United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 156 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 2010 No. 16

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Thursday, February 4, 2010, at 12 noon.

House of Representatives

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 2010

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Reverend Bertrain Bailey, St. John Missionary Baptist Church, Dallas, Texas, offered the following prayer:

God of our weary years, God of our silent tears, Thou who hast brought us thus far on the way; Thou who has by Thy might, led us into the light, keep us forever in the path, we pray. Lord, we intercede for our Nation at war and pray for Your comfort to the families whose sons and daughters have made the ultimate sacrifice, and we ask that You grant healing for the wounded.

We remember the sorrow and the suffering of the people of Haiti, who struggle from day to day with their backs against the wall, especially the children. We are thankful for the graciousness of our President of these United States, the House of Representatives, and the generosity of people around the world.

In this hallowed Chamber we seek the guidance of Your infinite wisdom for the House of Representatives to help solve the problems of our time and our great Nation. In the name of the One who loves the world. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DRIEHAUS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance?

Mr. DRIEHAUS 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.

HONORING REV. BERTRAIN BAILEY

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. It is an honor to be here today with our distinguished guest chaplain, Rev. Bertrain Bailey, who is Pastor of the St. John Missionary Baptist Church in Dallas, Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON's constituent. Rev. Bailey is well known for his strong faith and the work he is doing in the Dallas, Texas, community. He has impacted the lives of thousands of congregation members, and I am pleased that he could be with us today in the House of Representatives to share his prayers and wisdom.

For over 130 years, the Missionary Baptist Church has been known for its tradition of serving the church family and community. During his time at St. John's, Rev. Bailey has proven an energetic and dynamic leader. His spirit and initiative have endeared him to current members and attracted new members. I am pleased to be able to share his faith and inspiration with my colleagues. I thank Rev. Bailey for his presence and his blessing.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Chair will entertain up to 15 further 1-minutes on each side of the aisle.

There was no objection.

PAYGO: EFFECTIVE TOOL FOR ADDRESSING DEFICIT

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

Mr. BACA. Madam Speaker, the House this week will consider legislation reestablishing statutory pay-as-you-go. That's PAYGO. In 1990, the Clinton administration turned the deficit into a record surplus, due in part by adhering to PAYGO, a principle that compels Congress to pay for what we buy. However, under a Republican President in Congress, PAYGO was waived and allowed to expire, clearing the way for policies that wiped out $5.6 trillion of surplus and a huge debt financed by tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans that will have to be paid by the next generation. Restoring our national fiscal health will not be quick or easy, but restoring PAYGO is an important step towards that goal.

Printed on recycled paper.

PAYGO has a history of bipartisan support. Democrats hope the Republicans will join us this week in supporting this proven tool for fiscal responsibility. I hope that they will not continue to be the Party of ''No'' and they'll have the principles invoked for PAYGO.

''FOR THEE, BUT NOT FOR ME''

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a very prominent, prestigious dignitary is visiting the United States from Canada this week—the Premier of Newfoundland and Labrador, Danny Williams is here. But there was no pomp and circumstance for Premier Williams. No red carpets, no dinners in his honor. You see, this isn't a state visit. It's a sneak visit. The Canadian Premier came to America to have heart surgery at an undisclosed hospital in an undisclosed location. According to officials, the premier couldn't have the heart surgery under Canada's government-run health care.

I wonder why? Williams has loudly proclaimed the benefits of Canadian socialized medicine. Was it the long waiting lines or the rationing that sent him to the United States? Maybe the Premier realized he couldn't receive competent treatment with Canadian state-controlled health care and came to America to, well—get well.

It seems the elites have one standard for the masses and another standard for themselves. As one writer put it, ''State-controlled access for thee, but not for me.'' Government-run health care is unhealthy for Canadian Premiers and Americans as well.

And that's just the way it is.

STATUTORY PAYGO

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

Mr. SCHRADER. I rise today to urge the House to once again pass statutory pay-as-you-go legislation. I remind my colleagues of the history of PAYGO. Less than 20 years ago, PAYGO was used by a Republican Congress and a Democratic President to bring balance to the budget and begin paying down the debt from what were then record deficits. Unfortunately, during the Bush administration, PAYGO and other fiscally responsible policies were abandoned for tax cuts and expensive drug programs we didn't pay for. This week, we have the opportunity to once again vote for a return to fiscally responsible policies. We already voted for this on July 22, when we passed the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go-Act of 2009, with a bipartisan majority.

Although this bill isn't perfect, it's very practical. It worked in the 1990s. It moved us from a record deficit to record surpluses. It will work now. The fiscal and economic mismanagement that this Congress and the President inherited in January, 2009, must be addressed. Instituting statutory PAYGO is a concrete start to the fiscal reform American families struggling to balance their own budgets expect us to meet.

FINISH STRONG

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

Mr. CAO. Mr. Speaker, the New Orleans Saints' first trip to the Super Bowl this Sunday has not only boosted the morale of Orleans and Jefferson Parishes, but it has also changed the way New Orleanians think of their city and themselves. I am honored to convey New Orleanians' sentiments regarding the Saints to the world as the U.S. Representative of the Second District.

Mr. Ray Haeuser of New Orleans writes, ''When the city was still full of water, the Saints were with us. When the city was full of despair, the Saints were there to encourage us. When the water had subsided and the streets were passable again, the Saints were walking around the city looking to help. When the future looked cloudy, the Saints kept cheering us on, and we began to realize that cheering for the Saints was, in fact, cheering for our shared future. The Saints have become a symbol of a city where pulling together can be a celebration every day.''

Mr. Speaker, New Orleanians are mindful of the plight of the people of Haiti. But for this weekend, inspired by Mr. Haeuser and so many like him, we will cheer on our boys this Sunday with the President.

Who dat!

□ 1015

CLEAN ENERGY RACE

(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, this morning America is engaged in a great race, and that is a race with China to see who will be preeminent in the creation of millions of new jobs in the new clean energy economy. The President is right: the Nation that leads the clean energy economy will lead the world economy, and he is right that we do not intend to finish second place in this race.

Now at this moment, there is something pending in the U.S. Senate to determine whether we will win this race. There is something that is absolutely fundamental to drive millions of dollars of investment to these new technologies in solar and wind and geothermal so that we will finish first in this race, and that is to put a cap on carbon pollution. Because when we put a cap on carbon pollution, we will drive investment into the jobs of tomorrow. We must remain resolute. We call on the President to remain resolute. We have to deliver a cap on carbon so we can finish number one in the jobs race.

ENERGY AND JOBS

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

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, Congress received the White House's budget proposal. The President's budget more than doubles our national debt, drives spending to a record $3.8 trillion, pushes the deficit to an unheard of $1.6 trillion, and raises taxes by more than $2 trillion over the next 10 years. It also includes $36.5 billion in direct tax and fee increases on American oil, natural gas, and coal. These tax increases will only serve to reduce American energy production, increase energy prices, and destroy American jobs.

I support an all-of-the-above approach to our energy policy, one which encourages research and exploration for all forms of American-produced energy. Let's take this opportunity to do what is right for the future of our country by tapping into domestic energy resources and creating American jobs here at home.

VACATION IN VEGAS

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

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, things are very tough in Las Vegas right now. We have the second highest unemployment rate and the very highest mortgage foreclosure rate in the country. People are hurting. We rely on tourism to fuel our economy. It's our major industry.

So when the President singled out Las Vegas again by saying, ''When times are tough, you tighten your belts. You don't blow a bunch of cash in Vegas,'' he is hurting the people I represent badly. What he should have said is that Las Vegas is the most amazing place to vacation. It's a bargain right now, and everyone should go and enjoy our wholesome family entertainment, our great hotels, our fabulous shows, great restaurants, shopping, convention space, gaming, our great weather. We're near the Grand Canyon and Red Rock Canyon and Hoover Dam. Las Vegas has it all. That's what the President should have said. Mr. President, words matter, and you need to watch what you say. Your words are hurting the businesses and the families that call Las Vegas home, and they're hurting me.

OBAMA'S BUDGET

(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, the President's budget released on Monday is a blueprint for failure. It projects a $1.6 trillion budget deficit for this year alone; and in its entire 10-year window, the annual deficit never falls below $700 billion. The much vaunted spending freeze only covers some 13 percent of the budget and only accomplishes this goal by moving certain programs from discretionary to mandatory spending. Once the freeze is picked at by the free-spending leadership of the House and Senate, it will be reduced to a lukewarm puddle of even more deficit spending.

To make the tough decisions about balancing our budget, the administration looks to create a nonbinding commission. The President doesn't need a toothless commission when he already has the power to direct his Office of Management and Budget to create a blueprint for solvency. We need leadership. We need the buck to stop with the President, not with the commission of unelected economists, academics or bureaucrats.

SOLVING THE NATION'S FINANCIAL PROBLEMS

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

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, while there continues to be signs of an improving economy, it is clear that Americans still need help. In my hometown of Wilson, North Carolina, unemployment rose to 12.5 percent in December. That's one out of eight, and 73 of my 100 counties are suffering unemployment rates of at least 10 percent.

President Obama's 2011 budget wisely provides for critical investments to spur job creation and strengthen long-term economic security. This budget includes $100 billion in small business tax cuts, infrastructure and clean energy. This includes a new $33 billion small business tax cut, an extension of the broadest tax cut in American history, the Making Work Pay tax credit. It also increases the child care tax break for middle-class families and eliminates the capital gains tax on investments by small businesses. I urge my colleagues to join me in working to ensure that we take the necessary and commonsense steps to solve these problems.

BIGGER BUDGET BLUNDERS

(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, unemployment is still at double digits across the country; and in my home State of South Carolina, it is at a record high of 12.6 percent. Families are hurting, loosing jobs. With this dismal backdrop, why would the administration propose a budget that will increase taxes by more than $2 trillion over 10 years, killing jobs? The budget is more spending, more taxes, and more borrowing.

Media across the country are even calling this budget bluff. In the San Francisco Chronicle, liberal economists question the deficit reduction measures. Economist Isabel Sawhill called such measures ''totally depressing,'' saying it is ''depressing'' to see the administration abandon even the goal of a balanced budget. The Associated Press reports it as a deficit commission ''without teeth.'' Politico reports it is ''betting heavily on the symbolism of'' a spending freeze filled with loopholes and is already being undercut by Washington Democrats.

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

NO PAY RAISE FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

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

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to once again urge my colleagues to cosponsor H.R. 4255, Stop the Automatic Pay Raise for Members of Congress in Fiscal Year 2011 Act. Representative RON PAUL and I introduced a bipartisan bill which has 117 cosponsors, because we think that at a time like this, it is simply unconscionable for Members to be seeking a pay raise.

Unless Congress acts, that is precisely what will happen. Americans are struggling. They're not getting a pay raise and neither should Congress. President Obama has frozen pay for senior White House officials. Chief Justice Roberts recently announced that he is not seeking a salary increase for Federal judges this year. Congress should follow suit. We hear an awful lot about fiscal discipline in this Chamber. We talk the talk. Mr. Speaker, it is past time for us to walk the walk. I urge my colleagues to do the right thing by cosponsoring H.R. 4255 and stop Congress from getting a pay raise.

BIPARTISANSHIP

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

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, my Republican colleagues and I were pleased to meet with the President last week about the many problems facing our Nation, the most important being that folks across the country are without jobs. We can no longer pretend that exploding deficits, bigger government, more taxes, and generational debt will lead us out of this dire recession.

During his State of the Union speech, the President said that Republicans have presented no solutions. Later that week when we handed him a copy of the Republicans' ''Better Solutions,'' without reading it he said that many of our ideas have already been incorporated into his bills. Which is true? I urge the President to immediately abandon the government takeover of health care and other industries. Instead, he should actually consider some of these commonsense ideas so that we can solve this country's problems in a bipartisan way by immediately cutting deficits and restoring the thing this country wants most—jobs, jobs, jobs.

IN SUPPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday the President unveiled his budget to help restart our economy and get our deficit under control after years of mismanagement by the previous administration. As we make the hard choices that are needed, we must remember where we started. When President Obama was sworn into office, our economy was on the brink of collapse, 700,000 Americans were losing their jobs every month, and our financial and housing markets were in free-fall.

Working with Congress, President Obama took immediate and extraordinary steps to repair this economic and fiscal mess that he inherited. A year later, our economy is slowly but surely recovering but too many families continue to struggle. Unemployment remains unacceptably high. That's why job creation and economic recovery are the central focus of the President's budget. It requests $100 billion for a job creation package to help small businesses access credit and hire new workers.

It also invests in education, clean energy and our infrastructure, all essential for our long-term economic vitality. Finally, the President takes the first steps toward restoring the fiscal responsibility that had been lost in the past decade.

Mr. Speaker, after the mess we've inherited, we clearly have our work cut out for us, but the President's budget provides us with a good blueprint to meet these huge challenges.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR). Members are reminded not to traffic the well while another is under recognition.

WE NEED A BALANCED BUDGET

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, Congress will raise the debt ceiling $1.9 trillion to $14.6 trillion this week. The deficit last year, $1.5 trillion. The budget introduced on Monday is another $1.5 trillion. We're over $12 trillion in debt, on our way to $20 trillion.

The American people are saying, Enough is enough. Families and businesses in the last couple of years have had less revenues. They've made cuts. In the United States, 49 out of 50 Governors have had to balance their budgets. We need a constitutional balanced budget now. I would ask the President and congressional leaders to step up. Again, in the last 50 years, we've only balanced the budget five times. We need real leadership and real courage, and we need it right now. We need to make the cuts and get the budget in line.

MAKING ENDS MEET DURING THIS RECESSION

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

Mr. DRIEHAUS. Mr. Speaker, though our economy is growing again, we still face record budget deficits and a growing national debt due to the revenue lost during the Great Recession, the reckless tax policies of previous Congresses and the steps we took to turn around the economy. The President's proposal to freeze discretionary spending is an important step to meet this challenge, but we must do more. As we begin the budget process for 2011, Congress needs to make tough choices about spending just like millions of American families are doing to make ends meet during this recession.

As Members of Congress, we need to quit pointing fingers and come together to be smarter about the way we spend taxpayer money. We must enact strict PAYGO principles, stop abusive no-bid contracts, and crack down on wasteful earmarks. Noisy rhetoric about wasteful spending isn't going to reduce the deficit, just as it doesn't create jobs or stimulate the economy.

So I urge lawmakers on both sides of the aisle to put aside politics and business as usual so that our current deficit challenge doesn't become the burden of future generations.

PRESIDENT OBAMA'S FY 2011 BUDGET

(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, on Monday, President Obama submitted his fiscal year 2011 budget to Congress with the claim that he was planning on restoring fiscal discipline to Washington. However, once you look beyond the rhetoric, it's clear that the budget the President delivered to Congress does not deliver on its promises.

Mr. Speaker, the President's budget request totaled a new record of approximately $3.8 trillion in Federal spending—that's 25 percent of our GDP—and increased our deficit to $1.6 trillion for the current fiscal year 2010. In order to pay for this record level of spending, the budget request increases taxes by approximately $2 trillion over a 10-year period. His so-called spending freeze—well, that only applies to 13 percent of actual spending. With 10 percent of our workforce unemployed and over 15 million Americans out of work, there are families all across this country that are making sacrifices by cutting their expenses.

So, Mr. Speaker, we need a budget that recognizes that we cannot spend, tax, and borrow our way into prosperity. That's never worked. Unfortunately, the President's budget does not recognize this simple fact.

□ 1030

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

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

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased the President called for fiscal responsibility and more responsible spending in his recent State of the Union address. In 2009, we saw a $1.4 trillion budget deficit and will likely see the same this year. At over $12 trillion, our deficit is simply unsustainable. Clearly, it is time for us to do something about it.

I believe there are reforms that can bridge the gap between Republicans, Blue Dogs, New Democrats, and Progressives; policies like accountability and transparency in the appropriations process and a Bipartisan Fiscal Commission. This year, we must come together to pass these and other important policies. PAYGO is an important first step. It has a proven track record of success and has helped us reach record surpluses in the 1990s.

I am hopeful that my colleagues, Republican and Democrat, will join me in supporting this important legislation. Getting America back on the path to fiscal responsibility will take time. But with an incremental, systematic, bipartisan approach, we can secure a robust and productive economy for generations to come.

OFFSHORE DRILLING

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, last week Americans were encouraged when President Obama mentioned offshore drilling in his State of the Union address; yet, it took only 5 short days for the President to reveal his true intentions on offshore drilling. The President's budget plan shows revenues for new offshore leases dramatically declining in the next 5 years. If more areas are opened to exploration, revenues would increase, not decrease. Less revenue means less exploration. This shows this administration has no intention of opening up new areas to offshore drilling.

In 2008, the decades-long ban on offshore drilling was ended because the public demanded it. As a result, we now have over 500 million new acres available for energy production. But this administration is purposely choosing not to act. The President's words don't match his actions. This administration's policies are preventing the creation of millions of new American jobs. Mr. Speaker, it's time for America to move forward with an all-of-the-above energy plan that includes new offshore drilling.

PAYGO: EFFECTIVE TOOL FOR ADDRESSING DEFICIT

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

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, we're going to be taking up PAYGO. It is an effective tool for addressing the deficit. It will strengthen fiscal responsibility.

Now, what does the legislation do? It requires that all new policies reducing revenues or increasing entitlement spending be offset over between 5 and 10 years. It ensures that we can afford to fund America's most important priorities such as education, clean energy, health care for future generations. It will force advocates of tax cuts to acknowledge their costs and show how they would pay for them. It would force a serious examination of wasteful subsidies in the budget and tax loopholes that can be eliminated to offset new worthwhile programs.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that Republicans and Democrats will join us this week in supporting this proven tool for fiscal responsibility.

FISCAL YEAR 2011 DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY BUDGET

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, in a moment in history where our Nation is facing the constant threat of terrorism, we should be passing a budget that addresses those urgent needs. The administration's Department of Homeland Security budget does not.

In the midst of the Mexican cartel drug war raging on our border, the administration cuts 181 Border Patrol agents. At a time when our Coast Guardsmen are risking their lives in everyday places like Iraq and Haiti, this budget slashes active duty Coast Guard personnel by 1,100 people. And yet, we see budget increases to fund DHS bureaucrats in Washington, not security boots on the ground. And perhaps the most troubling, this budget devotes $200 million to try Guantanamo Bay terrorists on U.S. soil.

These exorbitant expenditures on misguided priorities are taking away from the critical needs of other DHS programs. What we need is a budget that addresses our current security needs, not a budget that brings terrorists to our soil and endangers Americans.

COMPARED TO WHAT?

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, we all remember the great line of Rodney Dangerfield. When asked, ''How's your wife?'' he said, ''Compared to what?'' Well, beginning last Friday, with President Obama's appearance before the Republican conference and this week with the introduction of the new budget, we have seen the ''compared to what.''

President Obama has an aggressive plan to create jobs and restore economic vitality. We want to provide credit to small businesses, job tax credits and very important incentives to both middle class working families and the businesses that create most of the jobs.

On the other side, we saw from Congressman RYAN their version of economic growth: Privatize Social Security, eliminate Medicare for everybody under 55, and give people vouchers to buy insurance which they won't be able to afford. And, of course, tax cuts across the board, which means more tax breaks for Bill Gates and Warren Buffett and the managers at AIG that just took $100 million worth of bonuses.

We now see the ''compared to what,'' and I hope that we continue to see the ''compared to what.'' We will see who has a plan that will create economic growth for the American people.

PAYGO

(Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, it's kind of interesting that my friends from the other side keep beating up on Democrats. I think Bill Gates is a Democrat and I think the other gentleman that you mentioned is as well.

But let me just say this, Mr. Speaker. It is amazing on this floor how we have convoluted the thought process. You see, we have a PAYGO system on the Democratic side that says you have to pay for tax cuts. What is that assumption? That is, every time you have a tax cut, that's a tax expenditure. That's the other language they used to use. In other words, the premise is that every dollar in your pocket is owned by the government, and only when they, at their sufferance, allow you to keep it is it okay. So if you give a tax cut or you maintain tax rates at present levels, you have an obligation here to somehow say, Thank you. Thank you Federal Government. Thank you members of the leadership on the Democratic side. You've allowed me to keep my money if I can show how you pay for it.

It used to be the other way around, government only spends what it takes in; not saying that you, the average American, have an obligation to pay for whatever they want to do, and if you don't, you have to somehow pay for it. It is your money in the first instance.

RECOVERY ACT JOBS: TAMPA FAMILY HEALTH CENTERS

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

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act is putting people to work in my hometown of Tampa.

Last Thursday at the University of Tampa, President Obama announced a new jobs initiative that will put thousands and thousands of Floridians to work constructing one of the Nation's first segments of high-speed rail. And on Monday, I paid a visit to Tampa Family Health Centers to meet a number of the medical professionals who have been hired through the Recovery Act.

I visited with Dr. Mildred Perea, a pediatrician. Dr. Perea finished her residency at the University of South Florida in June. She was hired to work at the community health center in July because of the Recovery Act. And since that time, she's been treating children with H1N1 and referring them over to the new dental clinic that is now available because of the Recovery Act.

I also met Sophia Dorril, a hard-working medical receptionist who is grateful to have a job during this tough economy, and Zer Yang, a popular new medical assistant who switched professions, retrained, and is making a difference for our neighbors.

In Tampa alone, we're about to break ground on two new community health centers that are vitally needed in East Tampa and Egypt Lake. So more jobs are on the way.

The Recovery Act is putting folks to work in my hometown, work that is making a significant difference in the lives of children and families in my community.

CHRISTMAS DAY BOMBER IS A TERRORIST, NOT A STUDENT

(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, in a recent interview with ABC World News, President Obama referred to the Christmas Day bomber as a Nigerian student. But he is not just a student. He's a terrorist, a would-be mass murderer who almost killed 288 innocent civilians.

The administration is so concerned about being politically correct that they water down the truth about the terrorist threat facing Americans. Last year, the Obama administration instructed officials to replace the term ''global war on terror'' with ''overseas contingency operation.'' Around the same time, Homeland Security Secretary Napolitano started referring to ''terrorist attacks'' as ''man-made disasters.'' The administration also abandoned the use of ''enemy combatants'' when referring to terrorists detained at Guantanamo Bay.

It's time to stop watering down our words and start calling terrorists what they are, terrorists.

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

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

Ms. KILROY. Mr. Speaker, in my household, just like the households of my neighbors and people in my community in Central Ohio, when we want to spend money, we have to figure out whether it fits within our budget. And as a local official, we also needed to make sure that our budgets were balanced and that we had the right kind of priorities in our budgets as we decided our spending plan. That's why passing pay-as-you-go legislation is so important.

It worked during the Clinton administration. We had to decide, Congress had to decide what the important priorities were, and it left a budget surplus at the end of the Clinton administration. During the Bush years, we saw the PAYGO legislation expire, and we saw that instead of making sure that we paid attention to the right kind of priorities, millions were given in tax cuts to the wealthiest, and our President was left with a budget deficit to confront.

Right now, if we pass PAYGO legislation, it will make sure that we can afford to fund America's most important priorities: Education, clean energy, jobs. And I hope that our colleagues across the aisle will join us in pay-as-you-go legislation.

ACTIONS SPEAK LOUDER THAN WORDS

(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, last Wednesday night we all had a stirring address here in this Chamber from the President in which he proposed a 3-year spending freeze. And we all lauded the fact that the President was getting serious about the notion of reducing Federal spending in light of the fact that we have seen this 86 percent increase take place in the past year over spending the year before. The problem is this: We all were taught as children that actions speak louder than words.

The first bill that is to be coming to this House since the President gave his State of the Union message calling for the spending freeze is a measure which is denying an opportunity for our colleague from Dallas, Texas, Mr. SESSIONS, to propose a freeze in the level of

spending. There are 17 amendments that have been made in order. The one amendment denied was the spending freeze amendment.

And so, Mr. Speaker, it's very important for us to note that it's easy to talk about the need for us to freeze spending, but when the first bill, the first bill that's coming to this House denies an opportunity to even debate it, it shows that actions do speak louder than words.

HEALTH CARE AND JOBS ARE IMPORTANT

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, last week we were honored, in the State of the Union, to hear President Barack Obama address in this hall a joint convention, and then he met with the Republican Caucus this week in what was a remarkable political instance of reaching out to the other side. Not since Bill Russell controlled the center for the Celtics have questions and thoughts been deflected in such a marvelous and a deft manner.

The President is concerned about health care and jobs, and in my community of Memphis, Tennessee, we need both. And each interest is represented in the MED, our charity hospital, our community hospital that's in danger of closing. It's the trauma center for the Midsouth. Because of the cuts in Medicaid, or TennCare in Tennessee, and the lack of disproportionate share for our State which we could have taken care of in a conference committee report and gotten equality with Hawaii, the MED's in danger of closing. It will have ripples throughout the health community and the hospital community in the entire Midsouth, and it will threaten jobs.

Health care is jobs. Jobs are important. This administration and our government needs to put our economy in the right direction and do it and preserve health care and trauma centers and emergency rooms like the MED.

□ 1045

WALL STREET REFORM AND CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, the economic meltdown was one of the most disastrous economic events in the Nation's history. The banks were the main culprits, but the Republicans in Washington aided and abetted them by deregulating finances and turning the other way when problems surfaced.

Now the House has passed the Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act. It ends bailouts by helping ensure taxpayers are never again on the hook for Wall Street's risky decisions. It protects families' retirement funds, college savings, homes and businesses' financial future from unnecessary risk by executives, lenders, and speculators. And it also protects consumers from predatory lending abuses, fine print, and industry gimmicks.

Mr. Speaker, we passed this bill in the House. It must pass in the Senate and go to the President. But we as Democrats are making a difference in trying to prevent another economic meltdown.

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.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL APPOINTMENT ACT OF 2010

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2843) to provide for the joint appointment of the Architect of the Capitol by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the majority and minority leaders of the House of Representatives and Senate, and the chairs and ranking minority members of the committees of Congress with jurisdiction over the Office of the Architect of the Capitol, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2843

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 ''Architect of the Capitol Appointment Act of 2010''.

SEC. 2. APPOINTMENT AND TERM OF SERVICE OF ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL.

(a) APPOINTMENT.—The Architect of the Capitol shall be appointed jointly by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the majority and minority leaders of the House of Representatives and Senate, the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives, the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives, the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, the chairs and ranking minority members of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate, a member of the Senate to be designated by the majority leader of the Senate, and a member of the Senate to be designated by the minority leader of the Senate.

(b) TERM OF SERVICE.—The Architect of the Capitol shall be appointed for a term of 10 years, and may be reappointed for additional terms.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 319 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1990 (2 U.S.C. 1801) is repealed.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall apply with respect to appointments made on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) and the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD on H.R. 2843.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 2843, the Architect of the Capitol Appointment Act. I thank the original cosponsors of this bipartisan legislation, including Ranking Member Representative ROBERT ADERHOLT of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Subcommittee; Ranking Member ZACH WAMP, who I want to thank especially for initially cosponsoring this legislation with me when he was the ranking member of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Subcommittee; Representative TOM LATHAM, who is also a former ranking member of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Subcommittee—Mr. Speaker, maybe it's me, since I keep losing ranking members on the other side of the aisle. And it has been a pleasure to work with all of these gentlemen—Representative ROBERT BRADY, chairman of the Committee on House Administration, and his ranking member, Representative DAN LUNGREN, and of course former House Administration Ranking Member VERNON EHLERS.

This legislation effectively removes the appointment role of the Architect of the Capitol from the executive branch, placing it in the rightful hands of the legislative branch where it belongs.

Specifically, this bill provides for the joint appointment of the Architect of the Capitol by House and Senate leadership, both majority and minority, and the chairs and ranking members of each of the House and Senate committees of jurisdiction—including the Committees on Appropriations, House Administration, Senate Rules, and Transportation and Infrastructure.

This is a long overdue change. The Architect of the Capitol serves a legislative branch function and as such, he or she should be chosen by the legislative branch. By making this change, we can simplify a process that has caused unnecessary delays in choosing a permanent Architect.

Because of the delays in this process, we have had an Acting Architect in place since February of 2007. It is now February of 2010. And Mr. Hantman, the immediate past Architect, was appointed following a 2-year vacancy.

The Capitol campus is currently facing over $1 billion in deferred maintenance. We've been working diligently over the last several years to address that backlog, and the Architect has been very helpful in coordinating and addressing that backlog, but we need to make sure that we establish some permanence and some consistency. It's critically important that a permanent Architect is selected so that he or she can face these issues with an eye to the future.

It's our hope that this bipartisan legislation becomes law so that Congress can play a direct role in selecting the right candidates for a legislative branch position of significant importance like this one.

I ask for all Members' support in passing this vital legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple bill. It returns the authority of managing our place to the Members of Congress. We are the legislative branch. The Capitol is our House. It is not the purview or within the province of the President of the United States. It seems strange, to say the least, that we have a process by which we do not direct who it is we establish as the person who is really the official caretaker of the Capitol.

The Architect suggests that you sit in a room designing architectural designs for the purpose of new additions and new buildings, and the Architect would be responsible for that under his direction. But he really takes care of this place. He is the top appointed official to make sure that the House of Representatives, the United States Senate and the entire Capitol complex runs.

And somehow, we have set up a situation in which there is input by the House, input by the Senate, and the tiebreaker is the President of the United States essentially, and that really doesn't make sense. We don't choose who the chief usher of the White House is—and when I say ''chief usher,'' people don't realize that's the person who runs the White House complex.

