coffman (CO)	Hall (NY)
Alexander	Cohen	Hall (TX)
Altmire	Cole	Halvorson
Andrews	Connolly (VA)	Hare
Arcuri	Conyers	Harman
Austria	Cooper	Harper
Baca	Costa	Hastings (FL)
Bachmann	Costello	Hastings (WA)
Bachus	Courtney	Heinrich
Baird	Crenshaw	Herger
Baldwin	Crowley	Herseth Sandlin
Barrow	Cuellar	Higgins
Bean	Cummings	Hill
Becerra	Dahlkemper	Himes
Berkley	Davis (AL)	Hinche
Berman	Davis (CA)	Hinojosa
Berry	Davis (IL)	Hirono
Biggert	Davis (KY)	Hodes
Bilbray	Davis (TN)	Holden
Bilirakis	Deal (GA)	Holt
Bishop (GA)	DeFazio	Honda
Bishop (NY)	DeGette	Hoyer
Bishop (UT)	Delahunt	Hunter
Blackburn	DeLauro	Inglis
Blumenauer	Dent	Inslee
Blunt	Diaz-Balart, L.	Israel
Bocchieri	Diaz-Balart, M.	Issa
Bonner	Dicks	Jackson (IL)
Bono Mack	Dingell	Jackson-Lee
Boozman	Doggett	(TX)
Boren	Donnelly (IN)	Jenkins
Boswell	Doyle	Johnson (GA)
Boucher	Dreier	Johnson (IL)
Boustany	Driehaus	Johnson, E. B.
Boyd	Edwards (MD)	Jones
Brady (PA)	Edwards (TX)	Jordan (OH)
Braley (IA)	Ehlers	Kagen
Bright	Ellison	Kanjorski
Brown (SC)	Ellsworth	Kaptur
Brown, Corrine	Emerson	Kennedy
Brown-Waite,	Engel	Kildee
Ginny	Eshoo	Kilpatrick (MI)
Buchanan	Etheridge	Kilroy
Burgess	Fallin	Kind
Burton (IN)	Farr	King (IA)
Butterfield	Fattah	King (NY)
Buyer	Filner	Kirk
Calvert	Fleming	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Camp	Forbes	Kissell
Campbell	Fortenberry	Klein (FL)
Cantor	Foster	Kline (MN)
Cao	Fox	Kosmas
Capito	Frank (MA)	Kratovil
Capps	Frelinghuysen	Kucinich
Capuano	Fudge	Lance
Carnahan	Gallely	Langevin
Carney	Garrett (NJ)	Larsen (WA)
Carson (IN)	Gerlach	Latham
Carter	Giffords	LaTourette
Cassidy	Gingrey (GA)	Latta
Castle	Gohmert	Lee (CA)
Castor (FL)	Gonzalez	Lee (NY)
Chaffetz	Goodlatte	Levin
Chandler	Gordon (TN)	Lewis (CA)
Childers	Granger	Lewis (GA)
Chu	Graves	Linder
Clarke	Grayson	Lipinski
Clay	Green, Al	LoBiondo
Cleaver	Green, Gene	Loebsack
	Griffith	Lofgren, Zoe

Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCullum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver

NAYS—32

Akin
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Boehner
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Culberson
Duncan
Flake
Franks (AZ)
Heller

NOT VOTING—13

Ackerman
Barrett (SC)
Conaway
Grijalva
Hoekstra

□ 1751

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to reduce the amount that the United States Postal Service is required to pay into the Postal Service Retiree Health Benefits Fund by the end of fiscal year 2009."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALLOWING UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE TO ACCEPT DONATIONS FOR PLAQUES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3137, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. Towns) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3137.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 414, nays 0, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 702]

YEAS—414

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Billray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Bocchieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Chu

Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCullum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mittelbach
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver

NOT VOTING—19

Ackerman
Barrett (SC)
Berman
Blumenauer
Boustany
Clarke
Conaway

□ 1759

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3246, ADVANCED VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY ACT OF 2009

Mr. POLIS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-255) on the resolution (H.

Res. 745) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3246) to provide for a program of research, development, demonstration, and commercial application in vehicle technologies at the Department of Energy, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3221, STUDENT AID AND FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF 2009

Mr. POLIS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-256) on the resolution (H. Res. 746) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3221) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 1800

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 744.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MASSA). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 648

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of House Resolution 648.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2480

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 2480.

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

There was no objection.

THE WAR IN AFGHANISTAN

(Mr. QUIGLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, today the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Mike Mullen, told Congress that he needed more troops to succeed in Afghanistan. He's probably right, just like Army Chief of Staff Eric Shinseki was right when he said we needed more troops in Iraq.

But just as we failed to ask the tough strategic questions about Iraq, it is my

sincere belief that we are now failing to ask the tough strategic questions about Afghanistan.

Colin Powell said, "When we go to war, we should have a purpose our people understand and support."

Do we have that today in Afghanistan? Every time we send a young American over for a tour of duty, we are deciding to go to war over and over again. The question is, Does the American public understand and support that decision? Do we as a body understand and support the long-term strategy behind the war in Afghanistan? Or has the people's House gone on autopilot, deciding to debate only numbers and not the bigger questions of why, how, and when this Nation should go to war?

HONORING THE 15TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am here to support House Resolution 738, honoring the 15th anniversary of the enactment of the Violence Against Women Act.

Violence against women is one of the world's most widespread human rights violations. It is a pandemic that can be stopped, but it requires dedicated political will and resources. As long as women across the globe continue to struggle to break through the shame and silence that surrounds the violence, we must continue to put it on every national and global agenda.

Violence against women fractures communities, devastates lives, and robs the gifts and potential of millions of women and girls. It is an issue that demands our utmost attention and our undivided priority.

Together we must continue our efforts to end this scourge on society and turn violence against women into an extinct crime rather than a global pandemic. Only then will women be able to live free of violence, which is a fundamental human right.

HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

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

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker and distinguished colleagues, the rich heritage of our Hispanic citizens has enriched the fabric of our culture since before there was a United States of America. From the old Spanish forts of Florida to today's vibrant communities of East Los Angeles in my own district, Latino culture has been, and continues to be, an important part of our national identity.

Our diversity is the key to our strength, and America would not be the great Nation it is without the passion, ingenuity, and perseverance of the millions of immigrants who have

come to our shores looking for a better life.

The values of our Hispanic communities, those of hard work, strength of character, commitment to family and country, are also American values. And today the entrepreneurial spirit of our 47.5 million Hispanic Americans is an integral part of our economic recovery.

So I ask my fellow colleagues to join me today as we recognize the beginning of Hispanic Heritage Month and to stand proudly with me in acknowledging that the Hispanic Dream and the American Dream are one and the same.

HONORING MAYOR BILL WELCH

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a man who was an example of what was the best of what is journalism and politics. Mayor Bill Welch of State College, Pennsylvania, passed away September 4 at age 67. In 2002 Welch was named Penn State's Renaissance Man of the Year, and I believe that title may be one of the best descriptions of the man.

After his 1964 graduation from Penn State, he became a reporter for the Centre Daily Times. He went on to become news editor, managing editor, and editor. A reporter from the newspaper quoted Welch as saying: "Commit to something greater than yourself. Do not shy away from differences. Seek them out." His work at the paper reflected that thought.

He went on to run for borough councilman and was elected mayor in 1994. He wore a signature panama hat and carried humor, intelligence, selflessness, and goodwill to everything he tried. Welch ran unopposed for the Democratic nomination for mayor in this year's primary and won the Republican nomination through write-ins. That probably sums up his command of politics.

At a time when parties are polarized, Welch was a man of the people. And he will be missed.

AUDITING THE FEDERAL RESERVE IS LONG OVERDUE

(Mr. GRAYSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, it was announced earlier today that there will be a hearing on H.R. 1207, the bill to audit the Federal Reserve Bank. This will be the first independent audit in the Federal Reserve's 96-year history, and it's long overdue.

Months ago I asked the Vice Chairman of the Federal Reserve, Who received the \$1 trillion in funds that the Federal Reserve has handed out to domestic institutions?

He said, I'm not going to tell you.

Then more recently to the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, I asked him,

Who received the half trillion, and we're talking about \$500 billion, that the Federal Reserve handed over to foreign central banks? Whom did they disseminate that money to?

And he said, I don't know.

Half a trillion dollars and he doesn't know.

It's long overdue. We need to audit the Federal Reserve, and I am happy to say that we're going to have a hearing on that very soon.

LET'S GET BACK TO THE BUSINESS OF CONGRESS

(Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, over the past several years we repeatedly hear politicians during debate using increasingly harsh words. Verbal attacks are rewarded with sound bites on the evening news and a bump in polling numbers, public profile, and fund-raising. Then like Pavlov's dog, we salivate at the next opportunity for a verbal attack. But to what end?

If there is anywhere that decorum in debate has a place, it is in the Chamber of the House of Representatives, with respectful discourse. When we focus only on the anger, we lose legitimacy as thoughtful legislators. We are tasked with maintaining a standard of cooperation and civility rather than insult and hostility. Both sides, both parties, all of us, must focus on changing for the better and set the example for our country, for the public, and for our people.

During this session of Congress alone, over a dozen resolutions have been brought up to attack, embarrass, and deride Members of Congress. In the meantime our Nation is faced with unemployment in record numbers, an ailing stock market, a health care crisis, growing debt, and two wars. That is the work of Congress. That is what the American people want us to address. Anything less is unacceptable. Period.

Let's all stop the name-calling and shouting. We've got work to do.

RECOGNIZING CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL OF MINNESOTA

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, as part of Children's Cancer Awareness Month, I rise to call attention to the innovative work of Children's Hospitals and Clinics of Minnesota.

Each year in the United States, there are approximately 12,400 children who will develop cancer before their 20th birthday. Children's Hospital is helping to combat cancer by embracing a simple motto: "better journey, better outcomes." They believe that the more you can help a child by simply being a kid during treatment, the more likely the cancer will be defeated.