And so it just makes very, very good sense. And I congratulate the gentlelady for bringing this to our attention, the gentleman, Mr. WAMP, and the other cosponsors.

So I rise in support of this bill, which will, as we say, establish a bicameral process by which we appoint the Architect of the Capitol. The Architect has carried the responsibility of preserving and enhancing the Capitol complex since construction on the U.S. Capitol began in 1793. Following the construction of the Capitol Visitor Center, management and administration of that center was placed under the purview of the Architect—further cementing the Architect's role in support of the legislature and its operations.

So accordingly, it is, as I say, the appropriate process by which the Architect is appointed by a bipartisan, bicameral process free of decisionmaking responsibility by the executive branch. The appointment process will be better aligned with the mission of the Office by emphasizing the relationship between the Architect and the ongoing legislative operations of the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP).

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank the distinguished ranking member for his time and all of the benefits that he brings to the House of Representatives.

This reminds me of when I got here in 1995 and in the morning, you would hear the strange noise as they would slide ice buckets down the floor up to the door of your office. And many of us thought, What are we doing paying people to deliver ice to our offices in 1995? And of course we ended that practice because it was an antiquated practice.

And if you study the history of this, this is an antiquated issue that has really never been resolved. The history of the Capital City and the need for the President to be involved in the appointment of the Architect of the Capitol that had responsibilities as we laid the city out is an issue of long ago but not today.

So I want to thank the original author, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ of Florida—who I don't agree with much these days—but I certainly agree with her a lot on this issue. And I thank her for her service because she and I came side-by-side to get the Capitol Visitor Center finally finished on time and with the revised budget. And it took extraordinary cooperation and work, and we did that. And frankly, it was because the legislative branch engaged in a very meaningful way to finally get our arms around all of those change orders and all of the delays and inefficiencies, and it just underscored the need for the legislative branch to drive the process. And it was by far the largest challenge that the Architect of the Capitol had seen in centuries, literally, to do the Capitol Visitor Center. And it reminded us of how important it is that we have in the House and Senate a cohesive and unified effort to oversee the Architect and the Architect's work.

In no way is this about an Architect. As a matter of fact, Stephen Ayers, the acting Architect, I think has done an outstanding job, and I hope will be made permanent under this new legislation which gives the legislative branch the total authority.

The gentlelady worked with me to make sure that the committees of jurisdiction—including this very committee that brings this bill to the floor today—is involved in the decisionmaking process so that it's not just the leaders either. These committees have their hands in these issues. There are bigger issues today in our country than this, but it doesn't mean we shouldn't keep the trains running on time. That is what this is, making sure that we're doing our job.

This is my 16th and final year here. I thank the gentleman from California. I have called him the conscience of the Republican minority today, and when he was in the majority I called him that because he was here early, he left to go back to California, he came back here. He has really provided extraordinary depth of knowledge and at times has been the conscience of the Republicans in the Congress. Extraordinary man.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ is a tiger. This is one of those issues that few people would grab the tiger by the tail, but she's that kind of person.

So we're doing this because it needs to be done. We're doing it for the legislative branch. We're doing it for efficiency and accountability and responsibility, and I urge passage.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I agree wholeheartedly with Mr. LUNGREN and Mr. WAMP. I couldn't have said it better myself.

It is incredibly important that we be good stewards of the Capitol complex and the facilities that we have the privilege to work in. It still amazes me every day when I walk up to the Capitol or past the Capitol when it's at night when it's all lit up or in the daytime. It's a structure that everyone who sees it marvels at it.

And it's our responsibility as the leaders of the, essentially, administrative committees that have responsibility for taking care of and funding the needs of the legislative branch to make sure that we are the ones that ultimately are held accountable and have the opportunity to coordinate the appointments of the Architect of the Capitol. It no longer makes sense—I am not sure that it ever made sense—to have the President of the United States be involved in what is essentially a legislative branch function, and it will make for a more efficient process and will enable us to preserve these facilities into the future for future generations.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I hope we have a unanimous vote in favor of H.R. 2843, and then I hope our colleagues on the other side of the aisle will see the wisdom of this and join us in reasserting the proper role of the legislative branch. And hopefully we can convince the President to give up this responsibility that I am sure does not weigh heavily on him at the present time.

This makes good sense. It ought to be accepted on a unanimous vote.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2843, as amended, a bill to provide for the joint appointment of the Architect of the Capitol by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the majority and minority leaders of the House of Representatives and Senate, and the chairs and ranking minority members of the committees of Congress with jurisdiction over the Office of the Architect of the Capitol, and for other purposes.

I extend my thanks to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), Chairwoman of the Appropriations Committee, Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT), Ranking Member of the Subcommittee, as well as the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY), Chairman, and the gentleman from California (Mr. LUNGREN), Ranking Member of the Committee on House Administration, for their cooperation and willingness to work with the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on this bill.

The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has a long and productive association with the Office of the Architect of the Capitol. Under House rule X, section (r), the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has jurisdiction over the Capitol Building and the House and Senate Office Buildings, in addition to public buildings and occupied or improved grounds of the United States generally. Over the years, the Committee has worked with the Architect's office on developing the Capitol Hill master plan, Capitol Hill Building fire and life safety programs, parking studies, and most recently on requirements in the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (P.L. 110–140) to ensure the energy efficiency of not only the House and Senate office buildings, but also to upgrade the Capitol Power Plant.

This bill provides congressional leaders with authority to appoint the Architect of the Capitol, and the appointments process includes House as well as Senate leadership, both majority and minority.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 2843.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2843, is a bipartisan initiative that would move the Architect of the Capitol selection process entirely to the legislative branch. This legislation has been amended from the version reported by the Committee on House Administration to include two additional House and two additional Senate Members. As amended, this legislation provides the following with authority to select the AOC: The Speaker of the House, the President Pro Tempore of the Senate, the majority and minority leaders of the House of Representatives and Senate, the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives, the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives, the chairs and ranking minority members of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate, a Member of the Senate to be designated by the majority leader of the Senate, and a Member of the Senate to be designated by the minority leader of the Senate.

Under the current system, the office of the Architect has been vacant for nearly 3 years. The long delay in filling the position has been exacerbated by the complexities and uncertainties of the current law, and the involvement of the executive branch.

The Committee on House Administration believes that enactment of H.R. 2843 will streamline the selection process.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. And urging support of that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1100

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2843, as amended.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''To provide for the joint appointment of the Architect of the Capitol by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the majority and minority leaders of the House of Representatives and Senate, the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives, the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives, the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, the chairs and ranking minority members of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate, and two other designated members of the Senate, and for other purposes.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOCIAL SECURITY DISABILITY APPLICANTS' ACCESS TO PROFESSIONAL REPRESENTATION ACT OF 2010

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4532) to provide for permanent extension of the attorney fee withholding procedures under title II of the Social Security Act to title XVI of such Act, and to provide for permanent extension of such procedures under titles II and XVI of such Act to qualified non-attorney representatives.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4532

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 ''Social Security Disability Applicants' Access to Professional Representation Act of 2010''.

SEC. 2. PERMANENT EXTENSION OF ATTORNEY FEE WITHHOLDING PROCEDURES TO TITLE XVI.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 302 of the Social Security Protection Act of 2004 (Public Law 108–203; 118 Stat. 519) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking ''**temporary**''; and

(2) in subsection (c), by striking ''EFFECTIVE DATE.—'' and all that follows through ''The amendments'' and inserting ''EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments'', and by striking paragraph (2).

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The item relating to section 302 in the table of contents in section 1(b) of such Act is amended by striking ''Temporary extension'' and inserting ''Extension''.

SEC. 3. PERMANENT EXTENSION OF FEE WITHHOLDING PROCEDURES TO QUALIFIED NON-ATTORNEY REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 206 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 406) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e)(1) The Commissioner shall provide for the extension of the fee withholding procedures and assessment procedures that apply under the preceding provisions of this section to agents and other persons, other than attorneys, who represent claimants under this title before the Commissioner.

''(2) Fee-withholding procedures may be extended under paragraph (1) to any non-attorney representative only if such representative meets at least the following prerequisites:

''(A) The representative has been awarded a bachelor's degree from an accredited institution of higher education, or has been determined by the Commissioner to have equivalent qualifications derived from training and work experience.

''(B) The representative has passed an examination, written and administered by the Commissioner, which tests knowledge of the relevant provisions of this Act and the most recent developments in agency and court decisions affecting this title and title XVI.

''(C) The representative has secured professional liability insurance, or equivalent insurance, which the Commissioner has determined to be adequate to protect claimants in the event of malpractice by the representative.

''(D) The representative has undergone a criminal background check to ensure the representative's fitness to practice before the Commissioner.

''(E) The representative demonstrates ongoing completion of qualified courses of continuing education, including education regarding ethics and professional conduct, which are designed to enhance professional knowledge in matters related to entitlement to, or eligibility for, benefits based on disability under this title and title XVI. Such continuing education, and the instructors providing such education, shall meet such standards as the Commissioner may prescribe.

''(3)(A) The Commissioner may assess representatives reasonable fees to cover the cost to the Social Security Administration of administering the prerequisites described in paragraph (2).

''(B) Fees collected under subparagraph (A) shall be credited to the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund, or deposited as miscellaneous receipts in the general fund of the Treasury, based on such allocations as the Commissioner determines appropriate.

''(C) The fees authorized under this paragraph shall be collected and available for obligation only to the extent and in the

amount provided in advance in appropriations Acts. Amounts so appropriated are authorized to remain available until expended for administering the prerequisites described in paragraph (2).''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 1631(d)(2)(A) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1383(d)(2)(A)) is amended—

(A) in clause (iv), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in clause (v), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new clause:

''(vi) by substituting, in subsection (e)(1)—

''(I) 'subparagraphs (B) and (C) of section 1631(d)(2)' for 'the preceding provisions of this section'; and

''(II) 'title XVI' for 'this title'.''.

(2) Section 303(e)(2) of the Social Security Protection Act of 2004 (Public Law 108–203; 118 Stat. 523) is amended by striking ''AND FINAL REPORT'' in the heading and by striking the last sentence.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The Commissioner of Social Security shall provide for full implementation of the provisions of section 206(e) of the Social Security Act (as added by subsection (a)) and the amendments made by subsection (b) not later than March 1, 2010.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 4532.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TANNER. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I want to thank Mr. JOHNSON for being here and being able to work together to work this out.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, for the past several years, one of the top priorities of our Ways and Means Subcommittee on Social Security has been helping the hundreds of thousands of Americans who have been waiting sometimes over a year or two for a hearing on their disability case due to the large backlog. We have urged the Social Security Administration to make eliminating this backlog a top priority.

I want to thank Chairman OBEY for his commitment to ensuring that the Social Security Administration has resources to address the issue effectively.

We join today with Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. LINDER on this bill to provide access to professional representation. The benefit application process can be very complicated, as many know; and this bill would help ensure that the applicants can get professional representation and help when they need it. It makes permanent an existing program to increase access to professional representation. And without the passage of this bill, the program would expire March 1.

It has the support of many organizations that are engaged in this effort. I would like to insert into the RECORD this morning a couple of letters from some of those people.

CONSORTIUM FOR CITIZENS WITH DISABILITIES,
February 1, 2010.

Hon. JOHN TANNER,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Social Security, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. SAM JOHNSON,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Social Security, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. JIM MCDERMOTT,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Income Security and Family Support, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. JOHN LINDER,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Income Security and Family Support, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN TANNER, CHAIRMAN MCDERMOTT, RANKING MEMBER JOHNSON, AND RANKING MEMBER LINDER: On behalf of the undersigned members of the Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities (CCD) Social Security Task Force, we are writing in support of H.R. 4532, the ''Social Security Disability Applicants' Access to Professional Representation Act of 2010.'' H.R. 4532 makes permanent two provisions included in the Social Security Protection Act of 2004 (SSPA), P.L. 108–203, designed to improve access to representation for claimants applying for Social Security disability and Supplemental Security Income benefits.

Section 302 of the SSPA authorized the withholding and direct payment of attorneys' fees in Supplemental Security Income cases. Section 303 established a demonstration project to allow withholding and direct payment of fees to eligible non-attorney representatives. Both programs are scheduled to sunset on February 28, 2010. Because both programs have been successful, we are writing to support their permanent continuation.

WITHHOLDING AND DIRECT PAYMENT OF FEES IN SSI CASES

Section 302 of the SSPA amended section 1631(d)(2) of the Social Security Act to extend the Title II fee withholding and direct payment procedures to claims under Title XVI of the Act.

The CCD Social Security Task Force has long supported allowing SSI claimants to enter into voluntary agreements with attorneys which would allow SSA to withhold and provide direct payment of attorneys' fees from past due SSI benefits. The SSPA established this provision and extended it to attorneys and non-attorney representatives who qualify under the Section 303 demonstration (described below). The SSA disability determination process is very complex and beyond the capacity, training, or experience of many claimants to negotiate without knowledgeable assistance. By ensuring that representatives will be paid a fee for successful work on a claimant's behalf, this provision has helped to assure that a knowledgeable, experienced pool of representatives is available to claimants. The limit on fees and the involvement of SSA in establishing the fees helps to ensure that the fees are reasonable. Experience has demonstrated that this provision has increased opportunities for SSI claimants to obtain representation.

FEE WITHHOLDING FOR QUALIFIED NON-ATTORNEY REPRESENTATIVES

Section 303 of the SSPA established a demonstration program to examine the effectiveness of allowing non-attorney representatives to qualify for fee withholding. In order to qualify, the non-attorneys must possess a bachelor's degree (or equivalent experience) and malpractice insurance coverage; pass a background check; complete a test examining knowledge of the Social Security disability system; and maintain continuing education in areas directly related to Social Security disability programs. To date, the demonstration program has been successfully implemented. We believe that claimants benefit from the availability of qualified non-attorneys and we urge that the sunset date be lifted.

CONCLUSION

CCD appreciates your efforts to assure that claimants applying for Social Security disability and Supplemental Security Income benefits receive the benefits to which they are entitled. Access to an experienced and qualified representative to guide claimants through the lengthy and often-confusing process is key to a timely and well-informed decision by SSA. Since the SSPA was enacted, the provisions detailed above have proven their effectiveness in increasing claimants' access to effective representation. For these reasons, we urge Congress to move quickly to extend and make permanent both programs so that there is no gap or delay which might affect claimants' cases and/or their ability to receive knowledgeable assistance.

Sincerely,

MARTY FORD,
The Arc and United Cerebral Palsy Disability Policy Collaboration.

PEGGY HATHAWAY,
United Spinal Association and National Spinal Cord Injury Association.

SUSAN PROKOP,
Paralyzed Veterans of America.

PAUL SEIFERT,
Council of State Administrators of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Co-Chairs, CCD Social Security Task Force.

On behalf of:

American Council of the Blind

Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law

Community Access National Network

Council of State Administrators of Vocational Rehabilitation

National Association for Disability Representatives

National Council for Community Behavioral Healthcare

National Council on Independent Living

National Organization of Social Security Claimants' Representatives

National Spinal Cord Injury Association

Paralyzed Veterans of America

Research Institute for Independent Living

The Arc of the United States

United Cerebral Palsy

United Spinal Association

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF DISABILITY REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 29, 2010.

Hon. JOHN TANNER,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Social Security, Committee on Ways & Means, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. SAM JOHNSON,
Ranking Member, Committee on Ways & Means, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. JIM MCDERMOTT,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Income Security, Committee on Ways & Means, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. JOHN LINDER,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Income Security, Committee on Ways & Means, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMEN TANNER AND MCDERMOTT AND RANKING MEMBERS JOHNSON AND LINDER:

On behalf of The National Association of Disability Representatives (NADR), a professional organization comprised of non-attorneys and attorneys who assist people in applying for disability income assistance from the Social Security Administration, I am writing to offer our strong support for H.R. 4532, the ''Social Security Disability Applicants' Access to Professional Representation Act of 2010.'' The legislation will make permanent two provisions included in the Social Security Protection Act of 2004 (SSPA), P.L. 108–203, designed to improve access to representation for claimants applying for Social Security disability and Supplement Security disability benefits. Both programs are scheduled to sunset on February 28, 2010.

WITHHOLDING AND DIRECT PAYMENT OF FEES IN SSI CASES

Section 2 of the proposed legislation amends Section 302 of the SSPA to permanently extend fee-withholding procedures for attorneys and qualified non-attorney representatives to claims under Title XVI of the Act. This provision of the SSPA has increased opportunities for SSI claimants to obtain representation and should be extended. Without Title XVI fee withholding, the most vulnerable among us may be unable to get the help they need in negotiating the Social Security claims process.

FEE WITHHOLDING FOR QUALIFIED NON-ATTORNEY REPRESENTATIVES

Section 3 of the bill makes permanent a demonstration program established in Section 303 of the SSPA to examine the effectiveness of non-attorney representatives who qualify for fee withholding by possessing a bachelor's degree (or equivalent experience), passing an examination, securing liability insurance, undergoing a background check and demonstrating ongoing completion of qualified courses of continuing education. The Government Accountability Office released a report in October 2007 analyzing the performance of non-attorney representatives in disability cases before the Social Security Administration. The study results indicated that non-attorney representatives who met the criteria necessary for fee withholding demonstrated levels of knowledge and success rates at least equal to that of practicing attorneys.

The demonstration program has proven to be extremely effective in improving access to qualified representatives for claimants. Just as important, many NADR members work with claimants from the initial application, which serves not only to expedite valid claims, but also to provide counseling that can weed out inappropriate cases before they enter the system. Once a claimant does enter the system, qualified representatives who understand the requisite objective documentary needs can assist the claims examiner and adjudicators to gather this critical information in a timely manner. All this leads to savings of time and resources.

Access to an experienced and qualified representative to guide claimants through the lengthy and often-confusing disability-claims process is key to a timely and well-informed decision by SSA. For all these reasons, NADR urges the House to pass H.R. 4532 as quickly as possible in order to ensure that these fee-withholding provisions remain in effect without interruption.

Sincerely,

SCOT E. WHITAKER,
President.

NATIONAL ORGANIZATION OF SOCIAL SECURITY CLAIMANTS' REPRESENTATIVES,
Englewood Cliffs, NJ, February 3, 2010.

Hon. JOHN TANNER,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Social Security, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. SAM JOHNSON,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Social Security, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. JIM MCDERMOTT,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Income Security and Family Support, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. JOHN LINDER,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Income Security and Family Support, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN TANNER, CHAIRMAN MCDERMOTT, RANKING MEMBER JOHNSON, AND RANKING MEMBER LINDER: We are writing in strong support of H.R. 4532, the ''Social Security Disability Applicants' Access to Professional Representation Act of 2010.''

Applying for Social Security disability and Supplemental Security Income disability benefits can be a confusing, complicated, and difficult process. While claimants have the right to be represented, it is a hollow right if there is no realistic way to obtain representation.

The Social Security Protection Act of 2004 (SSPA), Pub. L. No. 108–203, included two provisions intended to help claimants obtain representation: (1) the withholding and direct payment of fees in Supplemental Security Income (SSI) cases; and (2) establishing a demonstration project to allow eligible non-attorney representatives the option of withholding and direct payment of fees in both Title II and SSI cases. Under the SSPA, both of these provisions are scheduled to ''sunset'' after a five-year period, which would be March 1, 2010. Because both projects have been successful, we are writing to support their permanent continuation. H.R. 4532 accomplishes this goal.

Established in 1979, the National Organization of Social Security Claimants' Representatives (NOSSCR) is an association of nearly 4,000 attorneys and paralegals who represent Social Security and SSI claimants seeking to obtain disability and income security benefits. NOSSCR members are committed to providing high quality representation for claimants, to maintaining a system of full and fair adjudication for every claimant, and to advocating for beneficial change in the disability determination and adjudication process.

WITHHOLDING AND DIRECT PAYMENT OF FEES IN SSI CASES

Section 302 of the SSPA amended section 1631(d)(2) of the Social Security Act to extend the Title II attorney fee withholding and direct payment procedures to claims under Title XVI of the Act. This provision became effective for SSI fees paid on or after February 28, 2005.

Extending the existing fee withholding and direct payment provisions for Title II cases to Title XVI cases has made a measurable difference in the ability of SSI claimants to obtain representation. SSA's statistics for the hearing level show representation of SSI claimants has increased in every year since the SSPA provision was implemented.

Section 302 includes a sunset provision. Under that provision, the amendments made by section 302 will not apply to claims for benefits with respect to which the claimant and the representative enter into the agreement for representation after February 28, 2010.

Because the SSPA change has increased the opportunities for SSI claimants to obtain representation, we support the provision in H.R. 4532, which makes this provision permanent.

NON-ATTORNEY REPRESENTATIVES

Section 303 of the SSPA directs the Commissioner to carry out a five-year nationwide demonstration project to determine the potential results of extending the fee withholding and direct payment procedures that apply to attorneys under Titles II and XVI of the Social Security Act to non-attorney representatives who meet certain minimum prerequisites specified in section 303 and any additional prerequisites that the Commissioner may prescribe.

Under the prerequisites specified in section 303, individuals applying to participate in the demonstration project must have a bachelor's degree or equivalent education, possess liability insurance or equivalent insurance adequate to protect claimants in the event of malpractice by the representative, pass a criminal background check ensuring fitness to practice before SSA, pass an examination testing knowledge of the relevant provisions of the Act and the most recent developments in Agency and court decisions, and demonstrate ongoing completion of qualified continuing education courses. In addition, the Commissioner has required that individuals applying to participate in the demonstration project show that they have sufficient prior experience representing claimants before SSA.

The five-year demonstration project on direct payment of fees to eligible non-attorneys began on February 28, 2005, and also is scheduled to ''sunset'' at the end of five years. The demonstration project established by SSPA section 303 applies to claims for benefits with respect to which the agreement for representation is entered into after February 27, 2005 and before March 1, 2010.

We support the provision in H.R. 4532 that makes this provision permanent. We believe that, to date, the demonstration project has been successfully implemented by the contractor engaged by the Social Security Administration, CPS Human Resource Services. By all reports, the contractor has done a good job administering the demonstration project including periodic administration of the examination and ensuring that the other required criteria are met.

We appreciate your support for improving SSA's service for individuals who are applying for benefits by introducing and co-sponsoring H.R. 4532. We believe that making permanent the SSPA provisions regarding representation will benefit individuals with disabilities who file claims for benefits.

Very truly yours,

NANCY G. SHOR,
Executive Director.

In addition, the good news is that the bill has no cost. It may even generate a little money—some say $55 million over 10 years—from user fees paid by representatives who participate.

And so, Mr. Speaker, with that, I would ask that everyone support this

legislation. It is, I think, something that will not only benefit people who are engaged in the system, but will cut down in many respects, hopefully, on some of the time people who are sick and disabled have to wait before their cases are adjudicated.

I am joined today by my colleagues, JIM MCDERMOTT, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Income Security and Family Support, SAM JOHNSON, Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Social Security, and JOHN LINDER, Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Income Security and Family Support, in support of the Social Security Disability Applicants' Access to Professional Representation Act. This important, bipartisan legislation will help individuals with severe disabilities navigate the often lengthy and complex process of applying for Social Security and Supplemental Security Income (SSI) disability benefits.

For the last few years, one of the top priorities of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Social Security has been helping the hundreds of thousands of Americans who have been waiting years for a hearing on their disability case due to large claims backlogs. We have urged the Social Security Administration (SSA) to make eliminating this backlog a top priority. I particularly want to thank Chairman Obey for his commitment to ensuring that SSA has the resources to address this issue.

By improving access to quality, professional representation for disability applicants, this bill would address another barrier individuals with severe disabilities face when they apply for disability benefits. Increasingly the availability of professional representation can also help speed the disability process, as representatives can help to ensure that SSA has the medical evidence needed to adjudicate cases, avoiding unnecessary delays.

Specifically, this bill would improve access to representation by making permanent a temporary provision to expand access that is due to expire on March 1.

For many years, attorneys who represent Social Security disability claimants have been able to have their fees withheld from the claimant's past-due benefits and paid directly to them by SSA. By providing a way to ensure that attorneys are paid if the claim is successful, this system has helped to ensure that disability applicants—even those who are very low income—have access to professional representation. This representation is particularly important for those applicants who appeal their case by seeking a hearing before an Administrative Law Judge. The fee paid to representatives is limited to 25 percent of the claimant's past-due benefits, subject to a dollar cap, and is only paid if the claimant wins.

In 2004, Congress adopted a provision to temporarily expand this fee-withholding system in two ways: by extending the system to SSI claims, and also by allowing qualified non-attorney representatives to participate. To be a ''qualified non-attorney,'' a representative must pass an examination administered by SSA and meet other criteria designed to protect applicants.

This expansion of the fee-payment system has been very successful, and disability groups and other stakeholders have strongly supported making it permanent. In addition, both SSA and the Government Accountability Office have examined the program to extend fee-withholding to non-attorney representatives and found it was working well.

The Social Security Disability Applicants' Access to Professional Representation Act would ensure that these successful programs continue. The bill has no cost, and even generates some savings—$55 million over 10 years—due to user fees paid by representatives who participate.

Ensuring that individuals with severe disabilities have the help they need to navigate the complex benefit application process is a goal on which we can all agree. I urge you to support this bipartisan legislation to move us closer to this goal.

I want to thank, again, Mr. JOHNSON.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Filing for disability benefits isn't easy. There are deadlines to meet, complicated questions to answer, confusing forms to fill out, and doctor reports that need to be sent to Social Security. It's no wonder that close to two-thirds of all those who appear before an administrative law judge need a representative to help them navigate the complex process.

If benefits are paid, most representatives receive a fee of 25 percent of past due benefits, capped at $6,000.

Since 1967, through a process known as ''fee withholding,'' Social Security has withheld these fees from past due Social Security disability benefits and paid attorney representatives directly. However, non-attorney representatives and attorneys representing those applying for Supplemental Security Income, or SSI, benefits had to collect their fees from their clients.

This changed in 2004 when Congress passed the Social Security Protection Act. This legislation created a 5-year demonstration program that expanded fee withholding to SSI benefits and also allowed qualified non-attorneys to participate in fee withholding from Social Security and SSI benefits. The program expires March 1 of this year.

Both the Social Security Administration and the Government Accountability Office have studied these programs and found that they are working. Well qualified non-attorneys are participating in fee withholding, and those applying for SSI benefits have greater access to representation. Now that the demonstration program is about to expire, advocates for those with disabilities and associations representing attorneys and non-attorneys alike support making these provisions permanent.

I agree. So I was pleased to join with Ways and Means Social Security Subcommittee Chairman JOHN TANNER, one of the great Democrats over there, along with Income Security and Family Support Subcommittee Chairman JIM MCDERMOTT and Ranking Member JOHN LINDER, to introduce H.R. 4532, the Social Security Disability Applicants' Access to Professional Representation Act of 2010.

Not only does this bill help those filing for disability benefits; it also saves the taxpayers $55 million over 10 years, as representatives pay the government a user fee for processing their payments.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. I also hope our subcommittees will do more to make filing for disability benefits easier. The more progress we can make, the more our constituents will avoid losing their hard-earned benefits to representatives in the first place.

I thank Mr. TANNER for helping us with this, and I appreciate your time this morning as well.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, the bill before us, the Social Security Disability Applicants' Access to Professional Representation Act of 2010, will make permanent provisions first enacted in a demonstration program included in the Social Security Protection Act of 2004. The provisions allowed attorney fee withholding under Supplemental Security Income, SSI, and qualified non-attorney fee withholding under the Social Security and SSI programs. It also created standards for qualifying non-attorneys for participation in fee withholding.

This action has helped claimants as they work through the often complex and time-consuming disability process. Without action on this bill the provisions will expire on March 1, 2010.

The Social Security Administration, SSA, has received favorable feedback on the program from non-attorney representatives and has received no complaints from claimants. The Government Accountability Office studied the process and has raised no significant concerns.

In addition to support from disability advocates for making the provisions permanent, we received letters urging passage of the legislation from the National Association of Disability Representatives, NADR, and the Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities that Mr. TANNER entered into the RECORD earlier. At this time I would like to insert a letter of support into the RECORD from the National Organization of Social Security Claimants' Representatives.

Because attorneys and non-attorneys who participate in fee withholding are charged a fee by the SSA, preliminary estimates suggest the provisions would reduce the deficit over 10 years by approximately $55 million.

Join me in supporting the Social Security Disability Applicants' Access to Professional Representation Act of 2010.

NATIONAL ORGANIZATION OF SOCIAL SECURITY CLAIMANTS' REPRESENTATIVES,
Englewood Cliffs, NJ, February 3, 2010.

Hon. JOHN TANNER,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Social Security, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. SAM JOHNSON,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Social Security, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. JIM MCDERMOTT,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Income Security and Family Support, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. JOHN LINDER,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Income Security and Family Support, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN TANNER, CHAIRMAN MCDERMOTT, RANKING MEMBER JOHNSON, AND

RANKING MEMBER LINDER: We are writing in strong support of H.R. 4532, the ''Social Security Disability Applicants'' Access to Professional Representation Act of 2010.''

Applying for Social Security disability and Supplemental Security Income disability benefits can be a confusing, complicated, and difficult process. While claimants have the right to be represented, it is a hollow right if there is no realistic way to obtain representation.

The Social Security Protection Act of 2004 (SSPA), Pub. L. No. 108–203, included two provisions intended to help claimants obtain representation: (1) the withholding and direct payment of fees in Supplemental Security Income (SSI) cases; and (2) establishing a demonstration project to allow eligible non-attorney representatives the option of withholding and direct payment of fees in both Title II and SSI cases. Under the SSPA, both of these provisions are scheduled to ''sunset'' after a five-year period, which would be March 1, 2010. Because both projects have been successful, we are writing to support their permanent continuation. H.R. 4532 accomplishes this goal.

Established in 1979, the National Organization of Social Security Claimants' Representatives (NOSSCR) is an association of nearly 4,000 attorneys and paralegals who represent Social Security and SSI claimants seeking to obtain disability and income security benefits. NOSSCR members are committed to providing high quality representation for claimants, to maintaining a system of full and fair adjudication for every claimant, and to advocating for beneficial change in the disability determination and adjudication process.

WITHHOLDING AND DIRECT PAYMENT OF FEES IN SSI CASES

Section 302 of the SSPA amended section 1631(d)(2) of the Social Security Act to extend the Title II attorney fee withholding and direct payment procedures to claims under Title XVI of the Act. This provision became effective for SSI fees paid on or after February 28, 2005.

Extending the existing fee withholding and direct payment provisions for Title II cases to Title XVI cases has made a measurable difference in the ability of SSI claimants to obtain representation. SSA's statistics for the hearing level show representation of SSI claimants has increased in every year since the SSPA provision was implemented.

Section 302 includes a sunset provision. Under that provision, the amendments made by section 302 will not apply to claims for benefits with respect to which the claimant and the representative enter into the agreement for representation after February 28, 2010.

Because the SSPA change has increased the opportunities for SSI claimants to obtain representation, we support the provision in H.R. 4532, which makes this provision permanent.

NON-ATTORNEY REPRESENTATIVES

Section 303 of the SSPA directs the Commissioner to carry out a five-year nationwide demonstration project to determine the potential results of extending the fee withholding and direct payment procedures that apply to attorneys under Titles II and XVI of the Social Security Act to non-attorney representatives who meet certain minimum prerequisites specified in section 303 and any additional prerequisites that the Commissioner may prescribe.

Under the prerequisites specified in section 303, individuals applying to participate in the demonstration project must have a bachelor's degree or equivalent education, possess liability insurance or equivalent insurance adequate to protect claimants in the event of malpractice by the representative, pass a criminal background check ensuring fitness to practice before SSA, pass an examination testing knowledge of the relevant provisions of the Act and the most recent developments in Agency and court decisions, and demonstrate ongoing completion of qualified continuing education courses. In addition, the Commissioner has required that individuals applying to participate in the demonstration project show that they have sufficient prior experience representing claimants before SSA.

The five-year demonstration project on direct payment of fees to eligible non-attorneys began on February 28, 2005, and also is scheduled to ''sunset'' at the end of five years. The demonstration project established by SSPA section 303 applies to claims for benefits with respect to which the agreement for representation is entered into after February 27, 2005 and before March 1, 2010.

We support the provision in H.R. 4532 that makes this provision permanent. We believe that, to date, the demonstration project has been successfully implemented by the contractor engaged by the Social Security Administration, CPS Human Resource Services. By all reports, the contractor has done a good job administering the demonstration project including periodic administration of the examination and ensuring that the other required criteria are met.

We appreciate your support for improving SSA's service for individuals who are applying for benefits by introducing and co-sponsoring H.R. 4532. We believe that making permanent the SSPA provisions regarding representation will benefit individuals with disabilities who file claims for benefits.

Very truly yours,

NANCY G. SHOR,
Executive Director.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4532. This legislation will "permanently extend fee withholding procedures which allow Social Security and Supplemental Security Income (SSI) recipients to pay fees to lawyers and representatives in successful applications for benefits directly out of a claimant's benefits, such as SSI disability."

"The legislation would set the criteria for an eligible non-attorney representative, including requirements that a representative have a bachelor's degree, pass an examination, have professional liability insurance, and undergo a criminal background check. In addition, the bill would allow the Social Security Commissioner to assess 'reasonable fees' on recipients participating in the program. The program, which was last extended in 2004, is set to expire on March 1, 2009."

Mr. Speaker, it is known that proper representation for Social Security is a must, in order for individuals to obtain their benefits. In some cases, many may not be able to afford attorneys, hence losing the capability to acquire benefits, which are directly related to the well-being of their life. I am very eager for this legislation to pass, so those citizens, who have desperate needs, would be able to have them met.

By extending and continuing this "fee withholding" procedure, which is the practice of the Social Security Administration, this would open the opportunity for citizens to receive the proper representation. It enables them to pay their representative through the awarded Disability Insurance, DI, or SSI benefits. In addition, the program has also increased annual federal revenue by approximately $55 million, which is an added windfall.

So in conclusion, I support H.R. 4532 and I encourage my colleagues to follow my lead!

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4532.

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. TANNER. 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.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4061, CYBERSECURITY ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2009

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1051 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1051

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4061) to advance cybersecurity research, development, and technical standards, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science and Technology. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Science and Technology now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. All points of order against such amendments are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the

House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. The Chair may entertain a motion that the Committee rise only if offered by the chair of the Committee on Science and Technology or his designee. The Chair may not entertain a motion to strike out the enacting words of the bill (as described in clause 9 of rule XVIII).

□ 1115

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for purposes of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ARCURI. I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 1051.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1051 provides for consideration of H.R. 4061, the Cybersecurity Enhancement Act of 2009. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Science and Technology Committee. The rule provides that the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Science and Technology Committee now printed in the bill shall be considered as an original bill for purposes of amendment and shall be considered as read.

The rule waives all points of order against the amendment in the nature of a substitute except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI. The rule further makes in order only those amendments printed in the report. The amendments made in order may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to demand for division of the question. All points of order against the amendment except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI are waived.

The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. The Chair may entertain a motion that the Committee rise only if offered by the Chair of the Science and Technology Committee or a designee. Finally, the rule provides that the Chair may not entertain a motion to strike out the enacting words of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, the threat of cyberwarfare cannot be overstated. Cyberattacks target everything from classified government information to business and trade secrets to individual financial records. The motivation for these attacks can range from immature harassment to illicit financial gain. The scope can be similarly broad, from an individual computer or Web site to an entire network.

Investing in cybersecurity is the Manhattan Project of our generation. The only difference is that when we were doing the Manhattan Project, we were the only power with the technology. This time around, we are facing far more enemies that have the same level of technology that we do. In fact, nearly every high school hacker has the potential to threaten our unfettered use of the Internet. Just imagine what a rogue state committed to disrupting our cyberinfrastructure could do.

The National Institute of Standards and Technology is responsible for setting cybersecurity standards for nonclassified Federal networks. The bill tasks NIST with developing cybersecurity awareness programs to educate individuals, small businesses, State and local governments, and educational institutions on how to implement cyber best practices. It is estimated that 80 to 90 percent of all cyberbreaches could have been avoided with this type of cybersecurity training.

The legislation also directs NIST to conduct research related to improving the security of information and network systems that support so many aspects of our day-to-day life, which many of us take for granted.

The most troubling cyberthreat may be the very real prospect of state-sponsored cyberattacks against sensitive national security information. Cyberexperts believe China is effectively targeting our government networks and that these attacks have resulted in at least one breach of Lockheed Martin's F–35 Joint Strike Fighter development program.

It is estimated that the Federal Government alone needs to recruit between 500 and 1,000 more cybersecurity professionals each year in order to address these threats. The Upstate New York district that I represent is on the frontline of defending our Nation in the cyberwar in which we are engaged. Utica College offers a bachelor of science degree in cybersecurities. Graduates of this program are employed across the country, working to secure the networks of government and private business alike. However, this program currently only graduates about 50 students per year into the cybersecurity field.

Clearly, simply maintaining the status quo will not be enough. Media reports of new attacks by cybercriminals are becoming more frequent and alarming. Just last week, following the State of the Union address, hackers, suspected to be from Brazil, defaced 49 House Member Web sites. Each day, 400,000 new ''zombies'' are activated. These are computers that are taken over by hackers and can be remotely controlled without the owner knowing it, and 1.5 million new malicious Web sites are identified each month. There are more than 1 billion new endpoints added to the Internet; 50 percent of those will be in China and 35 percent will be in India.

We are locked in a technological arms race with our cybercompetitors. In order to win that race, we must train individuals to look at warfare from an entirely new perspective. This effort goes to the heart of our national security because it requires us to create opportunities in our colleges and universities to train this new type of warfighter to defend our Nation from cyberthreats, a warfighter every bit as important to our security as a traditional armed soldier in the field. The training for this new generation of warfighters that defend us, not from land, sea, or air attacks, but from cyberattacks, is every bit as important as boot camp is for our soldiers. In fact, that is what this bill does, creates a boot camp for our future cyberwarfighters.

H.R. 4061 sets that course by authorizing funding for a Scholarship for Service program through the National Science Foundation that will provide scholarships for students pursuing cybersecurity fields. The scholarships would be provided for up to 1 to 2 years for students pursuing a bachelor's or master's degree and up to 3 years for students pursuing a doctoral degree in the cybersecurity field, provided that the recipient serves as a cybersecurity professional in government agencies for an equal amount of time. This investment in cybereducation is necessary to meet our enemies on the cyberfrontlines and repel their attacks.

Through increased workforce development and continued strengthening of our public-private partnerships, we can and will ensure that the IT systems, on which so much of our way of life depends, are safe from cyberattack. The Cybersecurity Enhancement Act contains the strategic plan necessary to focus our resources to meet these challenges.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from New York for yielding time.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this structured rule that restricts my colleagues from offering amendments to the bill. We certainly are concerned about cybersecurity, but nothing is going to matter if we don't get our fiscal house in order.

The Democrats are basically wasting the American people's time by bringing this bill, which they know has widespread support, to the floor today, as it could, instead, have been on the suspension calendar for this week, leaving us more time to debate legislation that

would address the major problems facing the American people and my constituents in North Carolina, such as the status of our economy and what are we going to do about dealing with the national security issues that are facing us in this country. Instead of using the suspension calendar productively, Democrats have consistently used the majority of our time debating legislation that is not relevant to the challenges that American families are facing on a daily basis.

Democrats have spent the majority of our time debating suspensions such as H. Res. 784, which honors the 2560th anniversary of the birth of Confucius. In doing so, the Democrats have set a higher priority on the 2560th anniversary of the birth of Confucius over solving the problems of the American people. I have nothing against Confucius, Mr. Speaker, but this resolution is not helping American families get back to work or put food on their kitchen tables.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, so far this year the Democrats have spent the majority of our time debating resolutions such as H. Res. 1020, which honors the 95th anniversary of the signing of the Rocky Mountain National Park Act, and H. Res. 981, supporting development in Ukraine. Mr. Speaker, again, I have nothing in particular against these resolutions, but I would be remiss if I did not address the fact that Democrats are making these resolutions higher priorities of these topics than bringing forth commonsense solutions that will help Americans who are suffering across the Nation.

While the bill before us today authorizes several important programs, it also authorizes ''such sums as may be necessary for activities to improve cybersecurity.'' When American families are facing tough economic challenges, Congress should be tightening its own belt and setting funding limits rather than authorizing blank checks on the backs of the American taxpayers. We can do better than this, and we owe it to the American people to do better than this.

This bill also provides for annual increases in authorization levels. At a time of record budget deficits, it is crucial that we hold the line on spending. The Obama administration likes to talk about fiscal restraint, but we have yet to see those words put into action. In fact, talk of fiscal restraint is nothing but talk.

This bill is a classic example of legislation that could be trimmed back by keeping the authorization levels static rather than increasing them each year. But the Democrats refuse to allow such restraint and instead continue to govern as though they are not aware of the fact that our Federal deficit is growing each day. Perhaps they are not aware. So many have been in Washington for so long that they are out of touch with average citizens and the common sense that our citizens represent.

My colleague, Mr. SESSIONS, offered an amendment that would maintain fiscal year 2011 authorization levels in the bill for 3 years instead of increasing them annually, but the Democrats on the Rules Committee rejected the amendment and did not allow for debate on it on the floor today.

This bill is also being brought forth today under a structured rule, adding to the record number of structured and closed rules the Democrats have arbitrarily used since they have been in the majority. Even though an open rule was requested for this bill, Democrats have chosen to stifle and control the debate today, and so we have another structured rule before us, eliminating both Republicans' and Democrats' ability to offer important amendments affecting their constituents. With this structured rule, the Democrats in charge have blocked at least 13 amendments that were submitted to the Rules Committee last night. If we had an open rule today, I am certain we would be debating many more.

After promising to have the most open and honest Congress in history, why has the Speaker consistently gone back on her word? Why are the Democrats, who are in charge and have a large majority, shutting off debate and silencing their colleagues from both sides of the aisle? Are they afraid of debate? Are they protecting their members from tough votes?

Regardless of their motives, one thing is clear: The Democrats in charge are doing the American people an injustice by refusing to allow their representatives to offer amendments on the floor of the people's House. The American people want to hear debate and are tired of the backroom dealmaking of the Democrats.

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

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

I just want to say that my colleague talks about bipartisanship. And I want to say I can't understand how she can talk about a bipartisan bill, a bill that came out of the Science and Technology Committee with support from both sides of the aisle, and turn it into a partisan political fight. She is right, that is what Americans are tired of. And yet, during her statement she mentioned Democrats at least six times. I lost count after the sixth.

This is not a partisan bill. This is a bipartisan bill that is necessary for the security of our country. That is what people sent us to Washington for. They send us to Washington to make sure that we take steps to ensure that their way of life continues and that they are safe and secure.

This bill strategically places money into education so that we can educate the next generation of cyberwarfighters to protect the Internet and to protect people to be able to use the Internet.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN).

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Speaker, I speak today in support of H.R. 4061, the Cybersecurity Enhancement Act of 2009. I am a proud cosponsor of this bill, and I commend Congressman LIPINSKI for his work on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, more and more Americans rely on the Internet every day. Businesses depend on it for commerce. Consumers depend on it to be able to engage in transactions to support small business all across this country. People network in hopes of finding a job or connecting with friends, exploring opportunities to find the financial means necessary to go to college. This means that every day more people rely on secure networks to keep their personal information safe to make sure that people aren't taking advantage of their privacy and exploiting them, exposing businesses to attacks, costing taxpayers thousands and thousands of dollars, growing to millions and millions of dollars, with attacks every day.

□ 1130

We know that this costs the Federal Government money, Mr. Speaker, as more and more countries are looking to engage and find vulnerabilities in these networks just to do harm, to cost the American taxpayers more and more money. We need to make sure that we are truly investing and providing educational opportunities to young people, bringing in those who have some skill sets to teach them how to defend our country and defend business from all these cyber attacks that are costing us millions and millions of dollars every day. Because of our increasing dependence on technology, we must teach these students these important skills.

One provision of this legislation we are debating today will help train the force by establishing the Federal Cyber Scholarship for Service program. During committee markup, I successfully included an amendment to address any regional disparities that may exist to make sure that we are truly looking across the country, in small communities and rural America, to find these experts that can help us protect our country to make sure that small businesses aren't subject to those attacks.

My district in New Mexico is home to 17 different tribes, Mr. Speaker. New Mexico has 22. We need to make sure as they are developing their infrastructure that we provide them the opportunity to make sure they have these skill sets as well. We need to make sure that we are helping keep a vulnerable population engaged, that we are looking to create educational opportunities. But more importantly, Mr. Speaker, that we are standing up to those nations, to those people around the world that continue to try to find ways to attack this Nation. They found a way through cybersecurity. They are finding ways to be able to cost commerce money, to prevent business from happening, to stifle small business from growing.

We as a Congress need to make sure we stand with small businesses across

the country and provide educational opportunities and work with them. I urge my colleagues to vote for this rule and urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

I certainly agree with my colleague from New York that the bill itself is not a partisan bill. I am not talking about the bill. I am talking about the rule. This is a very partisan rule. It didn't need to be a partisan rule. All the majority had to do was allow for amendments on the floor and it wouldn't have been a partisan rule. So I need to remind him that that is where the partisanship comes in. We are here debating the rule.

Mr. Speaker, while debt limit increases have been passed under both Republican and Democratic Presidents and Congresses, the acceleration in the accumulation of the debt that brought us to this point merits examination. In January of 2007, when NANCY PELOSI became Speaker of the House, the statutory debt limit stood at $8.965 trillion. In less than 3 years, the debt limit has increased by more than 33 percent, representing an additional $1 trillion of debt per year. By comparison, the statutory debt limit, which stood at $40 billion in 1940, did not cross the $1 trillion mark until 1981.

And it has been only 7 weeks since the Democrats voted to increase the debt limit by $290 billion on December 16, 2009. In that time, House Democrats have passed seven resolutions congratulating sports figures or teams; passed 23 resolutions honoring individuals, entities, or causes; passed five bills naming post offices; authorized $50 million to construct a new national park in the Virgin Islands, but passed zero bills to reduce spending or lower the deficit. Clearly, they are not serious about this serious issue facing this country.

Since taking office just 1 year ago, the President has increased the public debt by $1.47 trillion, or 23 percent, from $6.3 trillion to $7.78 trillion. Under the administration's budget, the public debt will triple, jumping to $17.5 trillion by 2019. Before President Obama's budget and stimulus were enacted, the CBO estimated that the public debt in 2019 would be $9.34 trillion, or $8 trillion less than it is now projected to be under President Obama.

While the President touts his commitment to fiscal responsibility, he is encouraging Congress to pass a $1.9 trillion increase in the national debt limit, allowing the government to keep borrowing in order to keep on spending. The Senate has done it last week, and it is probably going to be brought to us tomorrow, where the Democrats will pass this. And I mention the Democrats being in charge and the Democrats doing this because it is important for the American people to know that the Democrats are doing this alone.

While the decline in Federal revenue as a result of the economic slowdown has contributed to the increase in the debt, the significant increases in Federal spending have also contributed to reaching the debt limit faster than anticipated. Record government spending in the form of both the first stimulus bill and increases in appropriations bills has been a recurring theme of the majority, and it is their responsibility alone because they have done it alone.

The record amounts of debt are a direct responsibility of a spending binge in the Democrat-controlled Congress and White House. In 1 year of controlling Washington, Democrats increased the annual deficit by 308 percent, from $458 billion to $1.4 trillion.

A quick review of Democrats' spending increases in 2009 shows why the deficit exploded. In that year alone, House Democrats passed $787 billion in, quote, ''stimulus'' spending, in addition to paying $347 billion in interest on borrowing money we don't have, two omnibus spending bills totaling more than $855 billion, and increased non-defense spending by 12 percent. Again, totally alone.

Faced with declining revenues, Democrats have pushed forward with the most irresponsible option by increasing spending and deficits rather than by lowering Federal expenditures. According to the House Appropriations Committee Republican staff, when all appropriations spending increases are combined, the Democrat majority has pumped over half a trillion dollars in additional spending into non-defense discretionary programs in three short years. This is over $512 billion, or 127 percent more money for non-defense discretionary programs than they received in the last year of GOP control of the Congress.

In fact, the fiscal year deficit for just 2009 of $1.417 trillion is the largest ever, and three times the size of the previous record-setting deficit, last year's figure of $458 billion. It is no wonder that we hear Democrats such as the House majority whip, who recently proclaimed, ''We have got to spend our way out of this recession.'' Statements like this make clear that the Democrats in charge have absolutely no concept of the value of money or how to meet a budget. It really is stunning that despite the economic turmoil caused by government spending too much, the ruling Democrats can't comprehend the consequences of spending money we don't have.

Although some rigid partisans may choose to ignore the election of Massachusetts Senator-elect SCOTT BROWN and try blaming the current spending largesse on George Bush, it is true that since President Obama's inauguration, the U.S. has had an average monthly deficit of $122.6 billion. By comparison, from the year 2000 until 2008, the average annual deficit was $196 billion, and we were fighting a war. So the Democrats' solution for a terrible problem is to make it much worse and just blame it on the other guy.

To that sentiment, Charles Krauthammer responds, ''Let's just get this straight: The antipathy to George Bush is so enduring and powerful that it just elected a Republican Senator in Massachusetts. Why, the man is omnipotent. And the Democrats are delusional: SCOTT BROWN won by running against Obama, not Bush. He won by brilliantly nationalizing the race, running hard against the Obama agenda.''

Unfortunately, the trend of increased Federal deficits will not come to an end under the President's new fiscal year 2011 budget. According to the President's own estimates, his budget and spending plan will cause deficits to average $905 billion for each of the next 10 years. Budget shortfalls incurred by the government fuel the rise in the Nation's debt because the government is forced to borrow money to meet the shortfall. In 2009, the budget deficit was $1.4 trillion, the first time in history the deficit exceeded $1 trillion, and the first time the deficit exceeded 10 percent of gross domestic product since World War II.

The consequences of this kind of reckless spending are worth highlighting. Today the cost of the national debt is $39,870 for every man, woman, and child in the United States. According to the December 2009 Monthly Treasury Report, the Federal Government is projected to spend $465.444 billion paying interest alone on the national debt in this fiscal year 2010. That amounts to $1.275 billion per day, or $1,530.75 for every one of the 304 million people living in the United States today. Just like paying interest on a credit card, these amounts are recurring and do nothing to actually reduce the debt principal.

Ironically, in March of 2006, then-Senator Obama warned his colleagues of the danger of raising the debt limit without addressing the underlying cause, explaining that, quote, ''The fact that we are here today to debate raising America's debt limit is a sign of leadership failure. It is a sign that the U.S. Government can't pay its own bills. It is a sign that we now depend on ongoing financial assistance from foreign countries to finance our government's reckless fiscal policies. Increasing America's debt weakens us domestically and internationally. Leadership means that the buck stops here. Instead, Washington is shifting the burden of bad choices today onto the backs of our children and grandchildren. America has a debt problem and a failure of leadership. America deserves better.'' President Obama was against raising the debt limit before he was for it. We agree with then-Senator Obama, but we disagree with President Obama.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

This is exactly what the American people are so tired of. My colleague talks about what the race in Massachusetts meant. It meant that people are tired with the partisan bickering. She

just squandered all of the time that we could be here talking about cybersecurity and the importance of passing this bill with talking about politics. Of course she fails to point out the fact that much of the debt was incurred under President Bush, fails to point out the fact that now two wars are on the books.

But that is not what we are here to talk about. We are here to talk about cybersecurity. And I want to read a quote for you. Just yesterday Dennis Blair, the Director of National Intelligence, testified before the Senate Intelligence Committee. And he said, ''Malicious cyber activity is occurring on an unprecedented scale with extraordinary sophistication.'' He went on to say, ''Sensitive information is stolen daily from both government and private sector networks, undermining confidence in our information systems, and in the very information these systems were intended to convey.'' These statements make clear that we cannot afford to maintain the status quo.

In order to meet our enemies on the cyber front lines and repel their attacks, we must create a boot camp for our future cyber warfighters. The investments contained in H.R. 4061 will increase our cyber workforce development and continue to strengthen the public-private partnerships to defend the IT systems on which so much of our daily life relies. That is what the American people have sent us here to Washington to ensure. Cybersecurity enhancement contains the strategic plan necessary to focus our resources to meet the challenges which Director Blair spoke of yesterday.

H.R. 4061 will also strengthen partnerships between the Federal Government and the private sector to guarantee a secure and reliable infrastructure. The benefit of existing public-private partnerships is also on display in Upstate New York, in my very district. The Air Force Research Laboratory Rome Research Site, the Rome Lab as we call it, hosts the main offices of the Air Force Research Lab's Information Directorate.

Located at the former Griffiss Air Force Base in Rome, Rome Lab's scientists and engineers use the latest electronic and computer technology to demonstrate new ways to defend our information networks against attacks. In concert with Rome Lab, the Mohawk Valley is home to a number of companies that are engaged in cutting-edge cyber research, companies that will use the graduates who come out of college with degrees in cybersecurity. Large companies such as PAR Technology, BAE Systems, Booz Allen Hamilton, ITT Industries, Northrop Grumman, and smaller, home grown companies, such as Dolphin Technology, Black River Systems, Assured Information Security, New York State Technology Enterprises Corporation, Syracuse Research Corporation, and Research Associates of Syracuse.

□ 1145

Together, the AFRL and these companies account for thousands of jobs in central New York; men and women doing critical research on our Nation to help fend off cyberattacks. There is no doubt that these companies and the critical public-private partnerships that they have formed with the Air Force Research Laboratory will benefit from this program. But, more importantly, it's the American people that will benefit from this program.

The Cybersecurity Enhancement Act requires the White House Office of Science and Technology policy to convene an industrywide nongovernmental task force of businesses and universities to explore potential public-private collaborations on cybersecurity research and development. This will ensure that these collaborations continue to strengthen our Nation's cyberdefenses. That is what we are here to debate. That is what the American people sent us to Congress for. And that is what we need to pass today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. It's time for our colleagues to accept accountability. They've been in the majority for 3 years but they continue to blame George Bush in the same breath that they accuse me of being partisan. Since the Democrats regained the majority in the House, I have heard a number of Members come down to the floor and quote Supreme Court Justice Brandeis, saying, ''Sunlight is said to be the best disinfectant.'' That quote is quite fitting today, considering that as we speak the majority has been drafting, behind closed doors, no sunshine in sight, health care legislation that will affect every American. What is going on behind these closed doors? We really do not know. We don't even know who is at the table. The American people deserve to know what is going on behind closed doors. We need to bring in the sunlight to a process that is shrouded with secrecy.

That's why I, along with a bipartisan group of 171 other Members, have cosponsored H. Res. 847, a resolution by my friend and colleague Representative BUCHANAN, that expresses the sense of the House of Representatives that any meetings held to determine the final content of sweeping health care legislation be held in public view and not behind closed doors.

In order to help bring sunshine to a process that the majority continues to hide from public view, I will be asking for a ''no'' vote on the previous question so that we can amend this rule and allow the House to consider the Buchanan transparency resolution. This vote will give Members of the majority the chance to live up to their promise, as Speaker PELOSI said, ''to lead the most honest, most open, and most ethical Congress in history.'' I know that Members are concerned that this motion may jeopardize consideration of the bill under consideration today, but I want to make clear: The motion I'm making provides for separate consideration of the transparency resolution within 3 days so we can vote on the bill before us today, and then, once we are done, consider H. Res. 847.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment and extraneous materials immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I am reminded of the first rule that they teach you in trial advocacy class, and that is when you're trying a case and you don't have the facts on your side, talk about everything but the facts. And I feel that's what my colleague from North Carolina is doing today. Rather than say that we can work together in a bipartisan way on a bill that is good for all Americans, she would rather talk about everything else that there is. Well, we're not here to talk about everything else today. We are here to talk about cybersecurity and the importance of passing this bill for the American people.

As I said earlier, investing in cybersecurity is the Manhattan Project of our generation. Cyberthreats and attacks are real, and they threaten our financial and defense networks every day. Nearly every aspect of everyday life in our global society is dependent on the security of our cyber networks. We rely on these systems to carry virtually all our business transactions, control our electric grid, emergency communication systems, and traffic lights.

The Cybersecurity Enhancement Act reauthorizes and expands the programs aimed at strengthening the Nation's cybersecurity, including a new scholarship program to train the thousands of cybersecurity professionals that are needed to defend our Nation. In requiring a cybersecurity workforce assessment, this bill will also give us a clearer picture of our current cybercapabilities and identify what new skills and educational advances are needed in both the Federal Government and the private sector to combat future attacks.

H.R. 4061 requires NIST to undertake research and development programs to improve identity management systems, which include health information technology systems, in order to improve interoperability, authentication methods, privacy protection, and usability of these systems. These systems hold great potential for streamlining the delivery of services and care to individuals, but they must be secure in order to function properly and efficiently. This legislation will ensure that they are.

From the perspective of my district in upstate New York, it plays a critical

role in our Nation's cybersecurity, and this research and development work is often discussed publicly. Yet, the work done by contractors, subcontractors, and universities, in conjunction with Federal agencies, employs thousands across New York in cutting-edge R&D. But, more importantly, they are essential to defending America from cyberterrorist attacks and espionage. It is essential these public-private partnerships continue to flourish and they have the necessary manpower in place to protect our Nation from these threats.

The Cybersecurity Enhancement Act will make that happen not just for New York, but across the Nation. This is not a program for which we can afford to ask, How can we do this, but a program for which we must ask, How can we afford not to do this?

H.R. 4061 is supported by numerous organizations, including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Business Software Alliance, Software and Information Industry Association, National Cable and Telecommunications Association, U.S. Telecom, TechAmerica, and Computing Research Association. This legislation enjoyed bipartisan support in committee, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support it.

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

The material previously referred to by Ms. FOXX is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1051 OFFERED BY MS. FOXX

At the end of the resolution, add the following new section:

SEC. 3. On the third legislative day after the adoption of this resolution, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV and without intervention of any point of order, the House shall proceed to the consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 847) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that any conference committee or other meetings held to determine the content of national health care legislation be conducted in public under the watchful eye of the people of the United States. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution to final adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules; and (2) one motion to recommit which may not contain instructions. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of House Resolution 847.

(The information contained herein was provided by Democratic Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 109th Congress.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Democratic majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, (VI, 308–311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

Because the vote today may look bad for the Democratic majority they will say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.'' But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the definition of the previous question used in the Floor Procedures Manual published by the Rules Committee in the 109th Congress, (page 56). Here's how the Rules Committee described the rule using information from Congressional Quarterly's ''American Congressional Dictionary'': ''If the previous question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business.''

Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled ''Amending Special Rules'' states: ''a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.'' (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: ''Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.''

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Democratic majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of H. Res. 1051, if ordered; and suspending the rules with regard to H. Res. 1043, H. Res. 901, and H. Res. 1044.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 175, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 29]

YEAS—238

Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (CA)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NAYS—175

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)

Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Childers
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Crenshaw
Davis (KY)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Griffith
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Minnick
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stearns
Sullivan
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—20

Abercrombie
Barrett (SC)
Culberson
Davis (AL)
Davis (IL)
Deal (GA)
Garrett (NJ)
Gutierrez
Johnson, E. B.
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Massa
Murtha
Radanovich
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Serrano
Smith (WA)
Souder
Young (FL)

□ 1218

Messrs. TERRY, SMITH of Texas, WHITFIELD, and SMITH of Nebraska changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. MCCOLLUM). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 237, noes 176, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 30]

AYES—237

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (CA)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—176

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachus
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Childers
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Crenshaw
Davis (KY)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Griffith
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Minnick
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stearns
Sullivan
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—20

Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Culberson
Davis (AL)
Davis (IL)
Deal (GA)
Gutierrez
Hoekstra
Johnson, E. B.
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Massa
Murtha
Radanovich
Reyes
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Smith (WA)
Souder
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1227

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.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEMBRANCE OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES AND THEIR FAMILIES

The SPEAKER. The Chair would ask all present to rise for the purpose of a moment of silence.

The Chair asks that the House now observe a moment of silence in remembrance of our brave men and women in uniform who have given their lives in the service of our Nation in Iraq and in Afghanistan and their families, and all who serve in our Armed Forces and their families.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. MCCOLLUM). Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

RECOGNIZING BRESCIA UNIVERSITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1043, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1043, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 418, nays 0, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 31]

YEAS—418

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
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
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—15

Barrett (SC)
Culberson
Deal (GA)
Gutierrez
Johnson, E. B.
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Massa
Murtha
Radanovich
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Smith (WA)
Souder
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes left in the vote.

□ 1236

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING 49TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INTEGRATION OF NEW ORLEANS SCHOOLS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 901, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 901, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 416, nays 0, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 32]

YEAS—416

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
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
Clarke
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kissell
Klein (FL)

Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—17

Barrett (SC)
Cleaver
Culberson
Deal (GA)
Gutierrez
Higgins
Johnson, E. B.
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Massa
Murtha
Radanovich
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Smith (WA)
Souder
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1243

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMEMORATING 65TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LIBERATION OF AUSCHWITZ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 1044, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KLEIN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1044, 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. McGOVERN. Madam 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 414, nays 0, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 33]

YEAS—414

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
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
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—19

Barrett (SC)
Boucher
Culberson
Deal (GA)
Gutierrez
Johnson, E. B.
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Larson (CT)
Massa
Matsui
Murtha
Radanovich
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Smith (WA)
Souder
Young (FL)

□ 1250

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the resolution was amended so as to read: ''Commemorating the 65th anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz, a Nazi concentration and extermination camp, honoring the victims of the Holocaust, and expressing commitment to strengthen the fight against anti-semitism, bigotry, and intolerance.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 4061.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. RICHARDSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

CYBERSECURITY ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2009

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1051 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4061.

□ 1254

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4061) to advance cybersecurity research, development, and technical standards, and for other purposes, with Ms. MCCOLLUM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to begin by thanking my colleagues, Dr. LIPINSKI, Dr. EHLERS, Mr. WU, Mr. SMITH and Mr. HALL for their contributions to the good bipartisan bill we are considering today. I would also like to take a moment to thank the various staffers who worked on this bill: Marcy Gallo, Travis Hite, Dahlia Sokolov and Mike Quear on the majority side; and Dan Byers and Mele Williams on the minority staff. We could not bring a good bill like this together without their help.

Last fall, the House passed a resolution recognizing National Cybersecurity Awareness Month. The resolution stated that we will need to build strong partnerships between Federal agencies, business and nongovernmental organizations and educational institutions in order to enhance the state of cybersecurity in the United States.

H.R. 4061 implements this principle of public-private partnerships in three areas: coordinating and prioritizing the Federal cybersecurity R&D portfolio, improving the transfer of cybersecurity technologies to the marketplace, and training an IT workforce that can meet the growing needs of both public and private sectors.

H.R. 4061 strengthens research and innovation partnerships through the requirement for a strategic plan for cybersecurity R&D that is based on an assessment of risk to our Nation and its population. In developing this plan, the Federal Government must solicit input from all stakeholders, including industry and colleges and universities. The plan must also describe how the agencies will support the transfer of promising technologies from our national labs and universities to the private sector.

Finally, the Federal agencies must convene a university-industry task force to explore collaborative models of cybersecurity. We need to get the best ideas of our scientists and engineers out of the lab and into the marketplace where they can contribute to our collective security and general economic growth.

H.R. 4061 builds educational partnerships to create a well-trained workforce and an informed public. Specifically, H.R. 4061 taps into our colleges and universities by providing scholarships to students pursuing degrees in cybersecurity in exchange for their service in the Federal IT workforce. The legislation also requires NIST to disseminate the cybersecurity best practices to individuals and small businesses in a more user-friendly format.

But the Internet doesn't stop at our borders, which means that improving cybersecurity also requires international partnerships. H.R. 4061 addresses this by requiring NIST to develop a comprehensive international cybersecurity strategy that defines what cybersecurity technical standards we need, where they are being developed, and ensures that the United States is represented.

Many organizations support this legislation, including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, U.S. Telecommunication Association, the National Cable and Telecommunications Association, the Business Software Alliance, the Association for Computing Machinery, the Computing Research Association, Sun Micro Systems, the University of Illinois at Urbana, the Georgia Institute of Technology, the Software and Information Industry Association, Applied Visions, Inc., Verisign, CA, Inc., Symantec Corporation, McAfee, Inc., and TechAmerica, among others.

But we have also had the support of our colleagues from New York and the chairman of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, Mr. TOWNS. And at this point, I would like to insert an exchange of letters into the RECORD between myself and Mr. TOWNS.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM,
Washington, DC, February 2, 2010.

Hon. BART GORDON,
Chairman, Committee on Science and Technology, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GORDON: I write to you regarding H.R. 4061, the ''Cybersecurity Enhancement Act of 2009''.

H.R. 4061 contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, including provisions related to the federal workforce. I recognize and appreciate your desire to bring this legislation before the House in an expeditious manner and, accordingly, I will not seek a sequential referral of the bill.

However, agreeing to waive consideration of this bill should not be construed as the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform waiving its jurisdiction over H.R. 4061. Further, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform reserves the right to seek the appointment of conferees during any House-Senate conference convened on this legislation on provisions of the bill that are within the Committee's jurisdiction.

I look forward to working with you as we prepare to pass this important legislation.

Sincerely,

EDOLPHUS TOWNS,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY,
Washington, DC, February 2, 2010.

Hon. EDOLPHUS TOWNS,
Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN TOWNS: Thank you for your February 2, 2010 letter regarding H.R. 4061, the Cybersecurity Enhancement Act of 2009. Your support for this legislation and your assistance in ensuring its timely consideration are greatly appreciated.

I agree that provisions in the bill are of jurisdictional interest to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. I acknowledge that by forgoing a sequential referral, your Committee is not relinquishing its jurisdiction and I will fully support your request to be represented in a House-Senate conference on those provisions over which the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform has jurisdiction in H.R. 4061. A copy of our letters will be placed in the Congressional Record during consideration of the bill on the House floor.

I value your cooperation and look forward to working with you as we move ahead with this important legislation.

Sincerely,

BART GORDON,
Chairman.

In conclusion, H.R. 4061 is a good, bipartisan bill that strengthens public-private partnerships, ensures an overall vision for the Federal cybersecurity R&D portfolio, trains the next generation of cybersecurity professionals, and improves the cybersecurity technical standards.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4061.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 4061. We are all aware of the importance of cybersecurity and how it has grown dramatically in recent years, as most of the critical systems upon which we depend, from telecommunications to electricity to banking and commerce, rely on secure and reliable computing.

□ 1300

There are short-term policy actions that we can and must take to protect our networks, but over the long term the key to cybersecurity is winning the technological race against our adversaries. That is what this legislation is really aimed toward.

The Science and Technology Committee has a long record of leadership on these issues, dating back to the 1980s, led well by the gentleman from Tennessee, and the agencies and programs we oversee are critical to the success of Federal efforts to address cybersecurity weaknesses and their threats.

This bill will help to support these efforts through authorization of activities in three general areas: the first one being basic research at the National Science Foundation; the second one, expanded NSF scholarships to increase the size and skills of the cybersecurity workforce; and third, increase R&D standards, development and coordination, and public outreach at the National Institute of Standards and Technology related to cybersecurity.

Now, these are modest but important changes that will help us do a better job of protecting our communications network, and I am pleased to join my fellow Texan, Mr. MCCAUL, as a cosponsor, along with two of our key subcommittee ranking members, Dr. EHLERS of Michigan and Representative SMITH of Nebraska.

I also want to note my appreciation for what this bill doesn't do. It avoids calling for any activities that could amount to being regulatory in nature. I think this is important. The committee heard from multiple outside witnesses that heavy Federal involvement in private sector cybersecurity processes would actually be counterproductive to security. I hope we can ensure this bill continues to restrain from such action as it moves through the legislative process.

This is a good bill, and it represents a small but important step in the government's overall efforts to address cybersecurity issues. I want to thank Chairman GORDON and our colleagues in the majority for working closely with the Republicans on this legislation, and I look forward to continued cooperative efforts as we move forward.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Madam Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois, the primary sponsor of this good bipartisan bill, Dr. LIPINSKI, who has just gotten back from home and a 78 percent victory in his primary last night. Congratulations.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Madam Chair, I would like to begin by thanking Chairman GORDON for all his work on this bill and on the cybersecurity issue in general. This is, as the chairman said, a good bipartisan bill. I also want to thank Ranking Member HALL for his work and Dr. EHLERS, as we worked on the Research and Science Education Subcommittee on this bill.

Almost a year ago, President Obama called for a comprehensive 60-day review of U.S. cyberspace policy. This call and the expert recommendations contained in the resulting report led to a series of hearings in my Research and Science Education Subcommittee as well as the full Science and Technology Committee. We heard in these hearings about the various aspects of cybersecurity R&D, including the state of research programs, partnerships with the private sector, the IT workforce, and how both NIST and the NSF are responding to the review.

H.R. 4061 is built upon what we learned in these hearings and addresses some of the critical issues raised in the 60-day review. Specifically, it aims to build strong public-private partnerships, improve the transfer of cybersecurity technologies to the marketplace, train an IT workforce for both the public and private sectors, and coordinate and prioritize Federal cybersecurity R&D.

Information technology is an integral part of all of our daily lives. Computers, cell phones, and Internet have greatly increased our productivity and connectivity. Unfortunately, this connectivity and dependence of our critical infrastructure on information technology have increased our vulnerability to cyberattacks. One month ago, we saw a coordinated foreign attack on Google's Web site. Last week, we also saw an infiltration on our House Web site. Last year, the Pentagon reported more than 360 million attempts to break into its network.

But it is not just the Pentagon or House of Representatives that needs to worry about cybersecurity. Cybercrime is a problem for businesses, large and small, and for every single American. The FTC estimates that identity theft costs consumers about $50 billion annually, and that, even more alarmingly, it is the fastest growing type of fraud in the United States. And these aren't just individual criminals. Increasing globalization in the Internet means that sophisticated organized groups can mine information, selling it both nationally and internationally.

Improving the security of cyberspace is of the utmost importance and will take the collective effort of the Federal Government, the private sector, our scientists and engineers, and every American to succeed, and this bill takes an important step forward in doing this.

Last fall, as Chairman GORDON said, under the leadership of Congresswoman CLARKE, we passed a resolution recognizing National Cybersecurity Awareness Month. Among other things, this resolution contributed to an important education and awareness campaign, a national effort to make people aware of the problem and to make them think about what I like to call practicing good computer hygiene. However, Federal leadership is not only needed to increase public awareness, but also in research, education and in demonstrating how to secure our systems.

Chairman GORDON gave a very good summary of what is in this bill. I want to focus on one particular aspect a little bit, on education. By that, I mean educating individuals, educating companies, and educating the next generation of IT professionals. H.R. 4061 addresses this by building on existing partnerships, such as the NSF-sponsored Center for Systems Security and Information Assurance at Moraine Valley Community College in Palos Hills, Illinois, in my district. This single school in my district has trained more than 600 cybersecurity faculty since 2003. Individuals are now teaching at community colleges and technical training programs nationwide.

In order to realize the full benefits of information technology, we not only need a highly skilled IT workforce, but also advances in basic R&D. Cyberthreats are constantly evolving, and cybersecurity R&D must evolve in concert through a combination of near-term fixes and long-term projects that build a more secure foundation. And because people are perhaps the weakest link in many IT systems, our research strategies need to include the social and behavioral sciences that can help us better understand how humans interact with technology. This is something that is often overlooked but is contained in this bill.

So, in closing, I just again want to thank Chairman GORDON for his work on this. I am very proud to be the author of this bill, and I urge its passage by the full House.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of this bill. I want to thank Ranking Member HALL and I want to thank my good friends across the other side of the aisle, Chairman GORDON and Mr. LIPINSKI, for, as usual, working in a bipartisan way to get good things done for the country. I think the American people deserve that, and they want to see more of that, of us up here in Washington.

I was proud to be the lead Republican sponsor on this bill as well because this issue is so important. A lot of times when you talk about cybersecurity, people's eyes kind of glaze over, and yet when we talk about cybersecurity, we are really talking about national security. We held hearings both in the Science and Technology Committee and on the Homeland Security Committee where we examined the vulnerabilities and the threats presented by cyberattacks, and it is very frightening.

When you talk to the top military advisers to the President, they will tell

you one of the greatest threats we face as a Nation is a cyberattack and that we are vulnerable. And when we had hearings on the issue, we heard that just about every Federal agency, in fact every one, including the Pentagon, had been hacked into and this institution had been hacked into. And there have been major data dumps where information was stolen from countries that we cannot speak of in the well of the floor right now, but foreign countries stealing information from the United States Government.

There are really several areas. There are criminal enterprises who use cyberattacks to steal intellectual property, and then there is the realm of espionage, where we have countries that go in and steal information from the United States Government, intellectual property, secrets within the government, data dumps the size of the Library of Congress. We had a classified program that was subsequently declassified that showed that through the click of a mouse power grids could be blown up.

Every critical infrastructure is tied to cybernetworks. Whether it be our utilities, our power grids, our financial institutions, whether it be air traffic controllers, virtually every sector is tied to the networks, to the Internet, and, therefore, is vulnerable. This bill I think is a good step forward in helping to protect our networks, certainly in the Federal Government.

Last year, I joined with Congressman JIM LANGEVIN from Rhode Island, working with CSIS, who had worked on the Iraq Study Group as well, to put together a team, a commission of experts across the Nation of cyberexperts to make recommendations to the next President of the United States. We made those recommendations to President Obama. I am pleased that this bill actually fulfills one of the main recommendations in that report, and that is to provide improving Federal cyberworkforces within the Federal Government. And this bill does a lot more than that.

Improving research and development, this bill establishes cybersecurity R&D grant programs that focus on technical and human behavioral aspects of cybersecurity. It improves our Federal cyberworkforce. It creates a scholarship program at NSF that can be repaid by Federal service. And, it improves coordination in the government. It gives NIST the authority to set security standards for Federal computer systems and develop checklists for agencies to follow. I think this is a very, very important point, because in our hearings, when we asked the Department of Homeland Security or representatives from the Department of Defense or NSA who is in charge of defending our networks, who is in charge, they couldn't answer that question, because there isn't one person in charge.

One of our recommendations was to have someone at the White House level be put in charge to coordinate the various agencies. And because there is no one in charge, there is the lack of coordination. So the very entities that have the offensive capability for cyberattack are not coordinating with the agencies that are tasked with defending the Nation from a cyberattack. I think that giving NIST the authority to set these standards for the first time is going to go a long way in protecting our networks inside the Federal Government.

It also reaches out to the private sector, which I particularly like about this bill. It emphasizes the implementation of checklists by Federal agencies that they should remain flexible and technology neutral in working with the private sector. It improves coordination outside the government by creating a task force of the Federal Government universities who know this issue very well and the private sector to coordinate the research and development.

I think the idea of a public-private partnership rather than having bureaucrats in Washington make all these decisions is vitally important, to bring in the expertise of the private sector and the technology sector who know this issue very well. And, as Chairman GORDON mentioned, this has broad-based support from business groups outside in the private sector and from the technology sector in particular.

□ 1315

So with that, I think this is a great first step towards protecting our Federal networks. I again want to commend the great leadership on both sides of the aisle for making this happen today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. First, I want to thank my friend from Texas for both his cosponsorship of this bill, but more importantly, his constructive, productive, bipartisan approach to bringing together this good bill.

I want to now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon, primary sponsor of the bill, the chairman of our Technology and Innovation Subcommittee, Mr. WU.

Mr. WU. Madam Chair, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4061, which will improve our Nation's cybersecurity by supporting research, create usable technical standards, and promote cybersecurity education. Cybersecurity is critically important, and I want to commend our chairman, Chairman GORDON, for bringing this legislation to the floor today and for his long term leadership on this issue.

The recent cyber attack perpetrated by China against Google and numerous other American companies is a stark reminder of the vulnerabilities we face in an electronically interconnected world. More and more of our personal information is making its way online. Everything from traffic control systems and air traffic control to manufacturing and banking depends on Internet networked systems.

Within the Science Committee, the Technology and Innovation Subcommittee, which I chair, has been exploring ways that the National Institute of Standards and Technology's expertise in information technology can be used to advance the administration's goal of securing cyberspace. Twenty-two years ago the Science and Technology Committee paved the way for Federal cybersecurity efforts with the Computer Security Act of 1987, the first of 13 major laws related to cybersecurity. The 1987 bill charged NIST with developing technical standards to protect nonclassified information in Federal computer systems.

H.R. 4061 improves on these ongoing efforts by implementing recommendations made in the Cyberspace Policy Review and in a hearing my subcommittee held last October. The Cyberspace Policy Review and witnesses at our hearing stressed the importance of increased coordination as the Federal Government works on international technical standards, an education awareness campaign for all Internet users, and improved identity management systems. NIST has a leadership role to play in all three of these critical areas.

The U.S. Government must better coordinate its efforts to develop international cybersecurity technical standards. These responsibilities are currently divided among numerous agencies without any coordinated, consistent policy. A coordinated, consistent policy will ensure U.S. representatives operate with the overarching needs of our Nation in mind when they negotiate.

Witnesses testified before the Technology and Innovation Subcommittee that NIST is suited for the role of policy coordinator because of extensive technical expertise, established relationships with international bodies, and the fact that it is a nonregulatory body. Experts also called for a cybersecurity awareness and education campaign.

While NIST can be a valuable resource for Internet users by providing consumers with the same guidance it gives to Federal agencies, witnesses have noted that NIST guidance is often too technical for the average Internet user. The legislation before us today tasks NIST with developing a plan to make its standards and best practices usable by those with less technical expertise.

In simple terms, 70, 80, 90 percent of needed cybersecurity improvement can be achieved by using available methods and technology. Take simple steps. Do back up your data. Don't back up data and take it home in an open, unlocked car. It is like clicking your seatbelt before you drive or washing hands before a surgeon operates on a patient. Commonsense steps, available methods and technology; simply put, good computer hygiene.

We also know that cybersecurity cannot be improved without first improving identity management. Today's bill

builds upon NIST's ongoing work on identity management systems, such as biometrics, by tasking NIST with improving the interoperability of these systems to encourage more widespread use. By focusing on the usability and privacy aspects of identity management, this bill will encourage greater confidence in the general public that their personal information will be secure.

Madam Chair, securing cyberspace is a primary concern of each and every one of us. We cannot stand by and let the most powerful tool for connecting Americans with each other and the world remain a technologic wild west. It is time to fence the prairie to make it available to the technologic communities of the future.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 4061 so that our communities and our constituents can be secure in the knowledge that they are safe when they go online.

Mr. MCCAUL. I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chairman, when I first came to Congress in 1993, we had computers but we did not have Internet. In fact, if it wasn't for Al Gore maybe we still wouldn't have it. I don't need to bring that up.

But you know, the reality is most of us, and my friend Mr. GORDON will remember, did not have cell phones. And then I remember there was a discussion that I had with one Member about, ''You know, I don't think it is fair for the taxpayers to pay for your cell phone. I think it is unnecessary.''

And I remember when I got a cell phone I wanted to have a 912 area code, because I didn't want the folks back home to think I went Washington if I had the 202 area code. But now in essence everybody has a mobile phone, as they do Internet. I remember Stacy Hall, our receptionist, who was the IT person since she was the youngest in the office. She was probably 22, a UGA graduate. She got this thing called the Internet, and she started planning her weekends with her friends.

Now, there were about five other 21-, 22-year-old kids on the Hill who knew what email was. So they started swapping. And then I remember eventually she told our scheduler about, ''You know, maybe you could use this like to schedule the Congressman.'' What a radical idea. And before you know it, 5 or 6 years down the road, everybody was addicted to it.

And then I remember 9/11, not many of us had a BlackBerry. But BlackBerrys had an ability to get out on the Internet a little bit better than cell phones, so BlackBerrys became an important thing. And I know Mr. GORDON and many of us here have seen all this grow, but now this phenomenal piece of equipment can find maps anywhere in the world. You can talk to somebody on the phone. You can take pictures and instantly send it to somebody. You can download music—although I have no idea how—and Internet people and look up things, Google online and Bing. And can you only imagine what this will be 5 years from now. It is unbelievable.

I entered Michigan State University, and the calculator was a slide rule. We actually voted my freshman year not to allow calculators because the Texas Instruments, I think it was called an SR–10—can I get an amen over there? I know you must have had one. It was $179. We voted in my chemistry class at Michigan State University not to allow calculators because most middle class kids could not afford it. And yet 4 or 5 years later you could get much better calculators that fit in your pocket for $10.

Technology has evolved at such a rapid pace, and yet along with it so have the bad guys. It used to be that maybe some interested math genius with a twisted sense of humor in Indonesia would hack into the Department of Defense computers just to see if he could, not really caring how many F–22s were in production, but just wanted to know. But then eventually the bad guys became more organized, more sophisticated, botnets, computer systems that talked to each other and shared information. A way of hacking into the Department of Defense, the Department of Energy, the Centers for Disease Control, all kinds of government agencies with all kinds of sensitive information. But there is no need to stop there. Wall Street, financial information, other things that you could get out of universities, all of it is vulnerable.

And so this bill today is relevant because it shows that Congress is moving along with the technology to rise to the challenge. We need to have cybersecurity experts. So many of the cybersecurity experts that we have now come up through a law enforcement background and then they learn their computer training.

What this bill does is to reach out to that young 17-, 18-, 19-year-old, and identify them as being interested in this, and merge in all their talents and say come on in the classroom because we need you as a line of defense. Technology against technology has to have that wall in-between them, and that wall is a brilliant, well-trained human being. That is what this bill seeks to do.

In my own district, I have to brag a little bit, that Armstrong Atlantic University has a Cyber Security Research Institute. And it is working to bridge the gap so that the young people can have a viable career in cybersecurity. The program is to produce a more educated cybersecurity investigator with expertise in areas not only in technology but in law enforcement and law itself, and policy itself, and work with cyber forensics in order to produce the kind of professionals that we need to overcome the threat that we face as a Nation. We cannot be passive about this topic. We have to be proactive.

This bill shows one of the great bipartisan efforts of Congress, for us to come together and address something that is truly a national security threat. So I am proud to support it. If you want any more information, you can get it on my BlackBerry. I will be glad to download it for you.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Madam Chairman, I want to thank my friend from Savannah for the history lesson there, and let him know that my 8-year-old daughter can be some help to him if he wants to download any of his music.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman would yield?

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. She can help me, too.

Mr. KINGSTON. Especially if it is some of that good Tennessee music that you all produce.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Madam Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RUPPERSBERGER), a member of the important Intelligence Committee.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Madam Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 4061, the Cybersecurity Enhancement Act.

I want to thank Chairman GORDON, Congressman WU, Ranking Member HALL, and Congressman MCCAUL for your bipartisan effort. You know, this is truly an example of working together on behalf of our citizens. If we could only do this on other issues such as health care and whatever, we would be a lot better off as a country. So thank you for your leadership, and let's continue this bipartisanship effort.

Cyber networks power almost everything we do, from our computers and cell phones and iPods to the electrical grid that allows us to turn on our lights. They also operate the classified military and intelligence networks that keep us safe and provide critical data to our troops in combat.

As a member of the Intelligence Committee and chairman of the Technical and Tactical Subcommittee, which oversees the technical aspects of cybersecurity, I know that protecting our cyber networks is a top economic and national security priority. We are under attack each and every day. These attacks have cost the U.S.A. $1 trillion last year, and also put classified information in the hands of our enemies.

Cybersecurity is a tough challenge because the government does not own the Internet. In fact, 85 percent of cyber is held privately. We have to get the public and private sectors on the same page, and this bill does that. This bill directs the National Institute of Standards and Technology, the measurement laboratory for our Nation, based in Maryland, to develop international cybersecurity technical standards. It also charges NIST with creating education campaigns for the public, a critical component to meeting this challenge.

This bill also helps to ensure that we have the workforce in place to meet the new demands by providing scholarships to students who agree to work as cybersecurity specialists after graduation. The bill also funds faculty and curriculum development at U.S. colleges and universities to help with the shortage of qualified cyber professors.

□ 1330

I also support the amendment proposed by my Maryland colleague, Congressman KRATOVIL, to establish a National Center of Excellence for Cybersecurity to consolidate our resources into one cyberclearinghouse. Protecting our Nation's network is not a Democratic or Republican initiative; it is USA first.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. I yield the gentleman 20 additional seconds.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Let's pass H.R. 4061 and make sure our own cybernetworks don't become a new weapon in our enemies' arsenals.

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

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the cochair of the House Cybersecurity Caucus, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Madam Chair, I rise today in strong support of the Cybersecurity Enhancement Act of 2009. I'd like to thank Chairman LIPINSKI and also Chairman GORDON for their efforts in bringing this important bill to the floor today.

In today's interconnected world, the American people expect their government's networks to have the same level of access and efficiency as the private sector. Further, building a more transparent and effective government requires leveraging new technologies to strengthen coordination between our Federal agencies, in addition to strengthening our communications with the citizens of our Nation. To achieve these goals, it is absolutely critical that our Federal networks and information systems are safe and secure.

Despite increased attention in recent years by the Congress and the administration on cybersecurity, our Federal networks remain exceptionally vulnerable still to attack. Securing them will require increased emphasis on coordination and technological advancements. I, of course, understand that the NSA and the very talented, dedicated workforce that work on cyberissues are the best in the world at what they do, but it will also require the United States to strengthen domestic cybersecurity talent and find new ways to leverage the expertise that exists in the private sector. This will be a true force multiplier for us. This bill takes significant steps toward achieving those goals by strengthening Federal cybersecurity standards, increasing research and development, and evaluating how to improve our Federal cybersecurity workforce.

That being said, we as a Nation cannot afford to fail in these efforts, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this very important piece of legislation.

Mr. MCCAUL. Just in closing, I cochair the Cybersecurity Caucus with Congressman LANGEVIN, and I want to commend him for his great work not only on the CSIS Commission but also on the caucus to try to raise awareness of this issue. It is a very, very important issue. I also want to thank Chairman GORDON, who I know is going to retire. We're going to miss him. But just the bipartisan spirit in which he has conducted himself on this committee to allow us to work together with the majority to get good legislation out of the Congress. As I said earlier, I think that's what the American people want. It's what they deserve. Certainly, there's no greater issue where Republicans and Democrats should come together than on issues impacting national security, which this bill does. We are Americans first. Again, this bill is a great step forward into furthering and protecting our Federal networks.

I hope, as with what happened with 9/11, we don't turn a blind eye and wait until there's a major denial of service attack before we start to pay attention to this issue. I think this bill, which I anticipate will pass the House overwhelmingly, is a great statement by the Congress that cybersecurity is important and that we can work together on this. I think, as Congressman WU talked about the attacks on Google recently, last Fourth of July we had a denial of service attack emanating that hit Korea and the United States. The disturbing thing about that attack was it was not to phish or to steal information, or perhaps espionage. Rather, it was intended to do harm. That denial of service attack was intended to shut down our networks. It was relatively unsophisticated.

But as we examine the denial of service attacks that we saw in Estonia, the denial of service attack in Korea and the United States just last Fourth of July, to me, that is an eye opener. It's just like before 9/11 we saw signs that the Congress needed to pay attention to. I think we have seen signs of that in the cyber-realm, and I hope we can work together across the aisle to further enhance and strengthen our cybernetworks, and in the private sector as well, so that we can avoid a cyber-9/11 attack in the United States.