Children's Integrative Medicine Program treats children dealing with all types of illnesses and injuries, bringing together the best therapies to help kids and their families. Most importantly, Children's gets results. Their treatment results are consistently among the best in the Nation.

Finding out a child has cancer is a terrifying moment for any family. I am proud to recognize that an institution that is working so hard to bring new approaches and a unique philosophy to families facing this terrible disease is successful in helping children get back to living their lives cancer-free.

TIME TO GET DOWN TO THE BUSINESS OF CONGRESS

(Mr. PERLMUTTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I just heard my friend from Pennsylvania (Mr. TIM MURPHY) talk about the business that really does involve the House, involve the Nation, and really the world, and it's time to get down to business, stop the name-calling, and proceed with the difficult chores we have at hand.

I couldn't agree with him more, and I thank him for his 1-minute.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. JONES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

COUNTRIES REFUSE TO TAKE BACK LAWFULLY DEPORTED FOREIGN NATIONALS

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, America needs to do a better job of protecting our borders. It is the job of the Federal Government to do so. And the Federal Government must do a better job of keeping criminals out in the first place.

The Federal Government needs to make sure we deport foreign nationals

after they have served their time and after they've been convicted in American prisons.

But there is a problem and let me explain. Right now foreign nationals who commit serious crimes in our country and are convicted and go to our prisons, while they are in prison, they are lawfully deported by our immigration judges. That's a good thing. And after they have served their time, of course, it's time for them to go back to where they came from.

But right now there are several countries that won't take back lawfully convicted foreign nationals. Those countries are Vietnam, Jamaica, China, India, Ethiopia, Laos, and Iran. These countries won't take back their convicted criminals. These individuals are really people without a country. So what happens to them? Because they have served their time in our Federal and State prisons for felonies, they are actually released back into our communities. They are people without a country.

Right now there are over 160,000 of these criminal aliens roaming our Nation and our streets. These people have been lawfully deported after they've served their prison time, but their home nation refuses to take them back.

So I am introducing legislation that will plug up this loophole. My bill will make it a lot more likely they will go back where they came from. This bill says that any country who won't take back lawfully convicted foreign nationals who have been deported will lose foreign aid. But China, for example, doesn't receive foreign aid; so what will happen to China is they will not receive legal visas for their citizens to come into the United States.

□ 1815

No more student visas for China if they won't take back their convicted criminals that have been deported. None whatsoever.

The current law says the State Department may deny visas under these circumstances, but the State Department seems to refuse to send individuals back to their lawfully deported countries because, I guess, China, for example, is a trading partner and they don't want to hurt the feelings of China.

My bill won't allow the State Department to ignore that portion of the law. Therefore, it will be mandatory. If they refuse to take back convicted foreign nationals, that nation will lose the right to come here legally. We need to make sure that these individuals don't come here in the first place, especially the criminal element. All sorts of dangerous things are coming across our wide-open borders. The possibilities are endless for what could be just walking across our southern border.

We know about the human and sex trafficking, the drugs, the guns, the dirty money and the like. But what about chemical and biological or nuclear materials? Do we know? Well, we

really don't know. We live in a dangerous world, and the criminal cartels that run loose on the southern border to me are just as dangerous to this Nation as the Taliban, and they are just as ruthless. Right now, they are in our own backyard.

In Texas, we are doing what we can on our own. Last week, the Governor of the State sent the Texas Rangers down to the southern border. They are being deployed in high traffic, high crime areas. The Governor has asked the National Guard to support the Texas Rangers. The Highway Patrol, the Department of Public Safety, aviation resources, and the Texas sheriffs are all part of this team to prevent the criminal element from coming into the United States. But our local law enforcement is overwhelmed, so the Federal Government needs to get its priorities straight.

Recently, at one of my town halls in August, talking about health care, an individual showed up and people in that town hall recognized who he was. His name was Ignacio Ramos. He and his wife, Monica, came just to appear at that town hall. When individuals in that town hall saw who he was, they stood, Mr. Speaker, for over 5 minutes and applauded the work of Ignacio Ramos and his partner and the work that they had done on the southern border of Texas. He and his partner, Jose Compean, were U.S. Border Patrol officers jailed for shooting a Mexican drug dealer. Their sentences were commuted, and properly so, by the prior administration. But it shows, Mr. Speaker, that our Federal Government doesn't have its priorities in order. They have them backwards.

One of the few things that our Constitution actually requires the Federal Government to do is to protect the national security of this Nation. Border security is a national security issue, and foreign criminals that have committed crimes in this Nation and been lawfully deported should be sent back home. We should do the obvious things first when it comes to national security. If a foreign national commits a felony in the United States and is deported but the home nation refuses to take back its outlaw, that country should lose foreign aid and the legal right to have its citizens come into the United States under our visa program.

And that's just the way it is.

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

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THOROUGH INVESTIGATION OF ACORN WARRANTED

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I am only going to speak for about a minute because I am going to be a little bit redundant.

The last couple of nights we have been talking about the ACORN organization. The ACORN organization over the past couple of decades got, you know, 30, 40, 50 million dollars for their services, quote/unquote. Now in the last authorization and appropriation bills, they have gotten \$8.5 billion, and this is an organization in just the last couple of weeks we found has been corrupt. They have been extolling the virtues of setting up a prostitution ring with young women coming into the country or being brought into the country illegally. And it is caught on television. It is caught on tapes.

It is really tragic that an organization like that should have any amount of legitimacy, let alone get taxpayers' dollars.

Tonight, I come here for a minute to say we need a thorough investigation of ACORN and why they have been authorized to get up to \$8.5 billion in taxpayers' money for the services that they perform. There is something funny going on here, and a lot of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have been reluctant to move towards an investigation. And the White House hasn't said much about this. I think probably because the President was the beneficiary of a lot of support from the ACORN organization when he was running for President.

Nevertheless, this should be investigated very thoroughly. We should not have a corrupt organization, known to be corrupt, proven to be corrupt. You see it every night on television. We should make sure that they don't get one dime of taxpayer dollars, and since they have been getting this money and we have authorized \$8.5 billion more for them to be able to utilize, there needs to be an investigation.

Now, the leader, the Republican leader of the House, has authored a letter which has been signed by many Members of the minority. I would urge Members on the majority side of the aisle to join with us in signing that letter requesting an investigation. This is something that should be done. It should not be postponed. We should get to the bottom of why ACORN got this money and why they have been doing what they have been doing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

PRAYER IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

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

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday of this week in the United States District Court of Northern Virginia, in Florida, Pensacola Division, a principal who served his school district for 30 years and an athletic director who served them for 40 years in a little school district in Santa Rosa County will be carried to a hearing in Federal court.

So why did over 60 Members of Congress today sign the letter standing with that principal and that athletic director and against this Federal judge? Why is it different than so many other cases? Why is it special? Because, Mr. Speaker, it is one of the first times we have literally had the potential for the criminalization of prayer in the United States of America.

What was the big crime that this principal and athletic director did? What was the great offense? This school principal, with 30 years of service, asked the athletic director of the school, who had 40 years of service, to offer a blessing before a meal that was being held for private donors to the school's athletic program.

The Federal judge for this court has set a date for this Thursday, suggesting that they could be punished with a \$5,000 fine, 6 months in prison, and the revocation of their retirement benefits. Why? Because one of them prayed. Why? Because one of them asked for the prayer. In fact, under the order issued by this judge in this court, this principal would not have been able to ask the President of the United States to speak at the school if the President concluded his speech, as he often does, with the phrase "God bless America."

If this action is allowed to stand, make no mistake, there will come a day when the Speaker of this House will be hauled into Federal court and threatened with jail because she dares to stand at that podium where you stand tonight and ask our chaplain to start our day with the prayer.

If this case stands, there will come a day when that chaplain is carried to court and threatened with jail because he offers that prayer he is asked to offer.

How far we've come from the day when 56 of the greatest Americans ever birthed pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor to defend a set of rights that ultimately gave us the right to stand on this floor tonight, a set of rights that have guided this Nation through darkness and through the light. But most of all, a set of rights given to us by the very Creator, the mention of whom by this principal or this athletic director could now lead them to a jail term.

Mr. Speaker, tonight we need to ask how far we have come. And if we do, the answer is clear: Too far. It is time for Americans to simply say enough is enough.

PRAYER IMPORTANT PART OF
OUR SOCIETY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, prayer has been an important part of our country since the founding of our great Nation, and attempts to take prayer away from the American people are attempts to take away the essential freedoms that have been guaranteed to every American since the beginning of our United States Constitution.

I thank Mr. FORBES for bringing this to the attention of this body, and I share his shock, I share his dismay that criminal charges were brought on behalf of Mrs. Winkler, Mr. Lay and Mr. Freeman for the simple act of engaging in prayer.

As the court explained in Santa Fe, not all religious speech that occurs in public schools or at school-sponsored events is speech attributable to government. There were no students present at either event.

Additionally, the court held the proposition that schools do not endorse everything they fail to censor is not complicated. The Supreme Court held that "there is a crucial difference between government speech endorsing religion, which the establishment clause forbids, and private speech endorsing religion, which the free speech and free exercise clauses protect."

In no way were these individuals trying to associate the school with prayer. They were offering the prayer, one at a privately funded event, the other at an event with private donors. The court held that "private religious speech, far from being a First Amendment orphan, is as fully protected under the free speech clause as secular private expression."

Teachers and administrators, when they act in their official capacity, may not encourage or discourage or participate in prayer with students. However, teachers may take part in religious activities before or after school or during lunch since the context makes clear they are not acting in an official capacity. Although schools may not direct or endorse religious activities, students do not shed their constitutional rights to freedom of speech or expression at the schoolhouse gate.

Mr. Speaker, the problem is that this displays a trend and a tendency that we are seeing where groups like the ACLU strike at one school district after another, one public display of religious expression after another, until they have reached their ultimate goal, which is to purge the marketplace of ideas of any semblance of religious expression. At that point, Mr. Speaker, we will have turned the First Amendment on its head, and the Founders in turn will be rolling in their graves.

PACE HIGH SCHOOL PRAYER

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

tleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, there is trouble brewing in the small community of Pace, Florida, a community of less than 8,000 people just south of my hometown, and full of hard-working Americans where I believe a Federal judge has gone well outside the bounds of the Constitution to declare that prayer offered among adults is illegal. That's right. The judicial branch is once again trying to act like the legislative branch, and in doing so is hindering the First Amendment rights of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I am not a lawyer and this is not a courtroom, but as a Member of Congress, I swore to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. And so help me God, that is what I intend to do.

The facts of the case in *Does v. School Board of Santa Rosa County* are clear. The Federal district court, without a hearing, issued an injunction preventing any school employee from promoting or facilitating prayer at any school-sponsored event. That action alone tramples upon the First Amendment rights of a specific group of people, denying them the equal protection that is provided under the very Constitution that we believe in.

The same Federal district court has now gone on to prohibit all employees from engaging in prayer or religious activities. The same court now thinks that Pace High School Principal Frank Lay and Athletic Director Robert Freeman violated this injunction at a private event with zero student participation. That the court would somehow consider this action to be criminal behavior is simply unconscionable.

However, Frank Lay and Robert Freeman now face criminal contempt charges for praying before a meal that was to be shared. All of this despite the fact that the Supreme Court itself has found that the free speech clause protects private religious speech. The Supreme Court has further gone to find that not all religious speech that occurs in public schools or at a school-sponsored event is attributable to the government.

As lawmakers, we cannot sit idly by and let this happen. As Members of Congress, we must act to uphold the Constitution. And as Americans, we must fight to ensure that our rights to freedom of religion and freedom of speech are not taken away.

America is a Nation of principles. We can sit here all night and argue about whether we are a Nation of Judeo-Christian principles or of secular principles. But the fact is that our Constitution protects all Americans and a court has no place deciding that some Americans do not warrant those protections. The Founding Fathers would be appalled, and I certainly am as well.

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

tleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PRICE of Georgia addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TIM MURPHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

FREEDOM OF PRAYER

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address an issue that Americans from the time of our Founders found fundamental in the forming of our country. That issue is the freedom of prayer as it relates to that right as defined under our Constitution in Amendment 1, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Tomorrow, in the State of Florida, two men, including the Pace High School principal and athletic director, face criminal contempt charges for prayer offered at a fieldhouse luncheon for private contributors in which no students were present.

The right to practice religion is among the most fundamental of the freedoms guaranteed by the Bill of Rights. While this right is guaranteed through our Constitution under the legislative authority and responsibility of the legislative branch, it was the judicial branch and judges, I would argue, without constitutional authority, legislating from the bench, that imposed an unconstitutional infringement on the rights of teachers, administrators, and students to free exercise of their religion.

This outrageous action was driven by a lawsuit filed by the ACLU against the Santa Rosa County School District, claiming that some teachers and administrators were endorsing religion in their schools. The school district entered into an agreement without any legal argument that prohibited prayer at all school-sponsored events and even prohibited all employees from engaging in prayer. Prohibited individuals from praying.

Principal Franklin Lay and Athletic Director Robert Freeman offered a prayer. The prayer was offered innocently, without intent to violate the order, and they didn't do it to take a stand against the order. They did not realize the order applied to them in such a way—a prayer before a meal at an event with private contributors in which no students were present.

The U.S. District Court initiated criminal contempt proceedings and the

two men face potentially fines, jail time, and loss of their retirement benefits for exercising a right guaranteed under the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, this is wrong. I stand with Principal Lay and Athletic Director Freeman to their right granted under our Constitution in Amendment 1 to freely exercise their religion and specifically to pray.

Mr. Speaker, I pray that we return to a time when our constitutional right to pray is honored, recognized, and, at the very least, not criminalized.

DANGEROUS WORDS

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, this body today has voted by a majority to disapprove of JOE WILSON's comment. It is important to always take things in context. And, in reviewing the context, we have to notice that we had a President of the United States for whom we pray as Christians. We're supposed to do that—and we do. And we respect the office. And he was not happy with the way things were going with regard to his health care proposal.

The American people seemed to have made pretty clear through August this was not something they wanted. So the President basically demanded to come into this House. Well, he can't come unless he's invited—an invited guest. So an invitation was issued because he wanted to come speak. And he did.

Now there are rules about proper decorum in here, whether you're an invited guest or whether you are a Member of Congress. But, as Members, this is where our voters voted to send us. So we're supposed to be here.

The President came in. And the truth is, I really had mixed emotions because I knew that on Monday the President had taken a shot and actually used the L word. He had said that—actually, his words were, "You've heard the lies. I've got a question for all those folks. What are you going to do? What's your answer? What's your solution? And, you know, what? They don't have one."

Well, it was not appropriate to say that we were lying about the proposal when we have taken the only proposal that we have, H.R. 3200, and read from it, and then we're told we're lying about the content and we have no solutions.

Well, I would never say the President was lying when he said no solutions because that would infer that he knew that what he said was not true. Whoever put that line in his teleprompter should know that it's not true, but I won't attach that to the President.

But you look at the speech. We heard the speech. He said, "Instead of honest debate, we've seen scare tactics." We're dishonest because we take the thousand-page bill and read from it, and that's dishonest? That's scare tactics?

We're told by the President in our House that we're trying to score short-

term political points, even if it robs the country. Now we're robbing the country, trying to score short-term points.

He goes on. That's not enough to come into somebody else's house as an invited guest, and he talks about all the misinformation. So we're spreading misinformation, he says.

He goes on, the very next paragraph, he's talking about our bogus claims spread by those who want to kill. Now we're robbers and killers. And then he laps at the prominent politicians for being cynical and irresponsible. And, yes, immediately before JOE WILSON spoke, he used the L word, said, It's a lie, plain and simple.

Those are dangerous words to be saying things like that and to come in and be poisoning this well. He had poisoned the American people, talking about lies on Monday. He comes in here and talked about a lie here. He goes on to say we're making wild claims. These were his words. And then talks about our demagoguery and our distortion, talks about our tall tales.

Then, a surprise. He says, When facts and reason are thrown overboard, we can no longer even engage in a civil conversation. He talks about acrimony. And that's the context of JOE WILSON's comments.

That's no way to act, Mr. Speaker, when you're invited into somebody else's house and you come in and use all these words to slander them. That wasn't being very nice.

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

(Mr. NEUGEBAUER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

SANTA ROSA COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT SCHOOL PRAYER CASE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. I want to add to the comments of my colleagues to briefly discuss a court case that may have ramifications for the constitutional rights of religious expression of all Americans.

On August 27, 2008, the ACLU filed a complaint against the Santa Rosa County School Board in Florida, seeking to enjoin the parties from endorsing and engaging in religious activities, including prayer.

The school district consented to an agreement prohibiting prayer at school-sponsored events. The school district then entered into a broader agreement prohibiting all employees from engaging in prayer or religious activities.

Michelle Winkler, a clerical assistant in the Santa Rosa County School District, attended a privately funded event

to honor non-instructional employees in the school district. She asked her husband, who's not an employee of the district, to read a prayer that she had written, and was charged with civil contempt of court.

Pace High School Principal Frank Lay and Athletic Director Robert Freeman were charged with criminal contempt for a prayer offered at a luncheon to honor private contributors to the school's athletic program. There were no students present at either of these two events.

In 2003, the Secretary of the Department of Education issued "Guidance on Constitutionally Protected Prayer in Public and Elementary and Secondary Schools." These guidelines state that public school officials must be neutral in their treatment of religion, showing neither favoritism nor hostility.

The Supreme Court held that "there is a crucial difference between government speech endorsing religion, which the establishment clause forbids, and private speech endorsing religion, which the free speech and free exercise clauses protect."

The court also held that "private religious speech, far from being a First Amendment orphan, is as fully protected under the free speech clause as secular private expression."

In its Santa Fe ruling, the court explained that not all religious speech that occurs in public schools or at school-sponsored events is speech attributable to the government. Additionally, the court held that "the proposition that schools do not endorse everything they fail to censor is not complicated."

Although schools may not direct or endorse religious activities, students do not "shed their constitutional rights to freedom of speech or expression at the schoolhouse gate."

Yes, teachers and administrators, while acting in their official capacity, may not encourage, discourage, or participate in prayer with students. However, teachers may take part in religious activities before or after school or during lunch, as the context makes clear they are not acting in an official capacity.

The circumstances involved in this case have unmasked the agenda of the ACLU. Students were not present in either event, yet contempt charges were brought against all parties. Mrs. Winkler was targeted for a prayer that her husband read, even though he was not an employee of the school district.

Mr. Lay and Mr. Freeman face penalties of 6 months in jail and loss of their retirement benefits for an innocent prayer said before a meal at which no students were present.

America was founded on the principle of religious liberty, and the constitutional protection of this right does not stop when they enter the doors of our public schools.

The ACLU is targeting small counties, towns, and school districts, not in an effort to protect against establishment clause violations, but to stifle religious expression.

As John F. Kennedy said during his inaugural address, “The trumpet summons us again to bear the burden of a long twilight struggle.” He spoke of foreign enemies who posed a threat to our Nation’s freedoms, but this case shows that this threat has become a reality here at home.

THE MAJORITY MAKERS: WHAT WE DID ON OUR SUMMER VACATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, it’s a great honor to be here tonight to join with at least one of my colleagues from the class of 2006, the Majority Makers, to discuss the theme: What we did on our summer vacations.

As everyone knows, it has been a very fascinating few months, as we in Congress and people throughout the country have talked about how we can solve one of the great problems that this country has been trying to deal with for generations, and that is a health care system that serves every one of its citizens.

I, like all of my colleagues in the House, have spent the greater part of August talking with my constituents. We have had town hall meetings, we have had telephone town hall meetings, we’ve met with groups, we’ve met with providers, we’ve met with individual citizens to talk about the problems facing Americans—the challenge of finding quality, affordable health care for every citizen.