So this is, again, a very important issue that, when you talk to leaders in the military, they get it. They recognize it. They want to work with the Congress to better improve our cybersecurity. Again, let me just give my thanks to Chairman GORDON for allowing this to come out of the committee and come to the House floor. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. In closing, let me just suggest to my friend from Texas that bipartisanship goes both ways, and I want to thank him for his great input in this bill, as well as Dr. EHLERS, Mr. HALL, Mr. WU, and Dr. LIPINSKI. It was a good team effort. And certainly our staffs were integral to having this be a successful bill. I agree with you—hopefully this will pass overwhelmingly and will send a message to the bad guys that we're on alert.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 4061.

Recent attacks on Government networks have served to increase awareness that cybersecurity is not just about protecting computers, but also has implications for U.S. national security and economic well-being. Without confidence in our Nation's internet infrastructure and data security, I am concerned that our country will not be able to climb out of the current economic climate. As such, I was pleased when President Obama declared in a speech in May 2009 that U.S. critical information infrastructures are a "Strategic National Asset".

Unfortunately, since that speech, the Administration's actions have not been indicative of those necessary to protect such a "Strategic National Asset." While I appreciate that the President recently appointed Howard Schmidt as Cyber Coordinator, this appointment was long overdue.

Madam Chair, A recent GAO report stated that, "Pervasive and sustained cyber attacks continue to pose a potentially devastating threat to the systems and operations of the Federal Government." The report went on to further state that, "The ever-increasing dependence of Federal agencies on computerized systems to carry out essential, everyday operations can make them vulnerable to an array of cyber-based risks. Thus it is increasingly important for the Federal Government to have effective information security controls in place to safeguard its systems and the information they contain."

In response to this GAO report and extensive hearings by the House Science and Technology Committee, I am pleased to support the Committee's bi-partisan legislation and applaud its authors. Specifically, H.R. 4061 authorizes activities in three areas in support of increased Federal focus on cybersecurity. This legislation:

Continues support of basic research at the National Science Foundation (NSF);

Expands NSF scholarships to increase the size and skills of the cybersecurity workforce; and

Increases R&D, standards development and coordination, and public outreach at the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) related to cybersecurity.

I also appreciate that this bill is not too overly burdensome and shies away from an overly regulatory approach. H.R. 4061 is a good first step as the 111th Congress addresses cybersecurity and I look forward to continuing this dialogue. I ask my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 4061.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 4061, "The Cybersecurity Enhancement Act of 2009," and I would like to thank my colleagues Representative LIPINSKI for introducing this measure, and Representative EHLERS, Representative WU, Representative SMITH and Representative HALL for their contributions to gain bipartisan support on this very important legislation that we are considering today.

This bill will help ensure a strategic plan for Federal Cybersecurity Research & Development (R&D) activities, strengthen public-private partnerships in cybersecurity, help train the next generation of cybersecurity professionals, and improve cybersecurity technical standards.

As we may recall, almost a year ago President Obama called for a comprehensive 60 day review of U.S. cyberspace policy. This review and the recommendations contained in the report led to a series of hearings on various aspects of cybersecurity R&D, including the state of research programs, partnerships with the private sector, the IT workforce, and how both NIST and the NSF are responding to the review.

H.R. 4061 is built upon these hearings, and addresses the issues raised in the 60-day review. Specifically, it aims to build strong public-private partnerships, improve the transfer of cybersecurity technologies to the marketplace, train an IT workforce for both the public and private sectors, and coordinate and prioritize Federal cybersecurity R&D. Of course cybersecurity research, standards setting, and education are only one piece of the recommendations of the 60-day report, and are only part of the solution. However, it is the beginning to a wide spread need to improving the security of cyberspace is that is one of the utmost importance and it will take the collective effort of the Federal Government, the private sector, our scientists and engineers, and every American to succeed.

Our Nation's cyber-infrastructure is an interconnected combination of private, public and Government networks. It is critical that Government and industry work closely to protect both the infrastructure and the future of innovation. Giving them the tools to ensure they can protect themselves—access to timely action-oriented information and availability of insurance for cyber incidents—as well as encouraging critical cybersecurity R&D here in the U.S., are the most important efforts our Administration can take to secure our cyber-infrastructure.

While we have been fortunate so far in avoiding a catastrophic cyber attack, last year the Pentagon reported more than 360 million attempts to break into its networks. A 2009 Consumer Reports study found that over the past two years, one in five online consumers has been a victim of cyber crime. In 2008 the Department of Homeland Security logged 5,499 such cyber attack incidents—a 40 percent increase over the previous year. A 2007 Government Accountability Office report estimates the total U.S. business losses due to cyber attacks exceed $117.5 billion per year.

I urge your support of this bill for we are all aware of the growing number of internet security incidents, involving such things as computer viruses, denial of service attacks, and defaced Web sites. These events have disrupted business and government activities, and have sometimes resulted in significant recovery costs.

It is important that we take inventory of all systems that are vital to the functioning of the Nation, and do all we can to protect them. This certainly includes our computer networks systems that can be attacked anonymously and from far away. These networks are the glue that holds our Nation's infrastructure together. An attack from cyberspace could jeopardize electric power grids, railways, hospitals and financial services, to name a few.

Last fall, under the leadership of Congresswoman CLARKE, we passed a resolution recognizing National Cybersecurity Awareness Month. Among other things this resolution contributed to an important education and awareness campaign, a national effort to make people aware of the problem. However, Federal leadership not only needed to increase public awareness, but also in research, education, and in demonstrating how to secure our own systems. Again, H.R. 4061 ensures an overall vision for the Federal cybersecurity R&D portfolio, trains the next generation of cybersecurity professionals, and improves cybersecurity technical standards.

It is now time for a broad-reaching, forward-thinking approach and the successful passage of H.R. 4061 is the beginning to bridge the gap and collaborate and coordinate with the private sector to conquer the many challenges to improve our country's security through cybersecurity.

As a member of the Homeland Security Committee, I am committed to working with my colleagues, businesses, and educational institutions to enhance the development and implementation of existing and future cyber security standards that enhance the Nation's security. Madam Chair, I support H.R. 4061.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Chair, today I rise in support of the Cyber Security Enhancement Act of 2009. Nearly 1 year ago, the administration called for a 60-day review of the national cyber security strategy. The report found that our Nation's digital infrastructure was largely at risk to a growing threat of cybercrime. Major advances in cyber security research and development were needed to address the report's findings. In order to protect against these sorts of intrusions I, along with other Members on the House Science and Technology Committee, worked to draft legislation that would address these findings.

During the Research and Science Education subcommittee markup on September 23, 2009, I amended this legislation to include a description of how the program will help contribute to a more diverse workforce by including women and minorities. This can be achieved by partnering Minority Serving Institutions, in addition to stakeholders in industry, academia, and other relevant organizations. Promoting broader participation of women and underrepresented minorities will only benefit the intent of this legislation.

I urge the passage of the Cyber Security Enhancement Act of 2009 which addresses many of the concerns in the administration's review. By adopting a comprehensive national cyber security research and development plan we will drastically advance American innovation in cyber security. I am proud to have worked towards securing some of America's vulnerabilities in cyberspace while increasing public education in this area of technology.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered read.

The text of the committee amendment is as follows:

H.R. 4061

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 ''Cybersecurity Enhancement Act of 2009''.

TITLE I—RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

SEC. 101. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) NATIONAL COORDINATION OFFICE.—The term National Coordination Office means the National Coordination Office for the Networking and Information Technology Research and Development program.

(2) PROGRAM.—The term Program means the Networking and Information Technology Research and Development program which has been established under section 101 of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991 (15 U.S.C. 5511).

SEC. 102. FINDINGS.

Section 2 of the Cyber Security Research and Development Act (15 U.S.C. 7401) is amended—

(1) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

''(1) Advancements in information and communications technology have resulted in a globally interconnected network of government, commercial, scientific, and education infrastructures, including critical infrastructures for electric power, natural gas and petroleum production and distribution, telecommunications, transportation, water supply, banking and finance, and emergency and government services.'';

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''Exponential increases in interconnectivity have facilitated enhanced communications, economic growth,'' and inserting ''These advancements have significantly contributed to the growth of the United States economy'';

(3) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

''(3) The Cyberspace Policy Review published by the President in May, 2009, concluded that our information technology and communications infrastructure is vulnerable and has 'suffered intrusions that have allowed criminals to steal hundreds of millions of dollars and nation-states and other entities to steal intellectual property and sensitive military information'.'';

(4) by redesignating paragraphs (4) through (6) as paragraphs (5) through (7), respectively;

(5) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

''(4) In a series of hearings held before Congress in 2009, experts testified that the Federal cybersecurity research and development portfolio was too focused on short-term, incremental research and that it lacked the prioritization and coordination necessary to address the long-term challenge of ensuring a secure and reliable information technology and communications infrastructure.''; and

(6) by amending paragraph (7), as so redesignated by paragraph (4) of this section, to read as follows:

''(7) While African-Americans, Hispanics, and Native Americans constitute 33 percent of the college-age population, members of these minorities comprise less than 20 percent of bachelor degree recipients in the field of computer sciences.''.

SEC. 103. CYBERSECURITY STRATEGIC RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the agencies identified in subsection 101(a)(3)(B)(i) through (x) of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991 (15 U.S.C. 5511(a)(3)(B)(i) through (x)) or designated under section 101(a)(3)(B)(xi) of such Act, working through the National Science and Technology Council and with the assistance of the National Coordination Office, shall transmit to Congress a strategic plan based on an assessment of cybersecurity risk to guide the overall direction of Federal cybersecurity and information assurance research and development for information technology and networking systems. Once every 3 years after the initial strategic plan is transmitted to Congress under this section, such agencies shall prepare and transmit to Congress an update of such plan.

(b) CONTENTS OF PLAN.—The strategic plan required under subsection (a) shall—

(1) specify and prioritize near-term, mid-term and long-term research objectives, including objectives associated with the research areas identified in section 4(a)(1) of the Cyber Security Research and Development Act (15 U.S.C. 7403(a)(1)) and how the near-term objectives complement research and development areas in which the private sector is actively engaged;

(2) describe how the Program will focus on innovative, transformational technologies with the potential to enhance the security, reliability, resilience, and trustworthiness of the digital infrastructure;

(3) describe how the Program will foster the transfer of research and development results into new cybersecurity technologies and applications for the benefit of society and the national interest, including through the dissemination of best practices and other outreach activities;

(4) describe how the Program will establish and maintain a national research infrastructure for creating, testing, and evaluating the next generation of secure networking and information technology systems;

(5) describe how the Program will facilitate access by academic researchers to the infrastructure described in paragraph (4), as well as to relevant data, including event data; and

(6) describe how the Program will engage females and individuals identified in section 33 or 34 of the Science and Engineering Equal Opportunities Act (42 U.S.C. 1885a or 1885b) to foster a more diverse workforce in this area.

(c) DEVELOPMENT OF ROADMAP.—The agencies described in subsection (a) shall develop and annually update an implementation roadmap for the strategic plan required in this section. Such roadmap shall—

(1) specify the role of each Federal agency in carrying out or sponsoring research and development to meet the research objectives of the strategic plan, including a description of how progress toward the research objectives will be evaluated;

(2) specify the funding allocated to each major research objective of the strategic plan and the source of funding by agency for the current fiscal year; and

(3) estimate the funding required for each major research objective of the strategic plan for the following 3 fiscal years.

(d) RECOMMENDATIONS.—In developing and updating the strategic plan under subsection (a), the agencies involved shall solicit recommendations and advice from—

(1) the advisory committee established under section 101(b)(1) of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991 (15 U.S.C. 5511(b)(1)); and

(2) a wide range of stakeholders, including industry, academia, including representatives of minority serving institutions, and other relevant organizations and institutions.

(e) APPENDING TO REPORT.—The implementation roadmap required under subsection (c), and its annual updates, shall be appended to the report required under section 101(a)(2)(D) of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991 (15 U.S.C. 5511(a)(2)(D)).

SEC. 104. SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL RESEARCH IN CYBERSECURITY.

Section 4(a)(1) of the Cyber Security Research and Development Act (15 U.S.C. 7403(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''and usability'' after ''to the structure'';

(2) in subparagraph (H), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon;

(3) in subparagraph (I), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(J) social and behavioral factors, including human-computer interactions, usability, user motivations, and organizational cultures.''.

SEC. 105. NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION CYBERSECURITY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS.

(a) COMPUTER AND NETWORK SECURITY RESEARCH AREAS.—Section 4(a)(1) of the Cyber Security Research and Development Act (15 U.S.C. 7403(a)(1)) is amended in subparagraph (A) by inserting ''identity management,'' after ''cryptography,''.

(b) COMPUTER AND NETWORK SECURITY RESEARCH GRANTS.—Section 4(a)(3) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 7403(a)(3)) is amended by striking subparagraphs (A) through (E) and inserting the following new subparagraphs:

''(A) $68,700,000 for fiscal year 2010;

''(B) $73,500,000 for fiscal year 2011;

''(C) $78,600,000 for fiscal year 2012;

''(D) $84,200,000 for fiscal year 2013; and

''(E) $90,000,000 for fiscal year 2014.''.

(c) COMPUTER AND NETWORK SECURITY RESEARCH CENTERS.—Section 4(b) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 7403(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon;

(B) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(E) how the center will partner with government laboratories, for-profit entities, other institutions of higher education, or nonprofit research institutions.''; and

(2) by amending paragraph (7) to read as follows:

''(7) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation such sums as are necessary to carry out this subsection for each of the fiscal years 2010 through 2014.''.

(d) COMPUTER AND NETWORK SECURITY CAPACITY BUILDING GRANTS.—Section 5(a)(6) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 7404(a)(6)) is amended to read as follows:

''(6) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation such sums as are necessary to carry out this subsection for each of the fiscal years 2010 through 2014.''.

(e) SCIENTIFIC AND ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY ACT GRANTS.—Section 5(b)(2) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 7404(b)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

''(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation such sums as are necessary to carry out this subsection for each of the fiscal years 2010 through 2014.''.

(f) GRADUATE TRAINEESHIPS IN COMPUTER AND NETWORK SECURITY.—Section 5(c)(7) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 7404(c)(7)) is amended to read as follows:

''(7) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation such sums as are necessary to carry out this subsection for each of the fiscal years 2010 through 2014.''.

(g) POSTDOCTORAL RESEARCH FELLOWSHIPS IN CYBERSECURITY.—Section 5(e) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 7404(e)) is amended to read as follows:

''(e) POSTDOCTORAL RESEARCH FELLOWSHIPS IN CYBERSECURITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall carry out a program to encourage young scientists and engineers to conduct postdoctoral research in the fields of cybersecurity and information assurance, including the research areas described in section 4(a)(1), through the award of competitive, merit-based fellowships.

''(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation such sums as are necessary to carry out this subsection for each of the fiscal years 2010 through 2014.''.

SEC. 106. FEDERAL CYBER SCHOLARSHIP FOR SERVICE PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the National Science Foundation shall carry out a Scholarship for Service program to recruit and train the next generation of Federal cybersecurity professionals and to increase the capacity of the higher education system to produce an information technology workforce with the skills necessary to enhance the security of the Nation's communications and information infrastructure.

(b) CHARACTERISTICS OF PROGRAM.—The program under this section shall—

(1) provide, through qualified institutions of higher education, scholarships that provide tuition, fees, and a competitive stipend for up to 2 years to students pursing a bachelor's or master's degree and up to 3 years to students pursuing a doctoral degree in a cybersecurity field;

(2) provide the scholarship recipients with summer internship opportunities or other meaningful temporary appointments in the Federal information technology workforce; and

(3) increase the capacity of institutions of higher education throughout all regions of the United States to produce highly qualified cybersecurity professionals, through the award of competitive, merit-reviewed grants that support such activities as—

(A) faculty professional development, including technical, hands-on experiences in the private sector or government, workshops, seminars, conferences, and other professional development opportunities that will result in improved instructional capabilities;

(B) institutional partnerships, including minority serving institutions; and

(C) development of cybersecurity-related courses and curricula.

(c) SCHOLARSHIP REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) ELIGIBILITY.—Scholarships under this section shall be available only to students who—

(A) are citizens or permanent residents of the United States;

(B) are full-time students in an eligible degree program, as determined by the Director, that is focused on computer security or information assurance at an awardee institution; and

(C) accept the terms of a scholarship pursuant to this section.

(2) SELECTION.—Individuals shall be selected to receive scholarships primarily on the basis of academic merit, with consideration given to financial need and to the goal of promoting the participation of individuals identified in section 33 or 34 of the Science and Engineering Equal Opportunities Act (42 U.S.C. 1885a or 1885b).

(3) SERVICE OBLIGATION.—If an individual receives a scholarship under this section, as a condition of receiving such scholarship, the individual upon completion of their degree must serve as a cybersecurity professional within the Federal workforce for a period of time equal to the length of the scholarship. If a scholarship recipient is not offered employment by a Federal agency or a federally funded research and development center, the service requirement can be satisfied at the Director's discretion by—

(A) serving as a cybersecurity professional in a State, local, or tribal government agency; or

(B) teaching cybersecurity courses at an institution of higher education.

(4) CONDITIONS OF SUPPORT.—As a condition of acceptance of a scholarship under this section, a recipient shall agree to provide the

awardee institution with annual verifiable documentation of employment and up-to-date contact information.

(d) FAILURE TO COMPLETE SERVICE OBLIGATION.—

(1) GENERAL RULE.—If an individual who has received a scholarship under this section—

(A) fails to maintain an acceptable level of academic standing in the educational institution in which the individual is enrolled, as determined by the Director;

(B) is dismissed from such educational institution for disciplinary reasons;

(C) withdraws from the program for which the award was made before the completion of such program;

(D) declares that the individual does not intend to fulfill the service obligation under this section; or

(E) fails to fulfill the service obligation of the individual under this section,

such individual shall be liable to the United States as provided in paragraph (3).

(2) MONITORING COMPLIANCE.—As a condition of participating in the program, a qualified institution of higher education receiving a grant under this section shall—

(A) enter into an agreement with the Director of the National Science Foundation to monitor the compliance of scholarship recipients with respect to their service obligation; and

(B) provide to the Director, on an annual basis, post-award employment information required under subsection (c)(4) for scholarship recipients through the completion of their service obligation.

(3) AMOUNT OF REPAYMENT.—

(A) LESS THAN ONE YEAR OF SERVICE.—If a circumstance described in paragraph (1) occurs before the completion of 1 year of a service obligation under this section, the total amount of awards received by the individual under this section shall be repaid or such amount shall be treated as a loan to be repaid in accordance with subparagraph (C).

(B) MORE THAN ONE YEAR OF SERVICE.—If a circumstance described in subparagraph (D) or (E) of paragraph (1) occurs after the completion of 1 year of a service obligation under this section, the total amount of scholarship awards received by the individual under this section, reduced by the ratio of the number of years of service completed divided by the number of years of service required, shall be repaid or such amount shall be treated as a loan to be repaid in accordance with subparagraph (C).

(C) REPAYMENTS.—A loan described in subparagraph (A) or (B) shall be treated as a Federal Direct Unsubsidized Stafford Loan under part D of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087a and following), and shall be subject to repayment, together with interest thereon accruing from the date of the scholarship award, in accordance with terms and conditions specified by the Director (in consultation with the Secretary of Education) in regulations promulgated to carry out this paragraph.

(4) COLLECTION OF REPAYMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In the event that a scholarship recipient is required to repay the scholarship under this subsection, the institution providing the scholarship shall—

(i) be responsible for determining the repayment amounts and for notifying the recipient and the Director of the amount owed; and

(ii) collect such repayment amount within a period of time as determined under the agreement described in paragraph (2), or the repayment amount shall be treated as a loan in accordance with paragraph (3)(C).

(B) RETURNED TO TREASURY.—Except as provided in subparagraph (C) of this paragraph, any such repayment shall be returned to the Treasury of the United States.

(C) RETAIN PERCENTAGE.—An institution of higher education may retain a percentage of any repayment the institution collects under this paragraph to defray administrative costs associated with the collection. The Director shall establish a single, fixed percentage that will apply to all eligible entities.

(5) EXCEPTIONS.—The Director may provide for the partial or total waiver or suspension of any service or payment obligation by an individual under this section whenever compliance by the individual with the obligation is impossible or would involve extreme hardship to the individual, or if enforcement of such obligation with respect to the individual would be unconscionable.

(e) HIRING AUTHORITY.—For purposes of any law or regulation governing the appointment of individuals in the Federal civil service, upon successful completion of their degree, students receiving a scholarship under this section shall be hired under the authority provided for in section 213.3102(r) of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations, and be exempted from competitive service. Upon fulfillment of the service term, such individuals shall be converted to a competitive service position without competition if the individual meets the requirements for that position.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to appropriated to the National Science Foundation to carry out this section—

(1) $18,700,000 for fiscal year 2010;
(2) $20,100,000 for fiscal year 2011;
(3) $21,600,000 for fiscal year 2012;
(4) $23,300,000 for fiscal year 2013; and
(5) $25,000,000 for fiscal year 2014.

SEC. 107. CYBERSECURITY WORKFORCE ASSESSMENT.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act the President shall transmit to the Congress a report addressing the cybersecurity workforce needs of the Federal Government. The report shall include—

(1) an examination of the current state of and the projected needs of the Federal cybersecurity workforce, including a comparison of the different agencies and departments, and an analysis of the capacity of such agencies and departments to meet those needs;

(2) an analysis of the sources and availability of cybersecurity talent, a comparison of the skills and expertise sought by the Federal Government and the private sector, and an examination of the current and future capacity of United States institutions of higher education to provide cybersecurity professionals with those skills sought by the Federal Government and the private sector;

(3) an examination of the effectiveness of the National Centers of Academic Excellence in Information Assurance Education, the Centers of Academic Excellence in Research, and the Federal Cyber Scholarship for Service programs in promoting higher education and research in cybersecurity and information assurance and in producing a growing number of professionals with the necessary cybersecurity and information assurance expertise;

(4) an analysis of any barriers to the Federal Government recruiting and hiring cybersecurity talent, including barriers relating to compensation, the hiring process, job classification, and hiring flexibilities; and

(5) recommendations for Federal policies to ensure an adequate, well-trained Federal cybersecurity workforce.

SEC. 108. CYBERSECURITY UNIVERSITY-INDUSTRY TASK FORCE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF UNIVERSITY-INDUSTRY TASK FORCE.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall convene a task force to explore mechanisms for carrying out collaborative research and development activities for cybersecurity through a consortium or other appropriate entity with participants from institutions of higher education and industry.

(b) FUNCTIONS.—The task force shall—

(1) develop options for a collaborative model and an organizational structure for such entity under which the joint research and development activities could be planned, managed, and conducted effectively, including mechanisms for the allocation of resources among the participants in such entity for support of such activities;

(2) propose a process for developing a research and development agenda for such entity, including guidelines to ensure an appropriate scope of work focused on nationally significant challenges and requiring collaboration;

(3) define the roles and responsibilities for the participants from institutions of higher education and industry in such entity;

(4) propose guidelines for assigning intellectual property rights and for the transfer of research and development results to the private sector; and

(5) make recommendations for how such entity could be funded from Federal, State, and nongovernmental sources.

(c) COMPOSITION.—In establishing the task force under subsection (a), the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall appoint an equal number of individuals from institutions of higher education and from industry with knowledge and expertise in cybersecurity.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall transmit to the Congress a report describing the findings and recommendations of the task force.

SEC. 109. CYBERSECURITY CHECKLIST DEVELOPMENT AND DISSEMINATION.

Section 8(c) of the Cyber Security Research and Development Act (15 U.S.C. 7406(c)) is amended to read as follows:

''(c) CHECKLISTS FOR GOVERNMENT SYSTEMS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology shall develop or identify and revise or adapt as necessary, checklists, configuration profiles, and deployment recommendations for products and protocols that minimize the security risks associated with each computer hardware or software system that is, or is likely to become, widely used within the Federal Government.

''(2) PRIORITIES FOR DEVELOPMENT.—The Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology shall establish priorities for the development of checklists under this subsection. Such priorities may be based on the security risks associated with the use of each system, the number of agencies that use a particular system, the usefulness of the checklist to Federal agencies that are users or potential users of the system, or such other factors as the Director determines to be appropriate.

''(3) EXCLUDED SYSTEMS.—The Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology may exclude from the requirements of paragraph (1) any computer hardware or software system for which the Director determines that the development of a checklist is inappropriate because of the infrequency of use of the system, the obsolescence of the system, or the inutility or impracticability of developing a checklist for the system.

''(4) AUTOMATION SPECIFICATIONS.—The Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology shall develop automated security specifications (such as the Security Content Automation Protocol) with respect to checklist content and associated security related data.

''(5) DISSEMINATION OF CHECKLISTS.—The Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology shall ensure that Federal agencies are informed of the availability of any product developed or identified under the National Checklist Program for any information system, including the Security Content Automation Protocol and other automated security specifications.

''(6) AGENCY USE REQUIREMENTS.—The development of a checklist under paragraph (1) for a

computer hardware or software system does not—

''(A) require any Federal agency to select the specific settings or options recommended by the checklist for the system;

''(B) establish conditions or prerequisites for Federal agency procurement or deployment of any such system;

''(C) imply an endorsement of any such system by the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology; or

''(D) preclude any Federal agency from procuring or deploying other computer hardware or software systems for which no such checklist has been developed or identified under paragraph (1).''.

SEC. 110. NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY CYBERSECURITY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

Section 20 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278g–3) is amended by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f), and by inserting after subsection (d) the following:

''(e) INTRAMURAL SECURITY RESEARCH.—As part of the research activities conducted in accordance with subsection (d)(3), the Institute shall—

''(1) conduct a research program to develop a unifying and standardized identity, privilege, and access control management framework for the execution of a wide variety of resource protection policies and that is amenable to implementation within a wide variety of existing and emerging computing environments;

''(2) carry out research associated with improving the security of information systems and networks;

''(3) carry out research associated with improving the testing, measurement, usability, and assurance of information systems and networks; and

''(4) carry out research associated with improving security of industrial control systems.''.

TITLE II—ADVANCEMENT OF CYBERSECURITY TECHNICAL STANDARDS

SEC. 201. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) DIRECTOR.—The term ''Director'' means the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

(2) INSTITUTE.—The term ''Institute'' means the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

SEC. 202. INTERNATIONAL CYBERSECURITY TECHNICAL STANDARDS.

The Director, in coordination with appropriate Federal authorities, shall—

(1) ensure coordination of United States Government representation in the international development of technical standards related to cybersecurity; and

(2) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, develop and transmit to the Congress a proactive plan to engage international standards bodies with respect to the development of technical standards related to cybersecurity.

SEC. 203. PROMOTING CYBERSECURITY AWARENESS AND EDUCATION.

(a) PROGRAM.—The Director, in collaboration with relevant Federal agencies, industry, educational institutions, and other organizations, shall develop and implement a cybersecurity awareness and education program to increase public awareness of cybersecurity risks, consequences, and best practices through—

(1) the widespread dissemination of cybersecurity technical standards and best practices identified by the Institute; and

(2) efforts to make cybersecurity technical standards and best practices usable by individuals, small to medium-sized businesses, State, local, and tribal governments, and educational institutions.

(b) MANUFACTURING EXTENSION PARTNERSHIP.—The Director shall, to the extent appropriate, implement subsection (a) through the Manufacturing Extension Partnership program under section 25 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278k).

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall transmit to the Congress a report containing a strategy for implementation of this section.

SEC. 204. IDENTITY MANAGEMENT RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

The Director shall establish a program to support the development of technical standards, metrology, testbeds, and conformance criteria, taking into account appropriate user concerns, to—

(1) improve interoperability among identity management technologies;

(2) strengthen authentication methods of identity management systems;

(3) improve privacy protection in identity management systems, including health information technology systems, through authentication and security protocols; and

(4) improve the usability of identity management systems.

The CHAIR. No amendment to the committee amendment is in order except those printed in House Report 111–410. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 111–410.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

Page 21, line 4, strike ''and an'' and insert ''an''.

Page 21, line 8, insert '', and a description of how successful programs are engaging the talents of women and African-Americans, Hispanics, and Native Americans in the cybersecurity workforce'' after ''private sector''.

Page 23, line 11, insert '', and shall include representatives from minority-serving institutions'' after ''in cybersecurity''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1051, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) and a Member in opposition each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. First, let me thank BART GORDON and this committee for the extraordinary work that they have done. And even though all of us are going to get an opportunity to say to the chairperson our thanks for his efforts here in Congress, I'd like to just personally thank him not only for the Cybersecurity Enhancement Act of 2009, but for substantial and substantive legislation throughout the course of his career.

I'm pleased to offer this amendment to address cybersecurity workforce concerns and advance the development of technical standards. If we're going to do that, we need to consider all of the different innovative opportunities out there. I was disappointed, though, to discover the significant gender and racial disparities in the cybersecurity industry.

We know cyberspace touches practically everything and everyone, yet I find it mind-boggling that we haven't made more of an effort to include everyone in protecting it. Women now constitute 50.7 percent of the U.S. population as of 2008, and the U.S. Census Bureau found that only 14 percent of women pursue professional careers in science or technology. Other underrepresented groups mentioned in this amendment include African Americans, Hispanics, and Native Americans. All of these groups have historically been underrepresented in scientific and engineering occupations. The U.S. Census Bureau recorded African Americans, Hispanics, and Native Americans as 28.2 percent of the U.S. population in 2008, yet these groups only represent a mere 10 percent of the science and technology industry.

In order to protect cyberspace, we need a strong vision and leadership. Both will require changes in policy, technology, education, and perhaps law. This bill will be recruiting the best and brightest, and we must ensure these opportunities are available to all Americans.

This amendment will address existing and potential racial and gender disparities in the industry. The first part of the amendment deals with the section on the cybersecurity workforce assessment. In this section, we require the President to transmit to Congress a report analyzing the cybersecurity workforce needs of the Federal Government. If we're going to take a good look at the sources and availability of cybersecurity talent in our country, then we must also take a more vigilant look at how we are including the talent of minorities.

According to a 1995 report by the National Research Council, ''limited access is the first hurdle faced by women seeking industrial jobs in science and engineering, and while progress has been made in recent years, common recruitment and hiring practices that make extensive use of traditional networks often overlook the available pool of women.'' Madam Chair, it is truly embarrassing that 15 years later, we find ourselves having made such little progress on this issue.

The second part of the amendment adds a requirement to include representatives from minority-serving institutions on the Cybersecurity University-Industry Task Force. In order to conduct a national dialogue on cybersecurity and develop more public awareness of the threat and risk, we need an integrated approach—one that includes a diverse industry that can

tackle our vulnerabilities while also meeting our economic needs and national security requirements.

Madam Chair, the United States needs a comprehensive framework to ensure a coordinated response and recovery by the government, the private sector, and our allies to a significant incident or threat. This amendment ensures that the process is accessible to our Nation's diverse talent.

In addition to thanking the committee, and especially Chairman GORDON, I'd like to thank our colleague, Congressman CIRO RODRIGUEZ of Texas for cosponsoring this amendment.

I urge my colleagues to support this effort.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Chair, I rise to claim time in opposition, although I do not intend to oppose this amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. HASTINGS and my colleague from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ) are making improvements to this bill to ensure that the strategic plan takes into consideration the talents of women and minority populations in the cybersecurity workforce and that the University-Industry Task Force includes representatives from minority-serving institutions. I therefore urge support for this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1345

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Chair, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished chairperson of the committee.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Madam Chairman, first of all, let me thank my friend from Florida for his very kind words. But more importantly, I want to thank him for introducing this important legislation. We can have the best technology in the world, but if we don't have the workforce to go with it, then the bad guys win. This will go a long way to improving and expanding our workforce, and I thank the gentleman for this amendment.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Madam Chair, I rise in support of the Hastings-Rodriguez Amendment to H.R. 4061, the Cyber Security Enhancement Act.

Our amendment aims to address the lack of minority representation in the cyber security industry. In addition it provides for a minority serving institution to participate in the university-industry task force authorized by this legislation.

Our country is blessed to have many top-notch universities already training our future cyber security experts. For example, a minority serving institution in my district, the University of Texas—San Antonio, is producing both undergrads and graduate degrees in information assurance and computer science. UTSA has been designated a Center of Academic Excellence in Information Assurance Education and a Center of Academic Excellence in Information Assurance Research by the National Security Agency and Department of Homeland Security. Only 23 programs in the nation have achieved the research designation.

Universities like UTSA can play a major role in our national cyber policy and the training of our future cyber workforce. This underlying legislation will set us on our way to prepare our diverse workforce for our current and future needs.

I would like to thank my colleague Mr. HASTINGS for his partnership on this amendment. I urge my colleagues to support the Hastings/Rodriguez amendment and support H.R. 4061.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. GORDON OF TENNESSEE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 111–410.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Madam Chair, as the designee of the gentleman from Colorado, I rise to offer his amendment.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. GORDON of Tennessee:

Page 13, line 22, insert ''or, at the discretion of the Director, with appropriate private sector entities'' after ''technology workforce''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1051, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) and a Member in opposition each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Madam Chair, one of the best ways for cybersecurity professionals to improve their skills is through meaningful and diverse experiences. This amendment would allow scholarship recipients to seek out internship opportunities in the private sector and then bring those experiences to their service in the Federal Government.

I want to thank my friend Mr. POLIS for this good amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Chair, I rise to claim time in opposition, although I do not intend to oppose this amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCAUL. As part of the Scholarship for Service program at NSF, scholarship awardees are to receive internships at Federal agencies. This amendment simply gives the director the discretion of allowing them to intern in the private sector. So, therefore, I support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 111–410.

Mr. FLAKE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk, designated as No. 3 under the rule.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. FLAKE:

Page 12, after line 25, insert the following new subsection:

(h) PROHIBITION ON EARMARKS.—None of the funds appropriated under this section, and the amendments made by this section may be used for a Congressional earmark as defined in clause 9(d) of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1051, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member in opposition each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Madam Chair, this amendment, I hope, is noncontroversial in nature. Section 105 of the bill would authorize appropriations for several National Science Foundation grant programs dealing with cybersecurity. For example, the bill authorizes nearly $400 million through 2014 for computer and network security research grants. In addition, the bill would authorize such sums as necessary to make grants related to computer and network security research centers and capacity building, Scientific and Advanced Technology Act grants, and traineeships and research fellowships. This amendment would simply prohibit any earmarking of the funds made available for these programs under this act.

It appears that the grants are already intended to be awarded on a ''merit-reviewed competitive basis.'' But I think we still need this amendment because we've seen in the past, time and time and time and time again, that programs that were set up to be competitive accounts that are supposed to be competitive or merit reviewed are simply earmarked later. So if we have this language in it, it will make it less likely that these accounts are subject to earmarking. It's unfortunate that we have to take this step, I realize, but I think we should.

I agree with the President when he said last week that we need to ''continue down the path to earmark reform'' and that ''restoring the public trust demands more.'' This is doing more. I think that we ought to go much further than this, but this is a good start.

I wish to yield as much time as he may consume to the ranking minority member for his comments.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Chair, I rise in support of this amendment, and I also support the gentleman's position on earmarks. This amendment would prohibit the earmarking of the NSF and NIST cybersecurity activities authorized in this bill. It is well understood that awarding grants through merit-based competitive processes is the best way to fund science and technology, and cybersecurity is certainly no exception. This insulation from political influences is, in fact, an important reason why NSF and NIST have such a strong reputation overall both within and outside of the Federal Government.

Mr. FLAKE's amendment will help ensure that this model is being protected by incorporating it specifically into the statute. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman. Let me just say, I mentioned that we have had examples in the past. Let me just give one where programs that were supposed to be competitively awarded were, in fact, earmarked. Last year we established a grant program called the Emergency Operation Centers. It was established by Congress in FY 2008, in the Homeland Security bill. Last year in the spending bill, it showed that 60 percent of the funds in this grant program were earmarked. We simply can't allow that to happen here. This is a $400 million authorization for this grant program, and we can't have it earmarked.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. I rise to claim time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Madam Chairman, I want to thank my friend for introducing this amendment. It certainly is accepted by the majority; and I want to assure him, as Mr. MCCAUL can also, that this particular bill is clean as a whistle. There are no earmarks, NSF, NIST, or anywhere else. Again, I thank him for making sure that we get that clarified.

I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

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

Mr. POLIS. Thank you, Chairman GORDON. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of the Polis amendment to H.R. 4061, the Cybersecurity Enhancement Act of 2009. We enjoyed working very closely with Chairman GORDON, his staff, Representative LIPINSKI; and I appreciate their leadership on this critical and bipartisan bill that will train the experts who we need to tackle tomorrow's challenges and enable the United States and the world to stay competitive in cybersecurity.

In a world of blogs and widgets, smartphones and email, we are truly a global community, growing ever-closer and ever-more interconnected. The average citizen cannot help but feel part of an extended electronic family. Technological progress has enhanced our personal and work lives regardless of our job or position. As someone who has founded and run several small technology-related businesses, I can speak to the advantages of working in the technology age and how it's improved my ability now on the political side to represent the people of Colorado's Second Congressional District.

My amendment expands the proposed internship opportunities available to participants in the Federal Cyber Scholarship for Service program to include placements in the private sector. I believe it will serve tomorrow's cybersecurity professionals and our national security interests to open up this program to a diversity of experience from the public and private sector. For the future recipients of these scholarships, it will provide the occasion to serve not only in the Federal technology workforce but also at the abundance of small, medium and large businesses that help make up our Nation's economy.

My district is a great example of where institutions of higher education, small business and the Federal Government cooperate to benefit one another and the rest of the Nation. We have a thriving community of startups, lower than average unemployment and a history of growing successful small businesses. With the collaboration of budding cybersecurity professionals from the University of Colorado in Boulder, these companies can benefit from their education and, in turn, impart the practical knowledge that will build each student's portfolio of experience. Having gained and grown from these experiences, I am positive that their education in the private sector will help promote unique solutions to daunting tasks during their time in the Federal Government. What originally seemed like a strategy only applicable to small high-tech companies in Boulder can now serve as a useful tool when confronted with the task of fending off cyberattacks from nation-states or rogue individuals.

The state of cybersecurity is fast becoming one of the greatest challenges of the 21st century. It's apparent that despite increased spending on research and development, our technological infrastructure is still vulnerable. China's recent intrusion into Google's operations should serve as a call for preparedness to both the private sector and the Federal Government.

This past May, President Obama's cyberspace policy review highlighted the importance of developing partnerships between the Federal Government and the private sector. The limits of cybergrowth are constantly expanding and so too must our plans to address the plethora of issues that crop up. As Secretary Clinton put it recently: ''The Internet, though a blessing, can be a threat to those who would fall prey to cyberterrorism.'' It is our job, as inventors and stewards of the Internet, to ensure unhindered, free and secure access to enrich the lives of everyone.

By boosting our training capabilities, we are helping to ensure a safe and free Internet experience. This amendment helps to guarantee that we are addressing the long-term challenges inherent in cybersecurity. It will create ties to the private sector and cultivate a workforce for the future. Madam Chairman, this amendment and this bill are critical to protecting our Nation's sensitive information and ensuring our cybersecurity. I appreciate the Committee of the Whole for accepting this amendment and Mr. GORDON for offering it.

Mr. FLAKE. Just to conclude, I appreciate the majority's willingness to accept the amendment. Again, I appreciate the fact that there are no earmarks in this authorization. What we're seeking to do here is that when money is appropriated for these programs that are authorized here, that none of that money can be earmarked like we've seen in many, many, many bills before.

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

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. MATHESON

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 111–410.

Mr. MATHESON. I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. MATHESON:

Page 9, line 23, strike ''is amended'' and insert ''is amended—

(1)''.

Page 9, line 25, strike the period and insert ''; and''.

Page 9, after line 25, insert the following new paragraph:

(2) by amending subparagraph (I) to read as follows:

''(I) enhancement of the ability of law enforcement to detect, investigate, and prosecute cyber-crimes, including crimes that involve piracy of intellectual property, crimes against children, and organized crime.''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1051, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. MATHESON. Madam Chair, I will be very brief. You know, right now this legislation to enhance cybersecurity authorizes the National Science Foundation to assist in doing research that will help law enforcement look for issues related to intellectual property. I thought it would be helpful if we also included and amended this bill to enhance the ability of law enforcement to prosecute cybercrimes that involve crimes against children and organized crime.

So simply stated, that is the substance of this amendment. I think any of us who are parents of children right now have concerns about when kids are using the Internet and the amount of inappropriate material that's on it right now and the number of folks who are targeting children on the Internet. So I thought that would be a helpful amendment to this bill. I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Chair, I rise to claim time in opposition, although I am not opposed to this amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Chair, NSF computer and network security research grants are intended to enhance computer security through basic hardware and software research in numerous areas, including the ability for law enforcement to detect, investigate, and prosecute cybercrimes.

This amendment merely highlights crimes against children and organized crime, such as cybercrimes, where these investments should be made. So I fully support this good amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MATHESON. I yield back the balance of my time as well, Madam Chair.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. ROSKAM

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 111–410.

Mr. ROSKAM. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. ROSKAM:

Page 8, line 20, insert ''and community colleges'' after ''minority serving institutions''.

Page 14, line 10, insert ''and community colleges'' after ''minority serving institutions''.

Page 21, line 6, insert '', including community colleges,'' after ''institutions of higher education''.

Page 23, line 10, insert '', including community colleges,'' after ''institutions of higher education''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1051, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

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

Madam Chair, I thank the majority for making this amendment in order and a special thank you to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) who was instrumental in putting this together.

The amendment is actually very straightforward and very, very simple. It just inserts the word or phrase ''community college'' at four different points in the bill.

□ 1400

What this amendment is trying to do is to expand the pool of people that we're reaching out to to bring into this idea of taking on this great challenge of cybersecurity. In a nutshell, I'd like to read just a quick paragraph from a community college in my district, the College of DuPage, located in Glen Ellyn, Illinois. It says of this amendment that it will capitalize on the abilities of the exceptional faculty, talented students, and the state-of-the-art facilities at the College of DuPage and institutions like it to produce careers and put in place systems to protect our country. And similarly, the amendment is supported by the American Association of Community Colleges.

But I think, putting this into a larger context, it's important, because if you look at where we're going as a Nation, and notwithstanding all the turmoil that we've seen regarding our economy and where we're attempting to go, and we're struggling with great unemployment rates and so forth, without question, it's the technology sector of our economy that's going to lead the way. And without question, we're going to need an underlying system that is secure. And so I think casting a wider net, including folks in the community college system who have proven themselves time and time again, to ultimately invite them into this solution, I think, is the way to go. It's a fairly straightforward amendment and it says that technology is important for our Nation and, ultimately, technology and cybersecurity are important for our Nation.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) for such time as he may consume.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Chairman, I'm pleased to strongly support this amendment. Our Nation's community colleges have played a crucial role in our technology and educational workforce. This amendment makes sure they are able to make recommendations and give advice to the Federal Government on the strategic plan. It emphasizes their eligibility as a potential institutional partner under the Scholarship for Service Program and really puts them at the table of the University-Industry Task Force.

So, with that, I strongly urge support.

Mr. ROSKAM. I thank the gentleman for his kind words.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. EDWARDS OF MARYLAND

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 111–410.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 6 offered by Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland:

At the end of the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. 205. PRACTICES AND STANDARDS.

The National Institute of Standards and Technology shall work with other Federal, State, and private sector partners, as appropriate, to develop a framework that States may follow in order to achieve effective cybersecurity practices in a timely and cost effective manner.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1051, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Maryland.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Madam Chairman, I want to take this moment to thank Chairman GORDON and Ranking Member HALL and Representative LIPINSKI for their hard work on this really important bill and for consideration of this amendment. I probably, like lots of Americans, have faced the circumstance, even in this last month and a half, private information compromised first at a bank, then at a Federal agency, and then at a retail establishment, all within the span of a month and a half.

Threats such as identity theft, denial of service attacks, worms, viruses, the loss of sensitive information, and other malicious activity are a part of the ever-evolving cybersecurity threat to our country. It's important that we act swiftly to prepare our Nation for these threats and to anticipate the threats that we'll face in the years to come. It's not an easy task. We operate on a system of databases throughout this country that interact at the Federal, State, and local level and in the commercial sector.

This bipartisan bill really accomplishes all of these goals. And further, the amendment that I'm offering really encourages the National Institute of Standards and Technology to work with other Federal Government entities, State governments and the private sector partners to develop a framework that States may follow as they strengthen their cybersecurity standards.

One of the weaknesses identified as our committee marked up this legislation is the lack of collaboration between various entities concerned with

cybersecurity. The underlying bill takes major steps to address this, but I believe that my amendment strengthens these measures and will lead to States that are many times on the front lines to make major progress toward keeping their networks and information safe; and, of course, that does trickle down to the local level and out into the commercial sector.

In my home State of Maryland, we just made a major commitment to cybersecurity, as many States have across this country, with varying standards of operation and security around the country. This amendment will ensure that States can use their resources much more efficiently. Security requirements and priorities are unique to each State and often times unique among government entities in the same State. My amendment recognizes this and allows States and the standards to adapt with the changing threats and needs.

Madam Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment because we must encourage collaboration and innovation as we aim to address the multiple threats to our cybersecurity.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to this amendment, although I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MORAN of Virginia). Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCAUL. This amendment directs NIST to work with Federal, State, and private-sector partners to develop a framework that States may use to improve their cybersecurity posture. Developing such a framework for use in assisting States is certainly consistent with NIST's expertise and capabilities, and there is clearly a need for this expertise at the State level.

I should note, in working with the States, that we should, of course, expect that the NIST role remains limited to the development of guidance that the States may use, if they choose, avoiding any activities that are mandatory or binding in nature.

I'd like to yield to the gentlelady from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) to say if that's a correct statement. That is my understanding of this amendment.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. That's correct.

Mr. MCCAUL. Reclaiming my time then, I'm comfortable with the language in this amendment as written and very much support its passage.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to yield 30 seconds to the chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON).

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from Maryland, and I want to thank her more importantly for introducing this commonsense constructive amendment that's going to provide additional tools for the States as they fight this issue, very well pointed out, this very difficult, day-to-day battle with cybersecurity.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I would like to just conclude by saying that it's really important that we get this right at every level because of increasing threats to our cybersecurity, both internationally and here domestically. And I urge, again, my colleagues for careful consideration and approval of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. PAULSEN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 111–410.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 7 offered by Mr. PAULSEN:

Page 7, line 15, strike ''and''.

Page 7, line 20, strike the period and insert ''; and''.

Page 7, after line 20, insert the following new paragraph:

(7) outline how the United States can work strategically with our international partners on cybersecurity research and development issues where appropriate.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1051, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that would require that the cybersecurity strategic research and development plan to also include how we can work with international partners to make our technology infrastructure even safer.

Throughout most of our Nation's history, our security concerns have evolved around our national security of military security, intelligence, and protection of our borders. Now, over the past few decades, our technological advances and our ever-increasing reliance on that technology are increasingly important and have drastically expanded. This, naturally, makes our technology a likely target for attack by those that would like to harm the United States.

Furthermore, as Minnesota's Chief Information Officer, Gopal Khanna, says, ''Cybersecurity is not just a Federal issue; it is also a national policy issue with huge global ramifications.'' And he is absolutely correct, Mr. Chairman. We must view the issue of cybersecurity from both a domestic and a foreign perspective. His article, ''Mutually Assured Survival in Cyber Space,'' which I do intend to offer into the RECORD, outlines the critical importance of our Nation's cybersecurity infrastructure.

As Mr. Khanna states, a cybersecurity attack on our most vulnerable assets—that's the data and information that power our productivity and support the United States and global economies—will be utterly devastating. An attack would not only affect us here at home, but it would have a very adverse impact on our trading partners and the flow of commerce every day.

Today's technology-driven economy makes cybersecurity an essential national security issue, one with ramifications that stretch across our Nation and far beyond our borders. We must remember this as we look at ways to strengthen cybersecurity. We need to think about our alliances abroad in the general context of new geopolitical realities of the digital cyberworld in which we live and operate today, and this amendment recognizes those realities.

[From Governing, Sept. 8, 2009]

MUTUALLY ASSURED SURVIVAL IN CYBER SPACE

(By Gopal Khanna)

We must pool resources to focus on an all-encompassing national approach to defending our information infrastructure from attacks.

For the better part of the 20th century, America's greatest threat came from the expansionist strategies of Communism, with its values and aspirations so contradictory to our own free and open democratic society. At the heart of the conflict was the proliferation of nuclear arsenals and the horrific potential to kill millions with one strike. Baby boomers who were schoolchildren at the time remember the drills when they were instructed to hide under their desks in the event of an attack.

While nuclear proliferation is still a threat, America is beginning to recognize a sleeper threat of a different kind: the devastation that can result from the mass disruption of business communications and the workings of government through cyber attacks. As we reflect on the results of President Obama's 60-day Cyberspace Policy Review, policy makers and private-sector leaders need to come together to apply great effort and creativity in crafting safeguards against these vulnerabilities.

The series of apparently orchestrated attacks on U.S. Web sites in July—directed at such critical entities as the Treasury Department, Secret Service, Federal Trade Commission and New York Stock Exchange—is precisely why the U.S. should become a leader in thwarting cyber attacks on our national and international information infrastructure. In his May 29 remarks on securing the nation's information infrastructure, President Obama stated that ''the status quo is no longer acceptable'' and called our attention to the critical work ahead. To reiterate that point, last month Homeland Security Secretary Janet Napolitano emphasized how important the role of state and local governments will be in meeting today's cyber security threats and that ''it is important to recognize that there is no international structure'' where cyber crime is concerned.

The Cyberspace Policy Review has validated our understanding that it is not only corporate America that is now under siege, but the federal, state and local governments, private institutions and non-governmental organizations as well. Capable of wreaking a different sort of havoc, and easier to execute, today's menace comes from cyber security attacks on our most valuable assets—the data and information that power our productivity and support the economy of the United States and the world.

That is why we must pool resources to focus on an all-encompassing national approach to defending our assets within the context of the new geopolitical realities of the digital world we live in. We need to apply all of our tools and our finest minds to harness our capabilities and competencies in the interest of protecting an infrastructure that supports our way of life. Just as ducking under desks would have done little to protect schoolchildren in the 1950s from a nuclear attack, simply hiding behind new software or the latest firewall will not protect us from tomorrow's range of cyber threats. We must do more.

To this end, the United States should take the lead in an international endeavor to address these threats; not only the risks to our own country but also the risks to our allies in free economies and open governments around the world. Every attack, regardless of its target, poses global dangers, due to the interconnections of digital infrastructure and networks as well as the interdependencies of national and regional economies, and imperils commerce and communications among all nations.

In the past, the doctrine of Mutually Assured Destruction acted as a deterrent to prevent a nuclear first-strike by either side. Both the United States and the Soviet Union knew that a strike would mean mutual annihilation. As a result, although the doctrine has not contained the spread of nuclear technology to rogue states, a nuclear weapon has not been detonated in military conflict since World War II.

We need to develop an analogous approach against these new dangers—one that fends off the cyber anarchy envisioned by some nation-states and fringe borderless entities.

The G–20 Summit in Pittsburgh this month is an ideal forum to establish America's leadership in cyber security. It's important that the international community come together to answer some basic, foundational questions about cyber attacks as a tactic of warfare: Should attacks of a cyber-nature be condemned in the same manner as chemical and biological weapons? How should a country respond to a cyber attack from another nation-state? How should the international community respond to such an attack?

The potential for mass disruption to all aspects of social, economic and political workings of nations requires that the G–20 country CIOs who are responsible for policies, practices and management of the digital infrastructure in their respective jurisdictions be a part of this discussion.

By working together, perhaps it will be understood that a cyber attack against one country is an attack against all countries, justifying a response—maybe even an international response. Time will tell if the international community will embrace as bold a deterrent as ''Mutually Assured Survival in Cyber Space.'' Still, now is the time to develop a doctrine of accountability and consequences that will serve as a deterrent to nation-states and rogue entities and prevent levels of cyber warfare that could jeopardize international trade, our government services, our security, our corporate and business interests, and most important, our open, democratic way of life.

I yield such time as he may consume to my colleague from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL).

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment. The gentleman is absolutely correct. The Internet knows no boundaries. This is not just an issue for the United States; it's a global issue that we need to address. This amendment simply states that the interagency cybersecurity R&D plan required by the legislation outlines how the United States can work strategically with international partners on cybersecurity R&D.

Cybersecurity issues are certainly global in nature. Many of our closest allies face the same threats and vulnerabilities that we do. Thus, it makes sense that we should work to cooperate more closely with our international partners, and that is what this amendment will do. Therefore, I strongly urge support.

Mr. PAULSEN. I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I'm not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I concur with Mr. MCCAUL in saying that cyberthreats know no boundaries. This is, again, a good commonsense amendment, and I thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN) for introducing it, and we support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Chairman, just in closing, I know that by working together on the commonsense approach—I thank the gentleman—I look forward to support of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MRS. DAHLKEMPER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 111–410.

Mrs. DAHLKEMPER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 8 offered by Mrs. DAHLKEMPER:

Page 12, after line 25, insert the following new subsection:

(h) COMPUTER AND NETWORK SECURITY CAPACITY BUILDING GRANTS—MANUFACTURING EXTENSION PARTNERSHIP.—Section 5(a)(3) of the Cyber Security Research and Development Act (15 U.S.C. 7404(a)(3)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (I);

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (J) as subparagraph (K); and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (I) the following new subparagraph:

''(J) establishing or enhancing collaboration in computer and network security between community colleges, universities, and Manufacturing Extension Partnership Centers; and''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1051, the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Mrs. DAHLKEMPER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania.

Mrs. DAHLKEMPER. Mr. Chairman, my amendment to H.R. 4061 expands computer and network security capacity, building grants to allow for collaboration between community colleges, universities, and Manufacturing Extension Partnership centers.

As we all know, cybersecurity is an issue that affects both our national security and our economic prosperity, and it poses a particular problem for our small businesses. Small and medium-sized businesses often cannot shoulder the costs of developing and maintaining the mechanisms needed to protect themselves from cybersecurity threats. Individually, the security of these firms may seem like a minor affair compared to larger economic and government entities; however, the 27 million small and medium-sized businesses across the country account for 95 percent of our Nation's business.

Collaboration will benefit all participants, from applied research and curriculum planning on the academic side to workforce training and better, more cost-efficient security measures for Manufacturing Extension Partnership centers and their industry partners.

I want to thank Representative GORDON, Ranking Member HALL, and Representative LIPINSKI for their leadership on this bill.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the Cybersecurity Enhancement Act of 2009 and my amendment that will help small businesses, starting with our manufacturers, better confront the serious challenges of cyberspace security.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to this amendment, although I'm not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCAUL. This amendment simply provides an establishing or enhancing cybersecurity collaboration between community colleges, universities, and NIST Manufacturing Extension Partnership centers, and is among the most eligible activities that may be supported by NSF cybersecurity research grants.

□ 1415

This collaboration between researchers and those that provide technical support regarding cybersecurity best practices is benefiting and should be encouraged. And therefore, I support

the gentlelady from Pennsylvania's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. DAHLKEMPER. I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON).

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. I thank my friend from Pennsylvania.

This is a very important amendment to our committee's work. The community colleges have so much potential to offer us, and I think by bringing this to the table we're going to bring a whole other sector to getting involved. And once again, this goes back to workforce issues. We can have the best technology in the world, but if we don't have the workforce to go with it, then we're not going to be successful.

So I thank the gentlelady for this excellent amendment.

Mrs. DAHLKEMPER. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Mrs. DAHLKEMPER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mrs. DAHLKEMPER. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 111–410.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I rise for the purposes of offering an amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 9 offered by Mr. GARAMENDI:

Page 28, line 21, and page 29, line 1, redesignate subsections (b) and (c) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively.

Page 28, after line 20, insert the following new subsection:

(b) WORKSHOPS.—In carrying out activities under subsection (a)(1), the Institute is authorized to host regional workshops to provide an overview of cybersecurity risks and best practices to businesses, State, local, and tribal governments, and educational institutions.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1051, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Long ago, I learned as a Boy Scout you need to be prepared, but to be prepared, you need knowledge and information. This amendment is all about knowledge and information for the public.

About 70 percent of Californians are linked to the Internet, but that Internet brings great problems. A new infected Web page is discovered every 5 seconds; a new spam-related Web page is discovered every 20 seconds. And additionally, there are some 2,500 e-mail messages that contain infected information. So we best be prepared.

In order to do that, we need knowledge, and that is what this amendment is all about. It provides the opportunity for the Institute to carry out the Cybersecurity Awareness and Education Program by conducting workshops around the Nation. With those workshops available, the information can be disseminated and made available to individuals.

That is the thrust of the amendment, and I seek an ''aye'' vote.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. I rise to claim time in opposition to this amendment although I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCAUL. This amendment specifies that as part of its outreach and education efforts NIST may host regional workshops on cybersecurity risks and best practices for businesses, State, and local governments and educational institutions.

I think that's a good thing, and while I do not oppose this amendment, I'd like to note that NIST has a very modest budget for cybersecurity activities, of which outreach and education is just a small fraction.

Accordingly, in carrying out the section of this bill is my expectation that this should work to leverage this funding to benefit the largest number of entities and individuals as it can. I recognize workshops can also serve as a useful outreach tool and should be an option.

So with that point in mind, I do not object to this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GARAMENDI. The gentleman points out some very good points that there are issues about the budget. I am sure that the Institute will find the very best way to carry out this particular task.

I yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. First, let me thank my friend from California for an excellent amendment. It's an improvement to an already-good bill.

Mr. Chairman, I rise now to offer my condolences to the family of Judy Ruckel. Judy was the printer for the Committee on Science and Technology, and she unexpectedly passed away earlier this week. Because she worked from home, I did not know Judy as well as I do other members of the staff. She was a quiet, often unseen stalwart of the committee. Most staff members never questioned how the documents that are the record of our work get produced, and it's a testament to Judy that they never had to. Judy just took care of it.

When I first became chairman, I had no idea what a committee printer did. I kept asking who the printer was, what did she do, where was her office. Universally I was told that Judy was the nicest, most caring person that you could ever have on your staff and that she was good at whatever she did and that I needed to have no concerns on that front. Everyone was right.

Judy's quiet presence and good work will be missed by all on our committee.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MRS. MCCARTHY OF NEW YORK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 111–410.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 10 offered by Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York:

Page 28, line 20, insert '', especially with respect to novice computer users, elderly populations, low-income populations, and populations in areas of planned broadband expansion or deployment'' after ''educational institutions''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1051, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. I'd like to thank Chairman GORDON and Ranking Member HALL for bringing forward this important bill.

The images of growth and the Internet over the years has brought, and will continue to bring, new and exciting opportunities. While these opportunities, however, have new challenges for all of us, H.R. 4061, the Cyber-security Enhancement Act of 2009 is an important bill that will foster safer and more productive Internet use nationally.