I think what was most revealing to me as I spent all of this time talking about health care with my constituents is how receptive they were and are to comprehensive health care reform once they understand, first of all, the need for reform; secondly, the direct benefit to them and their families of the reform that we’re proposing in the House; and, third, the relevance of health care to our economic future.

□ 1845

President Obama, in this Chamber last Wednesday night, discussed those very themes, and he did it in a very compelling way. I think anyone who watched that speech would have to have left it feeling, one, we can wait no longer to make major reforms in our health care system, that the trajectory that we’re on now is an unsustainable one, that we are facing extraordinarily high costs for insurance, we are facing extraordinarily high deficits in Medicare, and that we have to act now in order to mitigate the disaster that we face if we don’t act.

Secondly, the absolute challenge—and I think the national shame—that we have that 18,000 Americans die every year because they don’t have health insurance or access to care, the

absolute shame in this country that almost 1 million people are forced to file bankruptcy every year because they either have no health insurance and are facing enormous medical bills or they have inadequate health insurance, that even though they had it, it was not sufficient to pay for the cost of their care.

I mean, this is not what should happen in the wealthiest country in the world, a country that has met every challenge it has faced in its 220-year history. I think the President clearly defined that challenge for us last Wednesday night.

And then there is the question of how this all relates to our economic challenges, the fact that employers who are now insuring, at least partially, 160 million of our citizens are going to be facing such high costs—they face them now, and even higher costs in the future—that their ability to compete in the global economy is severely impeded because of these high insurance costs. We have enormous challenges in this area. And again, once I met with citizens and was able to discuss with them their situations and their challenges and how what we’re proposing to do in the House would address them, they change their opinions almost instantaneously.

And I just have to relate one story which was extremely meaningful to me. I was at what’s called a “district dialogue” one of our metro council members in Louisville put on. And there were 35 or 40 citizens there to address issues with him. I was invited as a guest. And when I walked in the room, I would say that the body language that I saw was, to put it lightly, very cold. And they were very skeptical because they knew I was going to talk about health care.

Well, I spent 1 hour and 15 minutes there explaining the need for reform, the cost of doing nothing, the benefits to citizens with and without insurance, and answering all their questions about our legislation in the House and many of the myths that had developed around it. And I will never forget one couple sitting down to my left. At the beginning of the meeting, the husband asked me a very challenging question—wasn’t quite hostile, but it was very challenging, and you could tell that he was extremely skeptical about what we were trying to do here. And I answered the question very respectfully and factually.

About 10 minutes later his wife said, Congressman, let me tell you about our situation. We’re 55. Eight months ago, my husband lost his job and we lost our insurance. We finally got insurance; it cost us \$750 a month. So they’re paying \$8,000 a year, after-tax income, unemployed, \$8,000 a year. She said our deductibles, our copays are very high. And 2 weeks ago, my husband had to go to the emergency room, I had to take him. Our bill was several hundred dollars and our insurance policy wouldn’t pay for it.

And I said, Ma’am, you are exactly why we’re doing this reform measure.

You are one of the case studies about what’s important about what we’re doing, because there are so many people in your category, middle-aged individuals who lost their jobs who really can’t afford the insurance that’s available to them, if it’s available at all, in the individual private market. And while you’re paying \$8,000 now, under our proposal you would probably pay something like \$2,000 a year. You could never be denied coverage because of a preexisting condition. If, heaven forbid, you got a serious illness, the insurance company couldn’t take your benefits away.

And I went through the list of all these ways in which our plan would help this couple. And she looked at me and said, Wow, that sounds pretty good. And that’s what I found throughout our community when I talked about health care.

And it was very gratifying as we went through all of these meetings and we encountered hostility, we encountered passion, we encountered a lot of people who are frustrated at a lot of the things that are going on in the world. But when it boiled right down to it, when you talked about what this plan that we’re considering in the House would mean to them, their objections seemed to melt away. And I think they began to believe, for the first time probably, that we were truly working to help them and not to in any way harm them or take away what they have.

So I thought my summer vacation was terrific in that regard because I know I was reassured that we are on the right path, that the American people are receptive to the type of reform we’re trying to provide. And I’m energized and look forward to the next few months when we actually refine our legislation and bring a package to the floor and hopefully deliver one to the President that will accomplish what we’ve been trying to accomplish—again, for generations—and that is to provide security and stability in the health insurance lives of every American.

With that, I take great pleasure in introducing my colleague from the class of 2006 from Colorado, the great State of Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER).

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I thank my friend, Mr. YARMUTH.

And I want to follow up on that. The last few months, in Colorado as well as every place else in the Nation and other places in the world, we’ve been talking about how do we finance health care? How do we finance it in Colorado, in Kentucky, wherever it might be? But that subject really leads to so many other conversations because the health care system touches every life in America, 300 million plus people.

And I can tell you from the Perlmutter family, from my family, the passion really has been evident because there are some things in the system that are broken and we have to fix them. There are some things in the

system that are working, but they can be better. And we need to do this in a way that's affordable to all Americans.

Let's start with what's broken, because that's something that affects my family and I know thousands and thousands and thousands of families across the country, and that is the discrimination that is suffered by people with prior illnesses. One of my kids has epilepsy. And if she doesn't have a job where there is group health insurance she is going to be denied coverage or be placed in a situation where the cost of her health care is going to be way beyond her means. Thank goodness she has a job where there is group health insurance, but if she were ever to leave that job or lose that job, she would be in trouble.

And she's like so many other people around the country who face this discrimination—and from my point of view, that discrimination is just wrong, and it's probably unconstitutional under the 14th Amendment to the Constitution, which guarantees all of us equal protection of the laws of this great country.

So there's a place where we really have a problem in the health care system where people who have prior illnesses, prior conditions, can't get coverage or they can only get coverage at prices that are out of sight.

Now, I don't fault the insurance companies on that; they're insurance companies, and they want to insure individuals and people who aren't sick. I don't blame them, that's how insurance works. If you insure somebody who is sick and you know it's going to cost you, then that doesn't help the shareholders and that doesn't help the company as a whole. But that is what's wrong with this, and that's why we've got to change it.

I compliment the President and the Members of this House who have had the guts to step up and deal with this issue because it is a major issue and a major change to policy that we have here in the United States, which is to cover people with prior illnesses. That's number one. And I can tell you, in my district in Colorado, almost everybody thinks that that needs to be changed. So we're dealing with something that is fundamentally wrong within the system, and it's something that almost every family can understand and relate to because they either have somebody within the family or they have a close neighbor or friend who has some kind of illness, number one.

Number two, we've got to fix something that every small business and individuals are seeing, and that is the increase in premiums year after year, and deductibles increasing so that the cost of your health insurance just keeps going up without any end in sight. And so we're trying, as part of this legislation, to put some restraints on this so that we slow these increases down so that businesses and individuals can afford insurance.

This is part of the menu, the choices that we want to bring as part of the legislation so that there is competition and choice and availability to small businesses and to individuals so that they can acquire insurance so that, God forbid, something bad happens medically or within the health of their family or their employees, that there's coverage.

So we're trying to deal with two very fundamental problems with our health care system today: One, denying people or discriminating against people with prior illnesses; and two, trying to put some lid or restraint on the ever-increasing premiums that we see to small businesses and to individuals so that they have a place they can turn to get insurance that isn't going to break them in half.

Now, we can improve things that are working. And one of those places where we really do have some great success stories and we can build on those is in the research that the country and our medical universities are conducting throughout the Nation. We are on the cusp of some tremendous breakthroughs when it comes to heart disease and cancer, two of the things that are so expensive to both individuals and businesses and the Nation. So if we can continue to really develop this research and continue to provide resources for research, there is hope and promise on some very difficult diseases that ultimately we can overcome.

And so it's with these kinds of things in mind—righting a wrong that comes about with discriminating against people with prior illnesses, helping small businesses and individuals find affordable insurance where there is competition and choice, and three, advancing the research that is ongoing in the Nation today where we really are going to have some tremendous breakthroughs that will be good for people's quality of life, but also for their personal pocketbooks and for the national pocketbook. There is real opportunity here.

We have to change this health care system. We can't continue to say, "No, we can't." We have to say, "Yes, we can." And that's what I want to see as we move forward with this health care debate.

With that, I would yield back to my friend from Kentucky.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank the gentleman. And I want to pick up on his conversation about small businesses because this is one of the very interesting reactions I got when I was home during the month of August. And of course I have some experience in that regard as well. I ran a small business for a number of years. We struggled very, very hard to provide health coverage for all of our employees. We had somewhere between 20 and 23 employees the entire life of my involvement in that business, and they were generally young, very healthy men and women. Unfortunately, we had a middle-aged woman who had cancer, and because we had that one unfortunate situation

among our employees, everyone suffered financially because of her misfortune.

□ 1900

Every year, we faced premium increases of 20, 25, 30 percent. We'd have to shop around as best we could. We'd have to increase co-pays and deductibles, things we had to do to be able to afford to provide coverage for everyone. Yet it wasn't just the business that was struggling; it was all of the individuals, again, all of whom had to pay dearly because of the misfortune of one person.

Under our health care reform, that would never happen. Everybody—every small business, every individual, regardless of their health histories or their health situations—would be guaranteed the lowest rates that anybody else could find. This is the way that America should function. The misfortune of one person should not adversely affect other people. In this particular case, the misfortune, through no fault of this woman's, should not put her in the situation of being discriminated against. So the gentleman is absolutely right.

We had a session back in Louisville during the break, and we invited about 20 to 25 small business people because we wanted to take the opportunity to talk with them and to get their questions because, again, a lot of the discussion surrounding this bill has been, oh, there's going to be a huge employer mandate and we're going to impose this huge tax on small businesses. A lot of people, when they hear those types of headlines, understandably get very concerned.

So we met. We spent 2 hours with this group of small business people, and what we found was exactly the situation that I described with my prior experience with small businesses. Every one of them was facing annual increases of double digits, sometimes approaching 30 percent.