I am so proud that the President, his administration, as well as my colleagues in Congress, have all made Internet innovation and security a priority. I am even more proud of the educational provisions in H.R. 4061 that, in my opinion, are vital to the successful growth and sustainability of the Internet and its many real-world applications.

Computer literacy may be something that some of us take for granted, but there are significant portions of our Nation that are unfamiliar with the full spectrum of dangers careless computer use can have.

Our daily lives have become increasingly reliant on the Internet, and over the years, Congress has made substantial investments in its growth. It is

only natural that Congress compliment this technological investment with targeted educational initiatives as well.

I am proud to offer, along with my esteemed colleague, Mr. KRATOVIL of Maryland, an amendment that will ensure that proper cybersecurity education efforts focus on those that need them most, namely new computer users, elderly and low-income populations, as well as those residing in areas of planned Internet expansion and deployment.

My amendment will do much to ensure that vulnerable populations receive due attention as part of a public awareness campaign for cybersecurity. According to the Pew Research Center, only a third of the elderly are considered to be Internet users. Moreover, the Pew Research Center finds that household income plays a significant factor in cyber literacy.

Too often we hear stories of those taken advantage of or ignorant to the dangers of the Internet. We have the opportunity to educate and prevent careless Web surfing.

Today, with my amendment, we, as a Nation, have an opportunity to ensure that those new and less experienced computer users are given the opportunity to be proactive members of the Internet community.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. I rise to claim time in opposition to this amendment, but do not intend to oppose it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply States that the NIST Cybersecurity Awareness and Education Program established in the bill helps makes the technical standards and best practices more usable for everyone, especially those new to computers: The elderly, those with low incomes, and those that may not have broadband quite yet, such as rural areas. Therefore, I do not oppose this amendment.

I would like to join Chairman GORDON at this point in time to offer my sincere condolences as well to the family of Judy Ruckel.

Judy served as a printer for the Science and Technology Committee since 2001 under both Republican and Democratic leadership. Day in and day out, Judy carried out her job with style and grace and never did she allow her struggle with diabetes to diminish her presence nor her performance.

Judy worked from home, but during her visits to our offices each week, she took time to look in on staff, inquiring about our families and challenges, always leaving a smile on the faces of those she came in contact with.

The job of managing countless hearing transcripts and markups and transforming them into permanent records is absolutely critical to the life of our committee, and Judy did it to perfection. She is irreplaceable. Judy's suffering has ended, and we will miss her very deeply, and God be with her.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. I'd like to yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

Mr. LIPINSKI. Every year, hundreds of thousands of people fall victim to Internet fraud so it's really clear we need to improve our cybersecurity awareness and education.

There are some who are especially vulnerable to falling victims to this fraud. So I think that this amendment by Mrs. MCCARTHY and Mr. KRATOVIL is a very good amendment.

I know that certainly I have seen and have had experience with people, especially those who are elderly, falling victim to crimes. I've had them come to my office and have problems about that and trying to clear that up.

So I think this is an especially good amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. I urge all of my colleagues to support the amendment. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MS. LORETTA SANCHEZ OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in House Report 111–410.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of Mr. SMITH from Washington, I rise to offer the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 11 offered by Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California:

Page 21, line 21, insert ''job security clearance and suitability requirements,'' after ''job classification,''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1051, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I rise in support of this amendment, which I am pleased to offer today on behalf of my colleague, Mr. SMITH of Washington, who is unable to be with us today due to a health issue.

I thank the gentleman for offering this amendment, which will strengthen our cybersecurity workforce, in turn protecting the security of our Nation.

Our country faces numerous cyberattacks each day, and as a result, we must ensure that our cyberworkforce not only possesses the knowledge and the skills necessary to defend our networks but also the ability to collaborate with the numerous departments and agencies within the Federal Government who lead the effort to combat these threats.

Information technology professionals at our civilian agencies who may not deal with classified information on a daily basis should be able to provide their expertise and have the ability to work with and discuss cyber-related issues with the Department of Defense and our intelligence community.

To that end, this amendment would modify Section 107 of the bill, which calls for the President to submit a report to Congress addressing the cybersecurity workforce needs of the Federal Government.

□ 1430

The amendment would require the report to also examine the current security clearance and job suitability requirements that may serve as a deterrent to hiring an adequately trained cyber-workforce.

Again, I want to wish Congressman SMITH a speedy recovery and encourage my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition, although I'm not opposed to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCAUL. This amendment would include some additional factors to be considered in the assessment of the cybersecurity workforce and barriers to entry into that workforce. Job security clearance and suitability requirements are important factors to consider in this assessment. I thank the gentlelady for a constructive amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Chairman, I have no other speakers, and I would just ask to move this and for my colleagues to vote on it. And I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. LANGEVIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in House Report 111–410.

Mr. LANGEVIN. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 12 offered by Mr. LANGEVIN:

Page 21, line 25, insert '', including recommendations on the temporary assignment of private sector cybersecurity professionals to Federal agencies'' after ''cybersecurity workforce''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1051, the gentleman

from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to H.R. 4061 that would expand private sector involvement in our cybersecurity efforts. By now we should all recognize the real danger our government faces from increasingly sophisticated cyberattacks, with threats ranging from mischievous hacking incidents to serious criminal activity or highly sophisticated cyber-penetration or attacks from nation-states.

Now, while the men and women of our Federal Government are incredibly talented and dedicate and work tirelessly to leverage the resources available to them to defend our government networks, the broad challenges inherent in cybersecurity and the often cumbersome government procurement process mean that they may not always have the specific expertise or capabilities or technology necessary to keep up with current threats.

This is very sobering in light of the fact that as we know, technology itself squares every 18 months, well, particularly on the human capital side. In such cases, the private sector can offer greater flexibility and a wider ranger of specialists, as well as agility. Current law does not allow, surprisingly, for security experts to share their cybersecurity expertise and knowledge with the men and women charged with defending our Nation's critical networks and data.

So my amendment directs the Presidential cybersecurity workforce assessment provided for in the bill before us today to study the possibility of permitting temporary assignments of private sector cybersecurity professionals to Federal agencies.

Now, these assignments would offer an important opportunity for the Federal Government to tap into a wider talent pool and improve private sector involvement and cooperation in protecting our Federal networks.

By creating easier access to that expertise through temporary assignments in the Federal Government, we can dramatically improve our ability to protect the public and private cyber-infrastructure. I think this really amounts to being a real force multiplier and a benefit to the American people and our Nation as a whole.

So I urge all of my colleagues to support this noncontroversial and commonsense amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCAUL. Let me tell you it is a point of personal privilege to commend the gentleman from Rhode Island for all of his great work in this particular area and how much I have enjoyed working with the gentleman, co-chairing the CSIS commission and also co-chairing the Congressional Cybersecurity Caucus. So thank you.

This amendment would modify the section of the bill requiring the President to transmit a cybersecurity workforce report to Congress, specifically by requiring that the President's review consider the potential for temporary assignment of private sector cybersecurity professionals as a means through which to meet Federal workforce needs.

These types of mechanisms, such intergovernmental personnel agreements, have long been used by Federal agencies in various capacities; and they provide a flexible means through which to address workforce needs expeditiously.

Accordingly, it makes sense for the President's workforce assessment to consider and report on these mechanisms. So therefore, I support the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chair, I would just again reiterate the fact that we have some incredibly talented and dedicated men and women who work within the Federal Government already that are working day in and day out to protect what is a critical national asset, and that is our cyber-assets, as the President has clearly identified is a critical national asset and very important to our Nation's security as well as to our economy. And yet we face the incredible challenge of staying one step ahead of the bad guys, if you will, which is becoming increasingly difficult.

This amendment would basically allow us to determine a way to allow private sector involvement to a greater degree while allowing, in a sense, detailees, if you will, or temporary assignments from the private sector to Federal Government agencies that would allow us to utilize their talent, again, acting as a force multiplier to making sure that we always have the best and the brightest and we are agile at being able to use the best talents available to us to make sure that we have robust cybersecurity in protecting, as I said, this critical national asset.

So with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MS. LORETTA SANCHEZ OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in House Report 111–410.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 13 offered by Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California:

Page 7, line 15, insert ''representing realistic threats and vulnerabilities'' after ''event data''.

Page 23, line 2, strike ''rights and'' and insert ''rights,''.

Page 23, line 3, insert '', and for the sharing of lessons learned on the effectiveness of new technologies from the private sector with the public sector'' after ''private sector''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1051, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the challenge of defending our Nation on a constantly expanding cyberfront continues to grow.

As vice chair of the House Homeland Security Committee and chairwoman of the Armed Services subcommittee that oversees the Department of Defense cybermission, I have constantly tried to improve how we address the need for the next generation technology and personnel to defend our country against this 21st-century cyberthreat.

The underlying legislation, I believe, is an important step towards enhancing our Nation's cybersecurity laws; and I have been a strong supporter of engaging the private sector in cybersecurity issues, especially when it comes to securing critical cyber-infrastructure.

To this end, the amendments that I am offering today would strengthen two existing provisions in the bill to further enhance the cybersecurity dialogue between the public and the private sectors. My amendment would add language to help facilitate access to realistic threats and vulnerabilities for our academic researchers during the development of the strategic plan that is in section 103 of the bill.

In addition, the amendment will strengthen section 108 by ensuring that the university-industry task force will propose guidelines for the private sector to provide feedback to the public sector on the effectiveness of the new technologies. This sharing of ''lessons learned'' will help us to improve critical cybersecurity technologies.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and the underlying legislation.

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

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCAUL. Let me say first I commend the gentlelady from California for the emphasis on the private sector.

I think too often when we deal with this issue, we focus mainly on the government and not enough on the private sector where the majority of the critical infrastructures are in this country. So let me commend the gentlelady for bringing this forward.

This amendment makes two changes to the bill which I believe are good changes. First, it requires that the cybersecurity R&D strategic plan describe how interagency efforts will facilitate access to realistic threat and vulnerability data by academic researchers. Secondly, it tasks the university-industry R&D task force created by the bill to consider how best the public and private sectors can share ''lessons learned on the effectiveness of new technologies.''

Both of these provisions make changes to the underlying bill that I believe improve the bill, and therefore I fully support its passage.

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

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to Mr. LIPINSKI of Illinois.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend Ms. SANCHEZ for her work on this amendment and also on cybersecurity in general on the Homeland Security Committee. From my time as a university professor, I understand the importance, first of all, of the cooperation between the private sector and universities. It is something that I feel very strongly about. We need to improve that; and certainly in cybersecurity, it is especially important.

The other thing that I understand is the need to have information, and the more information sharing that we can have, the better we can do with cybersecurity.

This amendment helps accomplish both of those things, so I strongly encourage my colleagues to support and vote for this amendment.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Chairman, I believe that I have no further speakers, and therefore, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and the underlying bill, and I yield back my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. CUELLAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 14 printed in House Report 111–410.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 14 offered by Mr. CUELLAR:

Page 7, line 15, strike ''and''.

Page 7, line 20, strike the period and insert ''; and''.

Page 7, after line 20, insert the following new paragraph:

(7) describe how the Program will strengthen all levels of cybersecurity education and training programs to ensure an adequate, well-trained workforce.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1051, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, I want to rise in support of this particular amendment of the Cybersecurity Enhancement Act. I certainly want to thank Mr. LIPINSKI for all the leadership that he has provided on this bill and the staff that worked so hard. I certainly want to thank my good friend from Texas also, Mr. MCCAUL, who has worked very hard on this issue, especially on the homeland security. We appreciate your working on that, Mr. MCCAUL.

This legislation will greatly improve the cybersecurity in both the private and public sector. As any modern business, small or large, will tell you, we live in a highly interconnected, highly technological 21st century.

As a member of the Homeland Security Committee, I know that we are under attack from cyberthreats every single day. Sensitive security and intelligence information pass through the Internet 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. And more than $1 trillion was spent last year fighting to keep this information safe. The more we rely on IT systems, the more we need to make the necessary investments to reduce cyberrisks and vulnerabilities.

My amendment today is simple. As we improve cybersecurity, we must help put Americans back to work.

□ 1445

My amendment requires that the advisory committee, as it produces a cybersecurity strategic research and development plan, determine how we ought to strengthen all levels of cybersecurity education and training programs to develop a well-trained workforce that meets our Nation's cybersecurity needs. We must work to enlist our Nation's high schools, trade schools, colleges, and universities to bring more young people into this industry.

We can also use the cybersecurity education to harness the technological powers of our own young people to keep our Nation and our Nation's businesses safe. We have an opportunity to strengthen the IT infrastructure in our workforce by getting together in partnership with our Nation's schools.

In my home State of Texas, we are leaders in the cybersecurity operation. As Mr. MCCAUL understands, Texas invests in people and productive technology both in the public and private academic sectors. In San Antonio, for example, we have the National Center for Excellence for Cybersecurity, which has increased job numbers in the cybersecurity and information assurance industries in Texas. We can also replicate this particular model.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, we want to make sure that we repair our economy and help put people back to work. This is why we must strengthen our cyberinfrastructure both in business, education, and government alike. We can focus on these goals; that is, how can we secure the IT future and how do we put people back to work?

I urge all my colleagues to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to this amendment. However, the good news is, Mr. CUELLAR, I do not intend to oppose it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCAUL. Let me first commend the gentleman from Texas, my dear friend and colleague, Mr. CUELLAR, on the outstanding work he has done in this area and on the Homeland Security Committee, and also his work with the Center for Excellence, in San Antonio, for cybersecurity. It is great for our great State of Texas.

This amendment requires a strategic plan to describe how the program will strengthen cybersecurity education and training efforts in order to ensure an adequate, well-trained workforce. The bill already has in place a robust workforce assessment requirement, but the robustness of our future cybersecurity workforce I believe is important enough to reemphasize it.

With that, I do not oppose this amendment. In fact, I strongly support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chairman, I just want to echo Mr. MCCAUL's words on this, that we need to make sure that we support our business, both public and private. I think this amendment will accomplish that, especially working with our education.

Again, to the chairman, thank you very much, and to the staff who worked so hard on this.

I ask Members to support this particular amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MS. SHEA-PORTER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 15 printed in House Report 111–410.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 15 offered by Ms. SHEA-PORTER:

Page 15, line 11, strike ''equal to the length of the scholarship'' and insert ''as provided in paragraph (5)''.

Page 15, after line 24, insert the following new paragraph:

(5) LENGTH OF SERVICE.—The length of service required in exchange for a scholarship under this subsection shall be as follows:

(A) For a recipient in a bachelor's degree program, 1 year more than the number of years for which the scholarship was received.

(B) For a recipient in a Master's degree program, 2 years more than the number of years for which the scholarship was received.

(C) For a recipient in a doctorate degree program, 3 years more than the number of years for which the scholarship was received.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1051, the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. SHEA-PORTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Hampshire.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to thank Chairman GORDON for his hard work on this bill. As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I know just how important it is that we focus on cybersecurity and combating the threats that we face. It is an incredibly important area, and I commend him for his work.

Mr. Chair, as cyberattacks become increasingly common and alarming, the government needs more expert cybersecurity personnel to protect us. The Scholarships for Service program is an important means to recruit such expert personnel. However, I believe that considering the high value of the education and security clearance, which is all provided at government expense, the current service obligation is insufficient to recover the significant Federal investment we are making.

My amendment extends the service obligation for recipients of cybersecurity scholarships or fellowships on a sliding scale depending on the degree program. Those in bachelor's degree programs would see their service requirement extend by 1 year to 3 years, those in a master's program by 2 years to 4 years, and those in a Ph.D. program by 3 years to 5 or 6 years, depending on the program.

Graduate students in cybersecurity programs need to have security clearances, and most students will need a clearance before beginning work in this field for the Federal Government. The cost of a clearance, which is a pricey $15,000, is an investment by the taxpayers and should be recovered by the Federal Government through an extension of service.

Extending the work requirement will also help slow the revolving door from government to industry and promote retention of valuable employees. Because these employees will have a security clearance, which is generally good for 10 years, they may be tempted to take their expertise into the private sector where they can make higher salaries. This amendment will help ensure recruitment of those who want to serve in the government and will prevent this valuable program from being used solely as a bridge to private industry.

It is fair to scale the extra work commitment according to degree, because a graduate degree with a clearance is far more valuable than an undergraduate degree with a clearance. The longer the educational investment, the longer the service requirement should be. A Ph.D. graduate should serve longer than a master's graduate who should serve longer than a bachelor's graduate. The extension of service allows us to retain those we train at government expense for a longer time, leading to a positive impact on retention and on our cybersecurity.

My amendment will increase retention of our valuable personnel who are trained at taxpayer expense. It is a good deal for the government and the student and represents a wise use of taxpayer funds.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCAUL. The gentlelady from New Hampshire's amendment is one that our side favored during the drafting of this legislation and one that we think makes the Scholarship for Service program at NSF even stronger. So I thank the gentlelady for bringing this amendment.

The intent of the program is to educate the Federal Government's future cybersecurity workforce. This amendment increases the amount of employment service a graduate will owe the Federal Government upon the completion of her or his education, ensuring a greater return on our initial investment.

Therefore, I support this amendment, and I encourage my colleagues to do so.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. I yield to the chairman, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) such time as he may consume.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlelady from New Hampshire for her amendment. It certainly ensures that we retain individuals who are trained at government expense, making sure the Scholarship for Service program provides the best value for taxpayers, and it is certainly also a good value for those who are receiving their education. It is a good, commonsense amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. I thank the chairman and his staff for the work on this bill. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. SHEA-PORTER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MS. CLARKE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 16 printed in House Report 111–410.

Ms. CLARKE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to address the floor on my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 16 offered by Ms. CLARKE:

Page 20, line 24, insert ''the extent to which different agencies and departments rely on contractors to support the Federal cybersecurity workforce,'' after ''agencies and departments,''.

Page 21, line 22, strike ''and''.

Page 21, line 23, redesignate paragraph (5) as paragraph (6).

Page 21, after line 22, insert the following:

(5) a specific analysis of the capacity of the agency workforce to manage contractors who are performing cybersecurity work on behalf of the Federal Government; and

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1051, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. CLARKE. Mr. Chairman, today I rise to offer my amendment to H.R. 4061 and request that it be supported along with the underlying legislation.

I first want to commend Chairman GORDON, Ranking Member HALL, and Representative LIPINSKI, as well as Representative MCCAUL, for their leadership in bringing this important bipartisan bill to the floor today and for supporting this amendment.

The Federal Government currently relies heavily on contract employees for critical cybersecurity functions. For instance, according to the Department of Homeland Security's Inspector General, contractors accounted for 83 percent of the total staff of the Department's Office of the Chief Information Officer.

A July 2009 Booz Allen Hamilton assessment of the cyberworkforce, titled, ''Cyber In-Security: Strengthening the Federal Cybersecurity Workforce,'' concluded the Federal Government needs more employees who can effectively manage the blended cybersecurity workforce of contractors and in-house employees.

Clearly, any assessment of the cybersecurity workforce should include an analysis of contract employees who perform cybersecurity functions for the government. My amendment to H.R. 4061, the Cybersecurity Enhancement Act of 2009, would do just that, amending section 107 of the bill to include an

analysis of the extent to which Federal agencies rely on contractors to support the Federal cybersecurity workforce as well as each agency's capacity to manage these contractors.

The amendment is not intended to judge whether Federal cybersecurity functions should be performed by government or contractor employees. It simply requires that these considerations be included in the workforce study.

I hope that you will join me in supporting this amendment.

I would just like to add that, as chair of the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats, Cybersecurity, and Science and Technology, I have become intimately aware of the cybersecurity challenges we face in the 21st century. I initially offered several other amendments which address the wide variety of challenges that we face, and I will work to address these issues through my subcommittee.

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

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCAUL. Let me first commend Ms. CLARKE for this amendment, but also her great work on the Homeland Security Committee as the chairwoman of the Cybersecurity Subcommittee.

This amendment simply requires the present Cybersecurity Workforce Assessment Report include an analysis of the capacity of the overall agency workforce to manage contractors providing cybersecurity support to Federal agencies. Contractors are a significant component of our cybersecurity efforts, and assessing their role and agencies' capacity to manage them is very, very appropriate. Therefore, I support this amendment.

With the time I do have remaining, Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield to the gentlelady from Texas, Ms. SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the distinguished gentleman, and I thank him for his leadership on homeland security as well and as ranking member positioned on the Cybersecurity Committee. And I thank the chairwoman of the Cybersecurity Committee, and I thank her for this amendment which I rise to support.

I am the chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Transportation Security and Infrastructure Protection. There is a great deal of overlap. So I thank Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. WU, Mr. SMITH, Mr. HALL.

We have been fortunate as to not have a major catastrophic incident with cybersecurity, but this bill will help ensure a strategic plan for Federal cybersecurity research and development, strengthen public-private partnerships in cybersecurity, and help train the next generation of cybersecurity professionals and improve cybersecurity technical standards.

Ms. CLARKE's amendment is a very vital amendment, for it will help subject to the assessment of the President's committee the same assessment on employees. This will assess the contractors who are dealing with cybersecurity, including minority women and small contractors of which we hope will increase.

While we have been fortunate so far in avoiding a catastrophic cyberattack, last year the Pentagon reported more than 360 million attempts to break into its networks. A 2009 Consumer Reports study found that, over the past 2 years, one in five online consumers had been a victim of cybercrime. In 2008, the Department of Homeland Security logged 5,499 such cyberattack incidents, a 40 percent increase over the previous year. A 2007 Government Accountability Office report estimates that total U.S. business losses due to cyberattacks exceed $117.5 billion per year.

This amendment will also put under scrutiny those contractors that are working in cybersecurity for the Federal Government, along with those employees. We have to be diligent in, one, making sure that this is a, if you will, securer technology that is being used around the country and around the world, but we must also be diligent in increasing the R&D and making sure that contractors are adhering to the rules and guidelines that are equal to excellence, as we want our employees.

Let me ask my colleagues to support the underlying bill and this amendment, and as well to be reminded that this is part of the Nation's homeland security.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. CLARKE. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

Mr. LIPINSKI. This is a very good and thoughtful amendment, and I thank Ms. CLARKE for helping to ensure that the Federal workforce assessment that we require in our report is complete and thorough in its analysis. I would like to also thank Ms. CLARKE and her staff for working with the committee on this language, and I strongly support this amendment and urge my colleagues to vote for it.

Ms. CLARKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1500

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. BRIGHT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 17 printed in House Report 111–410.

Mr. BRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 17 offered by Mr. BRIGHT:

Page 27, after line 7, insert the following new section:

SEC. 111. NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES STUDY ON THE ROLE OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES IN CYBERSECURITY EDUCATION.

Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, in consultation with the Director of the National Coordination Office, shall enter into a contract with the National Academy of Sciences to conduct and complete a study to describe the role of community colleges in cybersecurity education and to identify exemplary practices and partnerships related to cybersecurity education between community colleges and four-year educational institutions.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1051, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BRIGHT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment to the Cybersecurity Enhancement Act, H.R. 4061. Put simply, this amendment would require the National Academy of Sciences to conduct a study on the role of community colleges in cybersecurity education. It would also identify best practices related to cybersecurity education between community colleges and 4-year educational institutions.

By now, we all recognize the need for the underlying legislation. It was made even more evident following the State of the Union last week, when numerous congressional Web sites, including mine, were hacked by foreign actors. Without a doubt, we need to improve our national cybersecurity infrastructure. As the United States transitions into a future which addresses such cybersecurity issues, it will become increasingly important that we adopt advanced job skills and technological savvy. Unfortunately, a high school diploma is often not enough to qualify for the jobs of tomorrow. Recognizing the need for additional education, workers often return to technical schools and community colleges to obtain advanced training.

My amendment will serve to strengthen the community colleges that already play an important role in many of our districts. As demand for a skilled cybersecurity workforce continues to rise, we must be ready to supply it. This amendment will ensure that community colleges will play a role in providing these personnel that will be needed in the future.

This amendment is also consistent with the President's vision for promoting post-secondary education. In his State of the Union address to Congress last week, President Obama called for every American to commit to at least 1 year or more of higher education or career training. Some of

that training will happen in community college classrooms. This amendment could expand the options available in those classrooms across the country and make it easier for our constituents to commit to our shared goal of increased higher education.

As I worked my way through college when I was growing up, I began at the local Enterprise State Community College, which is located in my district. So I understand the value of 2-year institutions. My district alone is home to seven different community and technical colleges. And many Members of Congress are committed to preserving and protecting their role in our educational system. As we transition into 21st century jobs, it is vital that we also provide the resources to our community colleges that would allow them to change with the times. The amendment achieves that goal.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is simple and straightforward. It ensures a level playing field for community colleges wishing to offer educational opportunities in the cybersecurity field, and improves information sharing between 2-year and 4-year colleges. I urge its passage today.

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

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to this amendment, although I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCAUL. This amendment would require a National Academy of Sciences study on the role of community colleges in cybersecurity education, with an aim toward identifying best practices related to improving cybersecurity education through better linkages between community colleges and 4-year colleges and universities. It is important not to overlook the contributions of community colleges, as the gentleman stated, to our overall technical workforce, including those involved in computer and network security. This amendment is intended to help address that issue, and I strongly urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. BRIGHT. In closing, I would like to thank Chairman GORDON and his staff on the Science and Technology Committee for their attention to this issue and for working with my staff to draft this amendment. I would also like to thank Chairwoman SLAUGHTER and the Rules Committee for helping my staff put this together and allowing me to offer this amendment today on the floor.

Again, I urge all my colleagues today to support my amendment.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BRIGHT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY OF VIRGINIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 18 printed in House Report 111–410.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 18 offered by Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia:

Page 28, line 12, insert ‘‘, including among children and young adults,’’ after ‘‘public awareness’’.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1051, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I thank the Chair, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First of all, let me thank, Mr. Chairman, the leadership of Chairman GORDON and Ranking Member HALL and the floor managers, Mr. LIPINSKI of Illinois and Mr. MCCAUL of Texas. I appreciate very much their leadership.

Cybersecurity, Mr. Chairman, has been a growing concern, and recent events like the attack on Google and the hacking of Web sites maintained by Members of this very Chamber in the House highlight the urgency of today's action. As you know, the bill would expand research and development work in the field of cybersecurity, to provide for increased higher education opportunities, and to launch a much needed public awareness campaign on the importance of making our electronic communications and commerce as secure as possible in today's digital age.

My amendment, Mr. Chairman, would clarify that children and young adults should be an important target audience of that public awareness campaign, and must be included. Children and young adults are by far among the largest consumers of new media and technology, yet in many cases they are also the most naive when it comes to taking basic safety precautions when using this technology and these innovations, which makes it all the more important that we reach out to them specifically.

While children and young adults are among the most savvy users of technology, I fear they do not fully grasp the permanence of their actions, whether it is blogging, Facebooking, Tweeting, or posting videos on YouTube. The use and portability of information technology has exploded in the past decade. More than 80 percent of households, for example, in my district have Internet access. Technology has become a vital part of our everyday lives, particularly for the younger generation.

According to the Center for Education Statistics, 67 percent of preschool children have used a computer, and 23 percent of preschool children have used the Internet. Those figures of course jump exponentially higher once children reach school age, as technology becomes integrated into the classroom curriculum. By the time young people reach high school, 97 percent of them are using computers, and 80 percent are online regularly, which for parents of teenagers like myself, that may sound like a conservative figure.

I cannot emphasize enough, Mr. Chairman, how important it is for us to reach children at a young age, in the classroom, to develop a healthy sense of caution as we instruct them about the wonders of technology. That is particularly true in our science, technology, engineering and math-focused schools.

That is why in my district, Thomas Jefferson High School, ranked the number one high school in the United States 3 years in a row, is churning out the innovators of tomorrow. I look forward to exploring future opportunities in this area with the committee and urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to this amendment, although I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCAUL. First let me say what a great amendment this is. As a Federal prosecutor, I encountered crimes against children and also as deputy attorney general for the State of Texas. While there, we formed an Internet crimes against children's task force. The threat to children, both from child pornography and online predators, as the gentleman knows, is very real. And while the Internet is a great tool for our youth, it also does present a vulnerability and a threat to them. That is why I am so glad to see this amendment.

It simply clarifies when we are promoting and educating people on the importance of cybersecurity, we must include children and young adults along with the other targeted audiences. So let me again thank the gentleman for bringing this. I strongly support it, and encourage my colleagues to do so.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois, the distinguished floor manager.

Mr. LIPINSKI. I want to commend the gentleman from Virginia for his amendment. Obviously, as the gentleman talked about, the Internet is great for children, young adults, provides so many opportunities, but we need to be very careful because we all know the dark side and the down side. So much more can be done and should be done to protect children, young

adults. And Mr. CONNOLLY's amendment does that. So I want to urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I thank my distinguished colleagues, Mr. Chairman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MRS. HALVORSON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 19 printed in House Report 111–410.

Mrs. HALVORSON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 19 offered by Mrs. HALVORSON:

Page 15, line 2, strike ''need and to'' and insert ''need, to''.

Page 15, line 5, insert before the period at the end of paragraph (2) '', and to veterans. For purposes of this paragraph, the term ''veteran'' means a person who—

(A) served on active duty (other than active duty for training) in the Armed Forces of the United States for a period of more than 180 consecutive days, and who was discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable; or

(B) served on active duty (other than active duty for training) in the Armed Forces of the United States and was discharged or released from such service for a service-connected disability before serving 180 consecutive days.