Just today, for instance, I had a small business in the office. They're paying now \$7,200 per person for every one of their employees. They have about 35 employees. The quote for their policy that's up for renewal is a 30 percent increase. So they're spending now about \$2.5 million a year. The increase alone would add \$750,000 to their expense to keep the same level of coverage for their employees. I don't know many businesses that can experience a 30 percent increase in any aspect of their cost structure and survive for very long, and that's what all of these small business people were facing.

One of the things that we talked about was—they said, Well, you have an incentive in this bill that we're covered, which most small businesses aren't because we exempt 95 percent of the small businesses from the employer mandates. But if I'm over there, why wouldn't I just drop my coverage and put my employees into the public market, the exchange, where they would

again have these choices, but they would give up their coverage with me?

I said, Well, you know what? You might very well have that financial incentive to do that. On strictly a dollars-and-cents basis, it might make sense for you to do it, but you know what? Your employees may be better off because, under our plan, they'll have far more choices than they will under your plan. They don't have a choice under your plan. It's whatever you can negotiate for your group, and they're stuck with that. It may not be the provider network they want. It may not have the terms that they want. They're stuck with it.

Under our plan, if you decided to drop your coverage, they could shop in the exchange. They could pick the provider network, the plan that fits them best; and because of the subsidies that we provide, they're probably going to be out of pocket less money overall than they are with you. So it's not necessarily a bad thing that you would drop your coverage.

They said, Oh, well, that's interesting.

I said, Furthermore, under our plan, if you get someone who has a high cost of insurance—somebody who has a cancer or a condition that puts someone at a disadvantage—he's not necessarily locked in. I mean, he's not job-locked at all. If you were to drop your coverage under today's terms, he'd probably have to go to work for a big company to make up for it.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YARMUTH. I'll yield.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. One of the stories that I came across when I was home a couple of weeks ago—and this occurred at my neighborhood filling station where I'm pumping gas because I've got to go to a couple of events on a Saturday morning. One neighbor came up, and he was on the other side of the pump right across from me.

He says, This health care thing, ED, you know, I really want you to go slow and make sure that this thing is financially sound.

As he was saying that, the neighbor who was pumping gas at the island just behind me came over and said, ED, you guys aren't doing enough, and you're not going fast enough.

So the two of them, as I started pumping gas, started having this conversation. It was a great conversation. Both of them have very, very legitimate points; and we need, as we go through this, to make sure this is financially sound and that we try to predict as much as we can on an ongoing basis. We do know that there are problems with the system. We do know that we pay, as a nation, a lot more than almost any other industrialized country around; and, competitively, that puts us at a disadvantage. So we know we have to do something.

The gentleman who said we're not going fast enough was, you know, a young father—I think probably 35

years old. He works for a roofing company. He'd like to start his own roofing company, but he can't because his wife has Crohn's disease; and because she has Crohn's disease, if he were to go out and set off on his own, be a real entrepreneur and really try to make a go of it, which is what we all want to do in this country—and it's the opportunity that this country provides so many people—he can't because of his wife's medical condition, and the probability is that he won't be able to get anything to cover her if he sets out on his own.

So these two gentlemen, both of whom are neighbors of mine, had this great conversation—both of them with legitimate points—but there is an urgency here, and there is a restriction on people really going out and doing things the American way by setting out on their own to see what they can do for themselves, for their families and, ultimately, for their communities and this Nation.

So I clearly had an event, or a conversation, where the system today prevents entrepreneurship of young men and women who really want to, you know, try some new opportunities for themselves and for their families.

So, with that, I would yield back to my friend.

Mr. YARMUTH. I had another case just like that.

I was at an actual event that was saluting many of the benefits of the summer jobs program that we provided as part of the Recovery Act. It was called YouthBuild where they build homes. They get teenagers who are at risk; they're from the at-risk population. They give them jobs; they give them training, and they have them spend a summer productively.

I walked out to this construction site, and here was a young man, probably about the same age as yours, probably mid-30s. He said, May I talk to you a minute about my situation?

I said, Absolutely.

He said, My wife and I pay for the two of us, plus our one child, a \$900-a-month premium. So that's almost \$11,000 a year.

I asked, And your employer pays part as well?

He said, Oh, yeah. The \$900 a month is my part. My employer pays more.

So I don't know what the whole policy cost, but it was a lot of money.

He said, I've got a preexisting condition. I've got a very bad allergy situation. I've had it all my life, and I can't get insurance in the private sector. I would love to go out and start my own construction company, but I'm locked into this job because of health care, because I would be stuck without it if I had to leave it.

Interestingly enough, he was not supportive of what we're doing.

At the outset, he said, I really wish you wouldn't do this. You know, I don't like the Federal Government's getting involved in coverage—all of the standard arguments that we hear sometimes.

Again, he was someone whose problems with health care would have been solved, whose ambition to form his own company would have been restored, and yet he was still kind of blinded by a lot of rhetoric that's out there. I think I comforted him some in the conversation, but these stories are found throughout the country. We know that there are so many thousands and thousands of people who are in this situation, and this is the type of situation which has, I think, motivated all of us to work so hard to create reform that will be meaningful for the American people.

Just quickly back to the small business issue: so we spent 2 hours in this meeting with the 20 or 25-or-so small business people answering all their questions. At the end of the meeting, about half of them said, Go get it. Go get it. Go for it. We're with you. There were still two or three holdouts who just didn't think that the Federal Government should get involved in any way. When they're eligible for Medicare, we'll have to ask them if they still feel that way. These small business owners, for the most part, understood finally that this was something that would free them from a problem that they have been trying to work out.

So when you work it through, whether it's with senior citizens, with small businesses or with young families who have a situation where one of them might have a preexisting condition, this is exactly what we are trying to do—to create the opportunity for every American, regardless of their conditions or their situations, to have access to affordable health care.

You did make reference to kind of the global situation. My colleague, Mr. PERLMUTTER, talked about the fact that we are the only industrialized Nation in the world that does not provide a certain level of benefits, that is, guaranteed health care benefits for its population, and that we spend twice as much per person as any other country and a much larger percentage of our gross domestic product than any other country does. Right now, we spend about 17 or 18 percent of our GDP on health care. I think the next highest level in the world is about 11 percent.

While we do have some of the best health care anywhere available, it's just not available to enough people; and because of that and because of the fact that many people have virtually no health care and have no insurance and get very little care, we have poorer outcomes in this country even though we spend so much more. The World Health Organization ranks us 37th in the world. In their entire picture of health care outcomes, which includes infant mortality, life expectancy and survivability with certain diseases, we're 37th in the world overall.

That's something that should be a challenge and a motivation for all of us to do better because, again, America has always been the problem-solving

Nation. Whenever we put our minds to it and our collective will, we have been able to solve any problem that has confronted us.

People say, Well, we don't want to be Canada. We don't want to be Great Britain. We don't want to be Japan, or whatever it is.

I say that we don't have to be any of those countries. We're not those countries. We can do better than those countries; and we can create a health care system that is uniquely American, one that, again, provides security and stability to every American citizen, because that's what we're all about.

Before I yield back to my friend, it's interesting—as we talk about the world situation—and we have to confront issues like the myth that illegal immigrants are going to be covered under our bill. Now, we know there are people who are out there who will say anything to undermine this effort; but to me, the discussion about the illegal immigrants is intriguing because on the one hand it's very clear in section 246 that no undocumented aliens will receive Federal payments under this plan; but the opponents say, Well, but they'll still have access to care in the emergency rooms.

Yes, because President Reagan pushed for a law that requires hospitals and emergency rooms to treat anybody who goes there without regard to insurance or citizenship.

What's intriguing to me is that people don't necessarily take the next step, which is to ask, for instance: Do you really want people, doctors and nurses in the emergency rooms, to be worried first about checking somebody's citizenship when somebody is lying on a gurney or when your child or a child, any child or any adult, is mortally injured or has a very serious disease or is having a coronary? Do you want the doctor or nurse to say, Oh, wait a minute. I've got to go check your citizenship before I can treat you?

People don't think about the fact that it's not just that they would check Hispanic citizens or Hispanic people who would go to the emergency rooms or Asian people or whoever it is. They would have to check everybody. They would have to check everybody who would come in, and they would have to check senior citizens who would come in with grave illnesses. So we don't necessarily think through that.

The opponents would also say, Well, they can still buy insurance if they pay for it.

The answer of course is yes. Why is that a problem? Wouldn't you want people to have insurance rather than to go to the emergency rooms where all of us would subsidize their care? If they're illegal immigrants and can afford insurance, wouldn't you rather they have it so their kids, if they're in school next year, are not spreading a contagious disease? Wouldn't you rather they get the health care they need?

□ 1915

I mean, some of the arguments really just don't hold water once you think through them and understand that health care is a very specific category in society and humanity. And I am always amused when we say, well, illegal immigrants can still get care. Yes, I think we want them to still get care, but there is nothing in the legislation that we are proposing or that's being proposed on the Senate side, nothing in that law which would add a benefit, a Federal benefit, to illegal immigrants, and that is clearly spelled out.

So it takes a lot to work through these arguments, as my good friend knows, but it's worth working through them, because once you do, again, people feel much more comfortable and supportive with what we are doing.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. My friend, Mr. YARMUTH, mentioned Medicare, and one thing where there has been another myth is that there were going to be cuts in Medicare or things like that. In fact, it's just the opposite.

There are additional benefits, and one of the benefits that is very important, I know, to my district, and certainly when I was out talking to people, was getting rid of the doughnut hole in prescription drug costs. So that if you get to a certain level, all of a sudden, instead of the Medicare benefit paying for it, now you have got to pay for it out of your pocket.

And many people run into this, and it is financially just difficult and, in some cases, devastating to them because of this doughnut hole. And this bill, part of it is to eliminate this doughnut hole so that the benefits cover prescription medicines.

I think the bottom line for me here is that the status quo is not an option, that there has to be real change to the way this system operates, for individuals who are discriminated against because of their physical health and conditions to small businesses who see the costs going through the roof, and to the Nation that sees its costs going through the roof.

We can't stand idly by. We can't allow failure to reign. We must act. And it's a difficult subject. It's a very complicated system, and it touches 300 million people across this country, so everybody has a perspective on it.

But looking at it in the whole and trying to deal with it as a whole, we must make changes. And that's what I hope will occur over the next few months here in this House of Representatives and in the Senate and ultimately signed by the President so that we can get on with this and start making the changes that are so desperately needed before the system continues to get worse, premiums continue to go higher, people who shouldn't be discriminated against are.

We need change, and I am ready for it now.

Mr. YARMUTH. It's important to re-emphasize the point that Mr. PERLMUTTER just made was that this is

an incredibly complicated endeavor. And that's one of the problems we have in terms of a communications effort, that there are so many things that need to be explained. And as I have described it before, this is the biggest Rubik's Cube that anyone has ever tried to solve because there are so many moving parts.

And one of the things that I have heard from a number of people in my district is they say, well, why don't you do it piece by piece? Why don't you do it incrementally? And the answer is, of course, that because of the system we have in this country, you can't really approach this problem piecemeal, because you could say, for instance, we are going to address the problems in Medicare. You could do that, or you could say we are going to address the private insurance system. The problem is that they use the same provider networks. The same doctors service the private system and the public system, Medicare, Medicaid. The same hospitals service them, the same home health care companies, the same skilled nursing facilities service both.

So there is so much cost shifting going on, so that because Medicare pays less to providers, they charge private insurance companies more, which drives rates up. And they are always trying to balance their overall business to provider networks with the compensation they get, a reimbursement from both sides. So unless you deal with it holistically, you are going to basically push the finger in one side of the balloon and push it out the other end. We know that game.

And so incrementalism, while it might be desirable, it might be easier to achieve a comfort level in the country because people might be able to digest what we are proposing to do a little bit better, the fact is that reform that doesn't touch all of these areas is not going to be effective, and we will just distort the system even more and probably have more and more people fall through the cracks.

So nobody said this was going to be easy. I think it was Teddy Roosevelt 100 years ago who talked about providing universal health care, and we are still struggling with a way to bring health care to all our citizens. But we can do it. It's important work. I don't think there is anything we will ever do in this body at least domestically that will be as important as this effort.

And as I look around the world and see what other countries have done, see both the positive aspects of many other systems, some of the negatives, again, I don't think there is anywhere else in the world where I would say we can take that system and plop it down in the United States and it would be the perfect system for us.

There are elements of everybody's system around the world that could be useful in, again, creating that uniquely American solution.

There is a new book out called "The Healing of America" by a Washington

Post journalist named T.R. Reid, and he traveled around the world examining the health care systems, and he said there are three universal laws about health care reform or health care around the world. One is that no matter how good the system is for so many people, for as many people as possible, some people always complain about it. Secondly, doctors and hospitals will always complain that they are not being paid enough. And the final point was, the last reform always failed.

So we are in an imperfect arena, and we know that whatever we do here in this Congress, hopefully this year, will be far from perfect. We know that we will be working on this for as long as we are all alive, because there will be thousands of unintended consequences and unpredictable consequences of what we do.

But as my friend said, we have to start somewhere, and this is the time because we are looking at a very, very bleak picture moving forward, with tens of trillions of dollars of added debt in Medicare, with insurance premiums that are projected to increase by \$1,800 a year for the next 10 years for a family policy, which would take it in the range of \$30,000 by the end of the next decade.

And we know that the American economy, certainly not American businesses, and definitely not American families can afford that type of cost. So this is the biggest challenge, but also the biggest opportunity we have ever faced in this country.

And I am so glad, not just to be in Congress being able to work on this incredible endeavor, but also that the American people are so engaged in the process, because when the American people pay attention, the American people will respond, and they are responding with their input, with their reactions, and I think, ultimately, they will respond with their wholehearted support with the reform effort that we are engaged in.

So I would just offer the floor to my colleague, if he has any closing remarks, and then we will surrender our time.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I thank my friend, I thank him for hosting this hour. I think for me the status quo is not an option. We have to act because there are things in this system, the health care system and the way we finance it. We need insurance reform, because there are things that are broken. We need to fix what's broken. We need to improve what's working, and we need to have a system that is affordable and accessible to all Americans. And now is the time to act. We can't fade into the woodwork and hope this all makes itself better. Sometimes you have to tackle tough subjects, and people aren't going to be always right in line with you.

Now is the time for us to tackle a very tough subject, to bring the change that's needed for generations to come, to save money and provide care for in-

dividuals, for businesses and this Nation.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank the gentleman and thank him for his participation tonight. As I said a moment ago, we are involved in an incredible historic endeavor here, and I am very appreciative of the fact that we in the class of 2006, the Majority Makers, most of whom campaigned on a platform that included affordable quality health care for all, are able to participate here with the cooperation of the American people.

CORRECTION TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 2009, AT PAGE H9457

RECOGNIZING THE PERSISTENTLY HIGH RATES OF DROWNING FATALITIES AMONG CHILDREN

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 57) expressing the importance of swimming lessons and recognizing the danger of drowning in the United States, especially among minority children, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 57

Whereas the success of the United States Olympic swim team, including the record-breaking eight gold medals won by Michael Phelps, has brought great attention to swimming;

Whereas a New York Times article entitled "Despite Olympic Gold, Swimming Statistics Are Grim", highlighted the irony of the United States Olympic glory in light of a shocking number of drownings in the United States;

Whereas the New York Times has also highlighted the discrepancies in swimming education between African-American children and White children in the article "Everyone Into the Water";

Whereas according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), there were 3,582 unintentional and fatal drownings in the United States in 2005 representing an average of 10 drowning deaths each day;

Whereas for every child who fatally drowns in the United States, there are four near-drowning incidents that require emergency care and can lead to brain damage resulting in permanent disabilities ranging from loss of memory to the loss of all basic functions;

Whereas children are the most susceptible to fatal drowning incidents with one out of four victims being 14 years old or younger;

Whereas drowning is the second most common unintentional cause of death among children ages 1 to 14;

Whereas minority drowning rates greatly exceed the rates of White children;

Whereas according to the CDC, the fatal drowning rate for African-American children between the ages of 5 and 14 is over three times higher than the rate for White children, and the rate for American Indian and Alaska Native children is over two times higher;

Whereas according to a study by the University of Memphis, almost 60 percent of African-American and Latino children do not know how to swim as compared to roughly 30 percent of White children;

Whereas long-existing stigmas regarding minorities and swimming have contributed to the lack of swimming education in minority communities, and nonswimming minority families are far less likely than nonswimming White families to enroll in swimming lessons;

Whereas according to the United States Census Bureau, in 2007, 33.7 percent of African-Americans, 28.6 percent of Latinos, and 12.5 percent of Asian-Americans lived below the poverty line as compared to 10.1 percent of Whites, and swimming lessons can cost hundreds of dollars per course;

Whereas the Virginia Graeme Baker Pool and Spa Safety Act was signed into law in December 2007 addressing the pressing need for increased pool and spa safety requirements and education to prevent accidental deaths by drowning;

Whereas effective drowning prevention strategies require several approaches such as supervision, fully gated pools, CPR training, and swimming skills;

Whereas the ability to swim is an important and essential skill, and according to Safe Kids USA, in order to help prevent drowning, children should be enrolled in swimming lessons as early as age 4 to learn how to float, tread water, and enter and exit the pool; and

Whereas nonprofit initiatives, like the USA Swimming Foundation's program "Make A Splash", are working hard to meet the need for swimming lessons by partnering with local communities to offer all children access to swimming education: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) expresses the importance of access to swimming lessons for all communities in the United States as an integral part of drowning prevention;

(2) recognizes the danger of fatal unintentional drowning in the United States;

(3) condemns the persistently high rates of fatal drowning among all children, and the particularly high rates of fatal drowning among minority children;

(4) celebrates the passage of the Virginia Graeme Baker Pool and Spa Safety Act;

(5) celebrates the work of initiatives like USA Swimming Foundation's "Make A Splash" and Safe Kids USA to educate parents and caregivers on water safety and drowning prevention messages; and

(6) encourages public and private funding to support current and future initiatives that provide all children access to swimming education.

CORRECTION TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 2009, AT PAGE H9459

RECOGNIZING 15TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 738) recognizing the 15th anniversary of the enactment of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 738

Whereas in recognition of the severity of the crimes associated with domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking, on September 13, 1994, President Bill Clinton signed the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (hereinafter referred to as "VAWA") as part of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994;

Whereas subsequent reauthorizations of VAWA include the Violence Against Women Act of 2000 (hereinafter referred to as "VAWA 2000"), signed by President Bill Clinton, and the Violence Against Women Act and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (hereinafter referred to as "VAWA 2005"), signed by President George W. Bush;

Whereas VAWA was the first comprehensive legislative package designed to end violence against women;

Whereas the protections and provisions afforded by VAWA were subsequently expanded and improved by VAWA 2000, which created a legal assistance program for victims and expanded the definition of domestic violence crimes to include dating violence and stalking;

Whereas VAWA and interventions funded by that Act have reduced the incidence of domestic violence, have lowered sexual assault rates, and have averted societal costs by reducing the need for emergency and medical responses;

Whereas VAWA has succeeded in bringing communities together to address domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, including combined efforts by law enforcement, prosecutors, courts, victim services, and community-based programs to develop long-term plans for addressing such crimes locally and statewide;

Whereas VAWA has provided crucial Federal support to Indian tribes to combat the problems of sexual and domestic violence in Indian country;

Whereas VAWA brings innovative practices to the field by funding demonstration projects and training, and supporting the development of specialized courts and police teams;

Whereas the Sexual Assault Services program, authorized by VAWA 2005, enabled the 1,300 rape crisis centers in the United States to reduce waiting lists, reach out to underserved communities, and provide more comprehensive services to survivors of sexual assault;

Whereas VAWA provides a means for many victims of domestic violence who were dependent on their batterers for immigration status to self-petition and obtain legal immigration status on their own, and to access legal services to flee violence and recover from trauma;

Whereas organizations throughout the United States have received grants under VAWA to provide legal assistance to young victims of dating violence;

Whereas VAWA has provided crucial Federal support for efforts by criminal justice officials and victim service providers to hold offenders accountable and to keep stalking victims safe;

Whereas the continued support of VAWA and subsequent Acts combating violence against women is essential to best serve the 3,400,000 individuals in the United States who are stalked each year; and

Whereas September 13, 2009, marked the 15th anniversary of the enactment of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the 15th anniversary of the enactment of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994;

(2) continues to support the goals and ideals of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 and its subsequent reauthorization Acts; and

(3) recognizes the need to continue vigorous enforcement of the provisions of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 and similar Acts and programs to deter and prosecute crimes of violence against women.

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

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FORBES) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, September 22.

Mrs. BACHMANN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WOLF, for 5 minutes, September 16.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER, for 5 minutes, today and September 16.

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah, for 5 minutes, September 16 and 17.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia, for 5 minutes, September 16.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FORBES, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. FOX, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at their request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GOHMERT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 16, 2009, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

3352. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of an officer to wear the authorized insignia of the grade of major general, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3353. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report to Congress specifying each Reserve component the additional items of equip-

ment that would be procured and additional military construction projects for FY 2010, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 10543(c); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3354. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a quarterly report of withdrawals or diversions of equipment from Reserve component units; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3355. A letter from the Acting Deputy Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on the action taken by the department to identify and evaluate at all the stages of the acquisition of commercial computer software, pursuant to Public Law 110-417, section 803; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3356. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Capital Adequacy Guidelines; Small Bank Holding Company Policy Statement: Treatment of Subordinated Securities Issued to the United States Treasury under the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 [Regulation Y; Docket No. R-1356] received September 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3357. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation and Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Refrigerated Bottled or Canned Beverage Vending Machines [Docket No.: EERE-2006-STD-0125] (RIN: 1904-AB58) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3358. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's FY 2008 annual financial report to Congress required by the Prescription Drug User Fee Act of 1992 (PDUFA); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3359. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting Food and Drug Administration's Report to Congress "Changing the Future of Drug Safety: FDA Initiatives to Strengthen and Transform the Drug Safety System"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3360. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the National Emergency with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism that was declared in Executive Order 13224 of September 23, 2001, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3361. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting a report to Congress on the intent to impose additional foreign policy export controls on transfers (in-country) to certain persons specified on the Entity List; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3362. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting a periodic report on the National Emergency caused by the lapse of the Export Administration Act of 1979 for February 26, 2008 — February 25, 2009; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3363. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 09-44, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3364. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 09-50, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3365. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 09-51, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3366. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 09-47, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3367. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting Pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958, Transmittal No. 10-09 informing of an intent to sign a Project Agreement with Australia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3368. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 3(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, certification regarding the proposed transfer of major defense equipment from the Government of Canada (Transmittal No. RSAT-08-1657); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3369. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Zimbabwe that was declared in Executive Order 13288 of March 6, 2003; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3370. A letter from the Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's Year 2009 Inventory of Commercial Activities, as required by the Federal Activities Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3371. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3372. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's fiscal year 2008 annual report prepared in accordance with Section 203(a) of the Notification and Federal Employee Anti-discrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Public Law 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3373. A letter from the Office of Human Resources, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3374. A letter from the Office of Human Resources, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3375. A letter from the Office of Human Resources, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3376. A letter from the Office of Human Resources, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3377. A letter from the Director, Office of National Drug Control Policy, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report entitled, "Fiscal Year 2008 Accounting of Drug Control Funds"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3378. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Management and Administration, Office of National Drug Control Policy, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3379. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of a report required by Section 202(a)(1)(C) of Pub. L. 107-273, the "21st Century Department of Justice Appropriations Authorization Act", related to certain settlements and injunctive relief, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 530D Public Law 107-273, section 202; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3380. A letter from the Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting Constitutionality of Certificates of the Non-Existence of Records; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3381. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's Status Report on the Herger-Feinstein Quincy Library Group Forest Recovery Act Pilot Project for Fiscal Year 2008; jointly to the Committees on Natural Resources and Agriculture.

3382. A letter from the Administrator, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's report on the Preliminary Damage Assessment information for the state of Texas; jointly to the Committees on Homeland Security, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Appropriations.

3383. A letter from the Administrator, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's report on the Preliminary Damage Assessment information on FEMA-1851-DR for the State of Tennessee, pursuant to Public Law 110-239, section 539; jointly to the Committees on Homeland Security, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Ms. MATSUI: Committee on rules. House Resolution 745. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3246) to provide for a program of research, development, demonstration, and commercial application in vehicle technologies at the Department of Energy (Rept. 111-255). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. POLIS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 746. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3221) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes (Rept. 111-256). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. REHBERG:

H.R. 3563. A bill to authorize the Crow Tribe of Indians water rights settlement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (for herself, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia):

H.R. 3564. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to strengthen the provisions relating to child labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3565. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on dry adhesive copolyamide pellets; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3566. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Orgasol; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NADLER of New York (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. POLIS of Colorado, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. KILROY, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. STARK, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. WELCH, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. WEINER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. OLVER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HODES, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WATSON, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. HOLT, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. FILNER, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mrs. CAPP, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. TONKO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. HARMAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. HIMES, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. FARR, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MAFFEI, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. WU):

H.R. 3567. A bill to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act and ensure respect for State regulation of marriage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 3568. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage charitable contributions of real property for conservation purposes by Native Corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCALISE:

H.R. 3569. A bill to provide a sunset date for all presidentially appointed czars, to require Senate confirmation of those positions, and to provide that appropriated funds may not be used to pay for any salaries and expenses associated with those positions; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. BOUCHER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H.R. 3570. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to reauthorize the satellite statutory license, to conform the satellite and cable statutory licenses to all-digital transmissions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOEHNER (for himself, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. PENCE, Mr. ISSA, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. AKIN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BISHOP

of Utah, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BONNER, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BUYER, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CAMP, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. COLE, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. DENT, Mr. DREIER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EHLERS, Ms. FALLIN, Ms. FOXX, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. GOODLATTE, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. HARPER, Mr. HELLER, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HERGER, Mr. INGLIS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JONES, Mr. JORDAN of Ohio, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. LATTI, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. LINDER, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LUTKEMEYER, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. MACK, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PETRI, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. POSEY, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TERRY, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. TURNER, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. WAMP, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WOLF, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mrs. BIGGERT):

H.R. 3571. A bill to prohibit the Federal Government from awarding contracts, grants, or other agreements to, providing any other Federal funds to, or engaging in activities that promote certain indicted organizations; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H.R. 3572. A bill to provide a cost-of-living increase for Social Security benefits for 2010 of 2.9 percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 3573. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prevent a change in residency as a result of extended official duty in the uniformed services, Foreign Service, or intelligence community from triggering the repayment provisions of the first time home-buyer credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HIGGINS:

H.R. 3574. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for limitations on expenditures in elections for the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PERRIELLO:

H.R. 3575. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for an increase in the maximum amount of veterans' mortgage life insurance available under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 3576. A bill to secure the Federal voting rights of certain qualified ex-offenders who have served their sentences; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODRIGUEZ (for himself, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HALL of New York, and Mr. TEAGUE):

H.R. 3577. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide authority for certain members of the Armed Forces who have served 20 years on active duty to transfer entitlement to Post-9/11 Educational Assistance to their dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. WALZ):

H.R. 3578. A bill to amend part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to provide full Federal funding of such part; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mrs. LUMMIS, Ms. FOXX, Mr. WOLF, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. COBLE, Mr. STEARNS, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. SCHOCK, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. INGLIS, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. WAMP, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PENCE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. PAUL, Mr. ADERHOLT, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. OLSON, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. COLE, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. LATTI, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. TERRY, Mr. JORDAN of Ohio, Mr. HELLER, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. NUNES, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. UPTON, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. CARTER, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. LINDER, Mr. PITTS, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. BONNER, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky):

H. Con. Res. 185. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the President should issue, and Congress should hold hearings on, a report and a certification regarding the responsibilities, authorities, and powers of his "czars"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. HOYER:

H. Res. 744. A resolution raising a question of the privileges of the House; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HALL of New York (for himself, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. TIAHRT):

H. Res. 747. A resolution congratulating the United States Military Academy at West Point on being named by Forbes magazine as America's Best College for 2009; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. Res. 747. A resolution congratulating the United States Military Academy at West Point on being named by Forbes magazine as America's Best College for 2009; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. Res. 747. A resolution congratulating the United States Military Academy at West Point on being named by Forbes magazine as America's Best College for 2009; to the Committee on Armed Services.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

174. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, rel-

ative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 120 memorializing the Congress of the United States to make eradication of the fever tick in South Texas a priority and continue to provide appropriate funding and resources for this effort; to the Committee on Agriculture.

175. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Tennessee, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 352 urging the United States Congress to enact H.R. 1633 of the 111th U.S. Congress, the "Honor the Written Intent of our Soldier Heroes Act"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

176. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 22 urging the Congress of the United States to reopen consideration of this case to posthumously award the Medal of Honor to World War I hero Marceliao Serna; to the Committee on Armed Services.

177. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 73 urging the United States Congress to maintain the Federal Family Education Loan Program and continue to refine and improve this crucial public-private partnership; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

178. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Florida, relative to Senate Memorial 1330 memorializing the Congress of the United States, to authorize the Silver Alert Grant Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

179. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Florida, relative to Senate Memorial 152 memorializing the Congress of the United States to support federally funded and stated-funded home and community-based services for individuals with disabilities of any age, especially elders; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

180. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, relative to Assembly Resolution No. 202 memorializing Congress to encourage the establishment of a research center in New Jersey dedicated to chronic neuroendocrine immune disorders; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

181. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, relative to Assembly Resolution No. 206 memorializing Congress to reauthorize the "Ryan White HIV/AIDS Treatment Modernization Act of 2006"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

182. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, relative to Assembly Resolution No. 147 memorializing the Congress of the United States to oppose offshore drilling for oil or natural gas and urging the President and Congress to support energy independence and renewable resources; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

183. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, relative to House Joint Resolution 39 memorializing the Congress of the United States to post-ratify Amendment XXIV to the Constitution of the United States prohibiting the denial or abridgment of the right to vote for failure to pay any poll tax or other tax; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

184. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Oklahoma, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 11 memorializing the Congress of the United States to rescind applications by the Legislature to call a constitutional convention; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

185. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 38 urging the Congress of the United States to restore the presumption of a service connection for Agent

Orange Exposure to United States Navy and United States Air Force veterans who served on the inland waterways, in the territorial waters, and in the airspace of the Republic of Vietnam; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

186. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 86 urging the United States Congress to support the establishment of a veterans hospital in the Rio Grande Valley; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

187. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, relative to House Concurrent Resolution 183 urging the United States Congress to reject the provisions of President Barack Obama's budget that would eliminate the intangible drilling costs deduction, percentage depletion allowance, geologic and geophysical costs deduction, and domestic production activities deduction and to encourage instead the development of Texas oil and natural gas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

188. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 10 urging the Congress of the United States to provide emergency funding and resources to begin immediately addressing increasing delays at United States ports of entry on the Texas-Mexico border; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

189. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 79 urging the United States Congress to refine Department of Homeland Security policy to consider risk levels as well as population size in assessing the financial needs of first responders in border communities along the international boundary created by the Rio Grand; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

190. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, relative to Assembly Resolution No. 157 urging the Congress of the United States to support the development of onshore and offshore wind energy in New Jersey and to further support offshore wind energy development; jointly to the Committees on Natural Resources, Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 28: Mrs. BONO Mack.
 H.R. 39: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 211: Mrs. HALVORSON.
 H.R. 219: Mr. WITTMAN.
 H.R. 303: Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, and Mr. BOSWELL.
 H.R. 345: Mr. GERLACH.
 H.R. 503: Mr. SESTAK.
 H.R. 510: Mr. HODES, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. WU.
 H.R. 537: Mr. SCHOCK.
 H.R. 560: Mr. EDWARDS of Texas and Mr. ANDREWS.
 H.R. 571: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KAGEN, and Ms. KILROY.
 H.R. 697: Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN.
 H.R. 745: Ms. SPEIER.
 H.R. 811: Mr. BOSWELL.
 H.R. 847: Mrs. CAPPs.
 H.R. 927: Mr. TANNER.
 H.R. 944: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
 H.R. 953: Mr. GRAVES and Mr. LUJÁN.
 H.R. 954: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 1019: Mr. FLEMING.
 H.R. 1054: Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. KIND, Mr. CARTER, and Mrs. BACHMANN.
 H.R. 1055: Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 1067: Mr. SCHAUER and Mr. OBERSTAR.
 H.R. 1074: Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee and Mr. CARNEY.
 H.R. 1075: Mr. ROONEY.
 H.R. 1086: Mr. HERGER.
 H.R. 1101: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
 H.R. 1136: Mr. PAUL and Mr. CASSIDY.
 H.R. 1142: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
 H.R. 1175: Mr. MURPHY of New York.
 H.R. 1182: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GRIFFITH, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 1204: Mr. SCHAUER.
 H.R. 1207: Mr. SCHRADER and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.R. 1210: Mr. ADERHOLT.
 H.R. 1214: Mr. SCHAUER and Ms. BEAN.
 H.R. 1215: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
 H.R. 1245: Mr. KAGEN and Mr. SOUDER.
 H.R. 1255: Mr. HENSARLING.
 H.R. 1274: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 1324: Mr. POMEROY and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
 H.R. 1326: Ms. KILROY.
 H.R. 1362: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. LATOURETTE.
 H.R. 1430: Mr. WITTMAN.
 H.R. 1458: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey and Mr. LEWIS of California.
 H.R. 1483: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 1671: Mr. MCNERNEY and Mr. KILDEE.
 H.R. 1744: Ms. WATSON and Mr. WEXLER.
 H.R. 1751: Mr. WATT.
 H.R. 1766: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WEXLER, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
 H.R. 1822: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. JORDAN of Ohio, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, and Mr. MANZULLO.
 H.R. 1835: Mrs. BIGGERT and Mr. CLAY.
 H.R. 1925: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. WATT.
 H.R. 1926: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 2002: Ms. KOSMAS.
 H.R. 2016: Mr. CONYERS.
 H.R. 2084: Mr. TERRY.
 H.R. 2129: Mr. ALTMIRE.
 H.R. 2132: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
 H.R. 2139: Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. SERRANO.
 H.R. 2214: Mr. DOGGETT and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
 H.R. 2251: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, and Mr. TERRY.
 H.R. 2298: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mrs. BACHMANN, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 2329: Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland.
 H.R. 2336: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
 H.R. 2339: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
 H.R. 2429: Mr. WELCH.
 H.R. 2443: Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. KAGEN, and Mr. WELCH.
 H.R. 2521: Ms. CHU.
 H.R. 2546: Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Ms. HARMAN, and Ms. TITUS.
 H.R. 2547: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
 H.R. 2560: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
 H.R. 2713: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.
 H.R. 2720: Mr. TOWNS.
 H.R. 2724: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona and Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 2740: Mr. COURTNEY.
 H.R. 2766: Mr. CLAY.
 H.R. 2807: Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, and Mr. HEINRICH.
 H.R. 2811: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
 H.R. 2818: Mr. SESTAK.
 H.R. 2819: Mr. HINCHEY.
 H.R. 2835: Mr. SHERMAN.
 H.R. 2866: Mr. LATOURETTE.
 H.R. 2872: Mr. COURTNEY.
 H.R. 2935: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Mr. HELLER.
 H.R. 2964: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
 H.R. 3012: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Ms. CLARKE.

H.R. 3017: Ms. SUTTON and Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan.
 H.R. 3048: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 3070: Mr. SESTAK.
 H.R. 3094: Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 3116: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina and Mr. CHILDERS.
 H.R. 3179: Mr. SHERMAN.
 H.R. 3238: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. SESTAK, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. COURTNEY.
 H.R. 3245: Mr. WATT.
 H.R. 3250: Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. RANGEL.
 H.R. 3266: Mr. WEXLER and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
 H.R. 3286: Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
 H.R. 3308: Mr. WOLF.
 H.R. 3321: Mr. SABLAN, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 3341: Mr. TURNER.
 H.R. 3343: Mr. KUCINICH.
 H.R. 3463: Mrs. SCHMIDT.
 H.R. 3472: Mr. SCHAUER and Mr. PETERS.
 H.R. 3498: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
 H.R. 3527: Mr. SHERMAN.
 H.R. 3550: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Ms. HIRONO.
 H.R. 3551: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Ms. HIRONO.
 H. J. Res. 50: Mr. MANZULLO.
 H. Con. Res. 42: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H. Con. Res. 43: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H. Con. Res. 157: Mr. TURNER.
 H. Con. Res. 170: Mr. SOUDER and Mr. WOLF.
 H. Con. Res. 178: Mr. BERMAN.
 H. Con. Res. 181: Mr. EHLERS and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
 H. Res. 164: Mr. PALLONE.
 H.Res. 487: Mr. SULLIVAN and Mr. WHITFIELD.
 H.Res. 494: Mr. HEINRICH.
 H.Res. 598: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. FILNER.
 H.Res. 599: Mr. TIERNEY.
 H.Res. 604: Mr. GOHMERT and Mr. MCCOTTER.
 H.Res. 613: Mr. WELCH.
 H.Res. 615: Mr. KIRK.
 H.Res. 660: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Mr. CLAY.
 H. Res. 666: Mr. CONYERS.
 H. Res. 671: Mr. PAUL and Mr. FLAKE.
 H. Res. 707: Mr. PETERSON.
 H. Res. 725: Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. Teague, Mr. REYES, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. WALZ, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. SPRATT, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. BERRY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MASSA, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. SPACE, Mr. KIND, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. POLIS of Colorado, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. OLVER, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. BOSWELL, and Ms. MARKEY of Colorado.
 H. Res. 727: Mr. EHLERS, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. SPRATT, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Ms. BORDALLO.
 H. Res. 729: Mr. BILBRAY and Mr. MCCAUL.
 H. Res. 734: Mr. HERGER, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. BOCCIERI, Mr. OLSON, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. AKIN, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. CAMP, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. PITTS, Mr. WOLF, Ms. FALLIN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. CARTER, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
 H. Res. 736: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks,

limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative GEORGE MILLER of California, or a designee, to H.R. 3221 does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9(d), 9(e), or 9(f) of Rule XXI.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 2480: Mr. LANCE.

H. Res. 648: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

66. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City of Miami, FL, relative to Resolution 09-0383 petitioning President Barak Obama and the United States Congress to adopt the Military Readiness Enhancement Act of 2009 (H.R. 1283), which eliminates the "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

67. Also, a petition of the City of Oakland Park, Florida, relative to Resolution No. R-2009-099 urging the President and the United States Congress to adopt the Military Readiness Enhancement Act of 2009 (H.R. 1283), which eliminates the "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

68. Also, a petition of California Democratic Party, relative to a Resolution petitioning the Congress of the United States to pass single-payer healthcare, or, at a minimum, pass a law that will include a provision ensuring that states maintain the ability to enact truly universal health care through a state-based, single-payer health plan; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

69. Also, a petition of Essex County Board of Supervisors, New York, relative to Resolution No. 244 urging the United States Congress to work with the Vermont Department of Transportation to fast track the repairs/renovations to the Crown Point Bridge and to request stimulus funding for these repairs/renovations; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.