For purposes of subparagraph (B), the term ''service-connected'' has the meaning given such term under section 101 of title 38, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1051, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. HALVORSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. HALVORSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I rise to urge my colleagues to support my amendment to H.R. 4061, the Cybersecurity Enhancement Act of 2009. This amendment is simple, necessary, and beneficial to veterans. It will add veteran status as an additional item of consideration when selecting individuals for the Cyber Scholarship for Service program.

In light of recent attacks on both government and commercial technology infrastructure, it is critical that America be on the forefront of cybersecurity. Our veterans and servicemembers have a proven track record of successfully protecting American interests at home and abroad. The experiences and skills that our veterans have gained through their service are exactly what we need to improve our cybersecurity.

My amendment helps veterans continue their service to our country by increasing the likelihood that a veteran or servicemember will be selected for this competitive scholarship. The scholarship program will provide funding to individuals seeking B.A.s, M.A.s, and Ph.D.s in the field of cybersecurity. This amendment will allow our veterans and servicemembers to afford a better education and continue to serve their country.

Additionally, many veterans and servicemembers have already received cybersecurity and other relevant training during their service in the military. They are uniquely qualified to defend our Nation from cybersecurity threats we face. Furthermore, upon successful completion of their degree, scholarship recipients will be eligible for Federal employment in the field of cybersecurity. With thousands of veterans returning from service in Iraq and Afghanistan, and more than 20 percent of veterans under the age of 24 unemployed, it is critical that they are given every opportunity to continue serving their country.

Our veterans and servicemembers have sacrificed to protect our country and our freedom. We owe them all the assistance we can give them in helping them to better education and job opportunities in their civilian lives.

I would like to thank the committee and the chairman for working with my colleague from New Hampshire and me to introduce this amendment. Once again, I rise in strong support of the amendment, and I urge my colleagues to vote in support of it.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to this amendment, although I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCAUL. Let me thank the gentlelady for bringing this amendment. My home State of Texas is the home to probably more active duty service and veterans than probably any other State in the country. I think this is a great idea, including Lackland Air Force Base, which provides a cybersecurity command.

It is very straightforward. It adds veteran status as an additional item for consideration by NSF when it selects individuals for scholarships under its Cybersecurity Scholarships for Service program. Therefore, I strongly support the gentlelady's amendment, and I urge its passage.

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

□ 1515

Mrs. HALVORSON. With that, I yield 1 minute to my colleague, the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. SHEA-PORTER).

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. I was proud to work with my colleague, Representative DEBBIE HALVORSON, on this amendment. It is critical that we ensure every opportunity for our veterans who have served our country so admirably. This commonsense amendment makes sure their service is taken into consideration when being selected for the Federal Cyber Service Scholarship for Service. As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I understand how critical it is that we defend against cyberattacks. That means that we need a workforce dedicated to protecting our country. Our men and women who have volunteered in our armed services have showed exceptional courage and dedication. That service should always be met with our gratitude and our support. This amendment ensures that when someone has served our country, we give that service due consideration when they ask to serve again.

I thank my colleague for offering this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mrs. HALVORSON. I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

Mr. LIPINSKI. I'd like to thank Mrs. HALVORSON and Ms. SHEA-PORTER for their amendment and more broadly for all the work that they do on behalf of our veterans. It certainly is an issue of great importance. Last night, I had a father come to me and tell me that his son had come back from Iraq and was having trouble finding a job and was actually faced with re-enlisting because of his struggles in trying to find something. This amendment will certainly help there. Many of our veterans have technical backgrounds already. With some additional training, they are well positioned to continue serving their country by joining our Federal cybersecurity workforce, including at civilian agencies.

So I want to, again, commend Mrs. HALVORSON for her amendment, and strongly urge my colleagues to support it.

Mrs. HALVORSON. In closing, I just urge my colleagues to vote ''yes,'' and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. HALVORSON).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mrs. HALVORSON. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MS. KILROY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 20 printed in House Report 111–410.

Ms. KILROY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 20 offered by Ms. KILROY:

Page 14, line 10, strike ''and''.

Page 14, line 12, strike the period and insert ''; and''.

Page 14, after line 12, insert the following new subparagraph:

(D) outreach to secondary schools and 2-year institutions to increase the interest and recruitment of students into cybersecurity-related fields.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1051, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KILROY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KILROY. I yield myself such time as I may consume. I rise today in support of my amendment to H.R. 4061, the Cybersecurity Enhancement Act of 2009, to expand outreach to high school and community colleges to help train and recruit the next generation of our Nation's cybersecurity and information technology workforce. One of the most important aspects of the Cybersecurity Enhancement Act is the establishment of the Scholarship for Service program currently administered by the National Science Foundation. The program would operate with the goal of recruiting and training our Nation's future cybersecurity professionals through scholarships for undergraduate and graduate students in cybersecurity fields, government internship opportunities for scholarship recipients, and competitive, merit-based grants for faculty development, institutional partnerships, and the development of cybersecurity courses at institutions of higher learning.

My amendment will expand the Scholarship for Service program by making merit-based grants available for outreach to high schools and community colleges. Reaching out to high schools will help raise awareness of this program, steering students at an earlier age toward academic and professional careers in information technology and cybersecurity that they might not otherwise have considered. Young people are way ahead of us in terms of information technology and the use of computers but they still need the encouragement and guidance to pursue a cybersecurity career path. That guidance can be made possible through these kind of competitive grants.

My amendment also will expand outreach to community colleges. Cybercriminals are increasingly targeting small businesses, schools, and State and local institutions that lack the capabilities to adequately defend themselves against sophisticated cyberattacks. Encouraging students at community colleges to consider degrees in cybersecurity-related fields will help ensure that we have a workforce capable of defending our Nation's computer systems and networks at the State, local, and national level.

As a member of the Homeland Security Committee's Subcommittee on Emerging Threats, Cybersecurity, and Science and Technology, I strongly support the efforts of H.R. 4061 to build our Nation's cybersecurity workforce, develop a strategic research plan for cybersecurity, and to secure our communications and information technology infrastructure.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to this amendment, although I do not intend to oppose it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCAUL. I thank the gentlelady for this amendment. Certainly, our youth know the Internet and how to operate on it more effectively than anyone in this Chamber. This amendment adds an outreach to high schools and community colleges component to the characteristics of the Scholarship for Service program in an effort to attract more students to the program. I think it's a good idea. I support this amendment, and urge my colleagues to do so.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KILROY. I thank my colleague from Texas, who also serves with me on the Homeland Security Committee. I want to commend Chairman GORDON; Ranking Member HALL; Subcommittee Chair LIPINSKI, the sponsor of this legislation; and the Committee on Science and Technology for their hard work on H.R. 4061, to help build a strong cybersecurity workforce to protect and serve our Nation's communications and IT infrastructure. I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues to ensure that the Nation's essential infrastructure is protected, and I urge my colleagues to support my amendment expanding cybersecurity outreach to high schools and community colleges as part of the Scholarship for Service program.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KILROY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. KILROY. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MR. KISSELL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 21 printed in House Report 111–410.

Mr. KISSELL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 21 offered by Mr. KISSELL:

Page 11, lines 9 and 10, strike ''Section 5(a)(6) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 7404(a)(6)) is amended to read as follows:'' and insert ''Section 5(a) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 7404(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3)(A), by inserting '', including curriculum on the principles and techniques of designing secure software'' after ''network security''; and

(2) by amending paragraph (6) to read as follows:

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1051, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. KISSELL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KISSELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this is a simple amendment. It highlights the importance of curriculum in designing secure software. I would like to start out also by commending the chairman and ranking member for bringing this very timely and important piece of legislation to our attention. In North Carolina, we have many institutions, as there are across the United States, that are dependent upon secure software and informing our networks that are used in such a vital part of performing business on a day-to-day basis. Whether it's in our part of the world, it's the military, banking giants of America, education, or just corporations or businesses in general, or whatever, we're dependent upon networks and software for, once again, our day-to-day operations. However, Mr. Chairman, all too often we find that these networks are not as secure as they need to be.

A recent study done by Dr. William Chu, who is the department Chair at the University of North Carolina in Charlotte, which is a leading institution on secure software issues, Dr. Chu found that 97 percent—and he did this on a random basis—they looked at corporate Web sites. And on a random basis they looked to see if the security of those networks was sufficient to keep them from being compromised, and they found that they weren't. Ninety-seven percent of the time they weren't sufficiently secure to prevent this ability for hackers to compromise.

This is a wake-up call for us. So many of these amendments and this bill address that we've got issues here, and one of the ways that we can address these issues—it is in broad agreement—is that we need to improve the curriculum of our secure software. Now we would think this would be easily done in our colleges and universities. But, unfortunately, we find that this curriculum is not taught that consistently to a large degree to allow the programmers of tomorrow to learn how to secure software.

So this amendment is very simple. It instructs the director of NSF to put language into the mission statement of Computer and Network Security Capacity Building Grants language that would highlight the importance of curriculum in designing secure software.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to the amendment, but I do not intend to oppose it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCAUL. This amendment simply clarifies that NSF's support for cybersecurity-related curriculum development at universities includes ''curriculum on the principles and techniques of designing secure software.'' It's a good amendment that codifies and clarifies NSF's role in support of computer security curriculum development. I support this amendment. I urge my colleagues to do so.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KISSELL. Mr. Chair, this is a first step towards allowing our universities and colleges to be able to produce, once again, programmers of tomorrow to understand the importance of securing the software and the networks that are so important to us in so many ways. It's a first step; it is not the last step. But I do encourage my colleagues to support this and vote ''yes'' for this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. KISSELL).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. KISSELL. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MR. KRATOVIL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 22 printed in House Report 111–410.

Mr. KRATOVIL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 22 offered by Mr. KRATOVIL:

Page 27, after line 7, insert the following new section:

SEC. 111. NATIONAL CENTER OF EXCELLENCE FOR CYBERSECURITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—As part of the Program, the Director of the National Science Foundation shall, in coordination with other Federal agencies participating in the Program, establish a National Center of Excellence for Cybersecurity.

(b) MERIT REVIEW.—The National Center of Excellence for Cybersecurity shall be awarded on a merit-reviewed, competitive basis.

(c) ACTIVITIES SUPPORTED.—The National Center of Excellence for Cybersecurity shall—

(1) involve institutions of higher education or national laboratories and other partners, which may include States and industry;

(2) make use of existing expertise in cybersecurity;

(3) interact and collaborate with Computer and Network Security Research Centers to foster the exchange of technical information and best practices;

(4) perform research to support the development of technologies for testing hardware and software products to validate operational readiness and certify stated security levels;

(5) coordinate cybersecurity education and training opportunities nationally;

(6) enhance technology transfer and commercialization that promote cybersecurity innovation; and

(7) perform research on cybersecurity social and behavioral factors, including human-computer interactions, usability, user motivations, and organizational cultures.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1051, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. KRATOVIL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me begin by thanking Mr. GORDON, the chairman, and the ranking member for bringing the legislation to the floor. I rise in support of my amendment to the Cybersecurity Enhancement Act of 2009. Information technology has improved everything from the way we pay our bills to the way we communicate with our friends and neighbors. We are increasingly becoming a digital Nation where the strength and vitality of our economy, infrastructure, public safety, and national security are becoming more and more reliant on cyberspace. Of course, with that reliance on technology, as many have mentioned here today, come real concerns about the security of information traveling through cyberspace.

It's time we make every effort to secure and protect the privacy, finances, and resources of Americans who utilize information technology. I believe the underlying bill does much to accomplish this.

Mr. Chairman, I'm sure it won't surprise you, but I do believe that my amendment will enhance this bill by enhancing communication, collaboration, and cooperation between the public and private sectors. The amendment does so by requiring the director of the National Science Foundation to establish a National Center of Excellence for Cybersecurity. This Center would be awarded on a merit-based, comprehensive basis and would support the initiatives put forth by the underlying legislation to ensure the safety of our digital communications infrastructure. This National Center would be a partnership model involving government, private corporations, and academic institutions that will consolidate and coordinate our national cybersecurity resources.

□ 1530

As the cybersecurity industry grows, there is an increasing demand for skilled workers and a severe shortage of workers qualified to fill these jobs. The center will serve not only as a clearinghouse for our national cybersecurity resources, but it will create jobs and train individuals in the skills needed to protect the economy, bolster our national security, and protect Americans from cybercriminals.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take a brief moment also to express my support for an amendment that was heard previously, offered by Representative MCCARTHY, that would emphasize education and awareness programs in cybersecurity for populations in areas of planned broadband expansion or deployment, such as areas like my district in Maryland's Eastern Shore. Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to support both amendments and the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to this amendment, although I am not opposed.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCAUL. While the statute that we are amending today already authorizes the director of NSF to provide grants for computer and network security research centers, I believe that the establishment of a National Center of Excellence dedicated solely to cybersecurity can only increase our defensive capabilities, provided that any funding that does go to the National Center does not come at the expense of other Centers of Excellence, of course. With that, I urge my colleagues' support for this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KRATOVIL. Mr. Chairman, I yield so much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

Mr. LIPINSKI. First off, I want to commend Mr. KRATOVIL for his amendment. We have certainly seen Centers for Excellence do some very good work not only in the science and technology field, but I also know that in the transportation field, we have also seen that. I think this amendment that would establish a merit-based and a competitive-based Center for Excellence for Cybersecurity will be a great addition to our IT research in the country. I think it could be a very good enhancement to this bill, so I strongly support this amendment. I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment.

Mr. KRATOVIL. I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for his support and also the gentleman from Illinois.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. KRATOVIL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. LIPINSKI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 23 printed in House Report 111–410.

Mr. LIPINSKI. As the designee of the gentleman from Virginia, I rise to offer the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 23 offered by Mr. LIPINSKI:

Page 27, after line 7, insert the following new section:

SEC. 111. CYBERSECURITY INFRASTRUCTURE REPORT.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall transmit to the Congress a report examining key weaknesses within the current cybersecurity infrastructure, along with recommendations on how to address such weaknesses in the future and on the technology that is needed to do so.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1051, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, Mr. NYE's amendment calls on the GAO to examine key weaknesses within the Nation's cybersecurity infrastructure and to offer recommendations on how the Federal Government should address those weaknesses, and calling on the GAO will help to find those areas that are especially insecure. We certainly have heard enough times of where we have seen attacks, and attacks come from many different places, and there are attacks on many different cybersecurity systems. So I want to thank Mr. NYE for this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to this amendment, although I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would simply ask the General Accounting Office to examine the current cybersecurity infrastructure and report to Congress with recommendations on how to address any failings or weaknesses within the infrastructure and the technology available to do so. Therefore, I support this amendment, and I also urge my colleagues to do so.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. NYE).

Mr. NYE. I would like to thank my colleague for yielding. Mr. Chair, first I would like to thank Chairman GORDON and Ranking Member HALL for their important work on this bill, to improve our cybersecurity and strengthen the partnerships between the Federal Government and the private sector.

Cybersecurity is an issue of national security, and as we work to defend against the next generation of cyberthreats, the only way to make sure we're getting it right is to find out what we're doing wrong. That's why I have introduced an amendment to require the GAO to conduct a study, examining key weaknesses within the current cybersecurity infrastructure along with recommendations on how to address such weaknesses in the future and on the technology that is needed to do so.

Not only will this benefit Federal and private sector efforts to strengthen cybersecurity, but it will also help local cities and counties learn how to defend themselves against attacks on their networks and infrastructure.

In my district in Virginia, in the city of Hampton, we are doing exactly that. We are creating a regional Center of Excellence to help local communities improve their cybersecurity. This bill will help that effort, and the GAO report called for in my amendment will make it even stronger.

I would like to thank my colleagues for their support. I urge the rest of my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment and in passing this bill.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. OWENS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 24 printed in House Report 111–410.

Mr. OWENS. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 24 offered by Mr. OWENS:

Page 6, line 24, insert ", including technologies to secure sensitive information shared among Federal agencies" after "digital infrastructure".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1051, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would first like to thank Chairman GORDON and the committee for their work on this important bipartisan legislation. My amendment would expand the cybersecurity strategic R&D plan, created under H.R. 4061, by adding a component to address information sharing between Federal agencies.

Information technology has advanced rapidly in the last two decades, benefiting nearly every sector of our economy; but our dependence on IT in many ways increased our exposure to unconventional attacks. H.R. 4061 will help address our vulnerabilities by creating an overall vision for the Federal cybersecurity R&D portfolio. Improving the coordination of cybersecurity research and development activities is the first step in preventing a catastrophic attack on our IT infrastructure. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would improve the strategic R&D plan by including a component on technologies to secure sensitive information shared among Federal agencies.

Our Nation's security is at risk without protections in place to safeguard the flow of information within the Federal Government. I believe the amendment I am offering today gets at the heart of addressing this problem, and I urge its adoption.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to this amendment, although I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply states that "technologies to secure sensitive information among Federal agencies" shall be among the technologies addressed in the interagency cybersecurity R&D plan required by the bill. As I understand it, the gentleman's amendment is referring to information controlled by the Federal Government that is not classified but is still sensitive and particularly important to protect. This class of information is very substantial in numerous Federal agencies, including our research and development agencies, and I believe it's reasonable and appropriate to consider how best to pursue technologies that may assist in better protecting it without classifying the information outright. So therefore, I support the gentleman's amendment. I urge my colleagues to do so.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OWENS. In closing, I want to again thank the chairman, the ranking member, and the committee for their work. I urge support for my amendment and for the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. HEINRICH

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 25 printed in House Report 111–410.

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 25 offered by Mr. HEINRICH:

Page 8, line 20, insert "National Laboratories," after "minority serving institutions,".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1051, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. Chair, this legislation is critical to our national security, and I want to thank Representative DAN LIPINSKI and Chairman BART GORDON for their leadership. We have made some incredible advancements in the use of technology in the 21st century; and with much of our Nation's public and private commerce taking place on the Internet, defending our cyberspace from cybercriminals and cyberterrorism has never been more vital to our national security.

In central New Mexico, Sandia National Laboratories dedicated roughly $20 million last year to this very cause. Sandia has also created a program to train our future workforce by working directly alongside Sandia researchers to secure systems and examine attack modes. Sandia National Labs is a leader in defensive cybersecurity research and development for our Nation's intelligence community and has been home to countless high-level security advancements.

For decades, national laboratories across the Nation have worked to protect their own data and networks from intrusion. Of necessity, they have developed expertise in cryptography as well as sophisticated techniques to detect and thwart cyberattacks. This amendment simply includes our national labs as contributing stakeholders to the strategic management plan for cybersecurity research. Including our national labs and utilizing their cybersecurity expertise is critical to keeping our Nation's cyberspace secure, and I would urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to this amendment, although I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCAUL. Let me say, Mr. Chairman, I believe this is our last amendment, and I want to commend the chairman for his perseverance through 25 amendments here today.

This amendment simply adds national laboratories to the list of stakeholders that the administration should engage in developing its strategic plan for R&D. I think it's a good idea. I urge support. I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. HEINRICH. I simply urge my colleagues' support and yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

Mr. LIPINSKI. I would like to thank Mr. HEINRICH for working with the committee on amendment language. I have visited Sandia. We also have great work going on in my own backyard at Argonne National Lab on cybersecurity. There is a lot of great work going on at all of our labs and contributing so much behind the scenes to things that we don't see. So I want to thank Mr. HEINRICH for his amendment. I urge my colleagues to support it.

But in closing, on their last amendment here, I also would like to thank Mr. MCCAUL for all of his work. This is the way the American people want to see us work, work together, Democrats and Republicans. We work very well together on the Science and Technology Committee. It's an important issue that impacts people in their everyday lives. The amount of time that all of us spend on the Internet, the vulnerabilities that are out there, hopefully through this work, I know that we can really make things better, make the Internet more secure so we have fewer problems with attacks not just on the government but on individuals.

Again, I would like to thank Mr. MCCAUL, Chairman GORDON, and everyone who has worked together on this.

Mr. MCCAUL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIPINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MCCAUL. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to personally commend the gentleman for the authorship of this bill. I was proud to be a lead sponsor of the bill. When it comes to security matters and, I think, a lot of science and technology matters, we work in a very bipartisan way. Again, I think that's what the American people really want and deserve out of this Congress. So I am glad that we saw a little bit of that bipartisanship here today on the House floor. And thank you for your leadership.

Mr. LIPINSKI. I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL), and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and to support the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1545

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 111–410 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida;

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona;

Amendment No. 8 by Mrs. DAHLKEMPER of Pennsylvania;

Amendment No. 14 by Mr. CUELLAR of Texas;

Amendment No. 18 by Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 417, noes 5, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 34]

AYES—417

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
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
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kissell

Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Norton
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pierluisi
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Sablan
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOES—5

Broun (GA)
Mack
McClintock
Paul
Poe (TX)

NOT VOTING—17

Barrett (SC)
Christensen
Gohmert
Gutierrez
Johnson, E. B.
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Massa
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Radanovich
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Tonko
Woolsey
Young (FL)

□ 1611

Mr. PAUL of Texas changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mrs. MALONEY and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 34 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. PIERLUISI). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 396, noes 31, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 35]

AYES—396

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
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
Clay
Cleaver
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garamendi
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Norton
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pierluisi
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sablan
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—31

Berman
Berry
Brown, Corrine
Clarke
Clyburn
Conyers
Crowley
Edwards (MD)
Filner
Fudge
Grijalva
Hall (NY)
Hastings (FL)
Jones
Kennedy
Kucinich
Lee (CA)
Moore (WI)
Nadler (NY)
Paul
Payne
Rahall
Rothman (NJ)
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sherman
Waters
Watson
Watt
Woolsey
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—12

Barrett (SC)
Christensen
Gutierrez
Johnson, E. B.
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Massa
Murtha
Radanovich
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). Members are reminded that there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1622

Messrs. SHERMAN, KUCINICH, KENNEDY, BERRY, HASTINGS of Florida,

CONYERS, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, and Ms. WATERS changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. BORDALLO and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MRS. DAHLKEMPER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Mrs. DAHLKEMPER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 419, noes 3, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 36]

AYES—419

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
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
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Norton
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pierluisi
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sablan
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOES—3

Flake
McClintock
Paul

NOT VOTING—17

Barrett (SC)
Boehner
Christensen
Foster
Garamendi
Gutierrez
Johnson, E. B.
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Massa
Murphy (CT)
Murtha
Radanovich
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Slaughter
Young (FL)

□ 1630

Messrs. FLAKE and PAUL changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. CUELLAR

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 416, noes 4, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 37]

AYES—416

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
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
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden

Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pierluisi
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Rahall
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sablan
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOES—4

Broun (GA)
Flake
McClintock
Paul

NOT VOTING—19

Barrett (SC)
Christensen
Gingrey (GA)
Gutierrez
Johnson, E. B.
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Lewis (GA)
Massa
Murtha
Napolitano
Norton
Radanovich
Rangel
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Slaughter
Tsongas
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain on this vote.

□ 1638

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY OF VIRGINIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 417, noes 4, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 38]

AYES—417

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
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
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Norton
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pierluisi
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sablan
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOES—4

Broun (GA)
Flake
McClintock
Paul

NOT VOTING—18

Barrett (SC)
Castor (FL)
Christensen
Gutierrez
Johnson, E. B.
King (IA)
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Massa
Miller (NC)
Murtha
Radanovich
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Slaughter
Speier
Wilson (SC)
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). Members are reminded there are 2 minutes left on this vote.

□ 1645

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Chairman, I was absent from the House Chamber today, due to a family emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall votes 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, and 38.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BRIGHT) having assumed the chair, Mr. PIERLUISI, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4061) to advance cybersecurity research, development, and technical standards, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.J. RES. 45, INCREASING THE STATUTORY LIMIT ON THE PUBLIC DEBT

Mr. MCGOVERN, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111–411) on the resolution (H. Res. 1065) providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 45) increasing the statutory limit on the public debt, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

JIM KOLBE POST OFFICE

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

Ms. GIFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the legacy of a former Member of Congress, Congressman Jim Kolbe. This body honors him with the passage of H.R. 4495, legislation to rename his hometown post office at 100 North Taylor Lane in Patagonia, Arizona.

Congressman Kolbe's record of service began as a page in this historic place of Congress for Senator Barry Goldwater. This experience would have a lasting impact on his appreciation for the virtue of public service, resulting in a long and distinguished career dedicated to cultivating a better Arizona, and in fact, a better Nation.

He spent his life in service in the United States Navy, the Arizona State legislature, and in the United States Congress for Arizona's Fifth and Eighth Congressional Districts. As our hometown newspaper, the Arizona Daily Star, noted upon his retirement in December of 2006, ''He earned a reputation as a moderate in a partisan world, a voice working from the center.''

Congressman Kolbe did not work from a predetermined list of party positions. He worked to unite his colleagues in finding solutions to important issues to Arizonans, from increased economic opportunity through trade to environmental conversation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join with me in honoring this great figure, a man who served our community in Arizona, who served our Nation, Congressman Jim Kolbe, a true statesman and a beloved public figure.

COMMENDING PIUS BANNIS

(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 rise today to applaud the outstanding work and selfless commitment of Mr. Pius Bannis. Mr. Bannis is the Field Office Director in Port-au-Prince for the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. He has gone above and beyond the call of duty in the weeks since the horrific earthquake that devastated Haiti on January 12.

Working around the clock, Mr. Bannis has helped to process hundreds of adoption cases, helping to unite American families with their Haitian children in the aftermath of this tragic disaster. Mr. Bannis is a hero. Because of his tireless efforts and compassion, many of the most vulnerable children in Haiti are able to look toward a much brighter future.

I am inspired by the selfless dedication, and again thank Mr. Bannis, as well as all of the employees of the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, for their extraordinary service in helping Haitian children.

HONORING ANTONIO MANGLONA BORJA

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

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, they say only the good die young. I don't know if only the good die young, but I do know that Antonio Manglona Borja from the island of Tinian in the Northern Mariana Islands was a very good man, and I do know that Antonia Manglona Borja has died much too young.

Tinian is a small island with a small number of families. Everyone knows everyone. And no one who lives there can fail to touch the lives of others. But some people have an impact on the community that is outsized, that makes their presence—and their absence—of greater significance.

Antonia Borja made his presence felt in so many ways: as an officer of the Department of Public Safety; as someone deeply involved with youth and adult sports; as a public representative on boards and commissions. Most of all, he was always there to give a hand to friends and neighbors in need.

Antonia Manglona Borja, Mr. Speaker. He was a good man. He died too young. And we all will miss him.

Mr. Speaker, They say only the good die young. I don't know if only the good die young. But I do know that Antonio Manglona Borja from the island of Tinian in the Northern Mariana Islands was a very good man. And I do know that Antonio Manglona Borja has died much too young.

So I rise today to honor him on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives in the hope that knowing that Antonio was recognized in this way will give some comfort to his parents—Elias Manibusan Borja and Rosa Manglona Borja, to his wife—Bernadine Palacios Borja, to their children—Anthony Silvestre, Kristine, and Dennis—and to all Antonio's many friends and family members who miss him.

Mr. Speaker, Tinian is a small island with a small number of families. Everyone knows everyone. And no one who lives there can fail to touch the lives of others

But, of course, some people have an impact on the community that is outsize, that makes their presence—and their absence—of greater significance.

Antonio Borja made his presence felt in so many lives. As an officer of the Department of Public Safety, he helped to keep the peace on Tinian. He was there in moments of crisis and trauma for his community. He helped others and held them safe, when they were most in danger, most in need.

Mr. Borja learned the job of Public Safety Officer from the ground up, beginning as recruit in 1985 and quickly moving up the ranks to Captain in just nine years time. And Mr. Borja took what he learned as an officer and continued to contribute to the welfare of his community after his retirement nine years ago.

He was deeply involved with youth and adult sports. He served on the board of public corporations. Most of all, he was always there to give a hand to friends and neighbors in need.

Antonio Manglona Borja, Mr. Speaker. He was a good man. He died too young. And we all will miss him.

JUVENILE DIABETES

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

Mr. BOCCIERI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 3 million young Americans who courageously fight juvenile diabetes every day. Recently, I had the privilege of meeting three brave children from my northeastern Ohio district, Andrew Butterworth, Meghan Jordan, and Gaetano Cecchini, who suffer from juvenile diabetes, but take their condition with great humility and strength.

Each day 40 children are diagnosed with diabetes in the United States. The price to maintain treatment can cost thousands of dollars per year. While insulin is enough to keep that person alive, it doesn't prevent the potential side effects of kidney failure, blindness, amputations, and heart attacks.

When Meghan came to my office, she gave me a notebook with pictures and descriptions of her enjoying her life to her fullest, in spite of her condition. And she writes, ''Having diabetes is physically and emotionally hard. I check my blood sugars at least five times a day and give myself 4 shots a day. My grandpa really helped me with diabetes, but he passed away, and I miss him very much. Promise to remember me and the children who have juvenile diabetes and help us find a cure.''

We owe it to them to fight hard to make sure that juvenile diabetes and other debilitating diseases that affect our children are looked at, fought, and make sure that we can end them in a timely fashion.

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 Georgia (Mr. DEAL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEAL 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 Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□ 1700

THE LAST DOUGHBOY AND THE WAR TO END ALL WARS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRIGHT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. They called it the ''war to end all wars''; 4.7 million Americans went over there to Europe in the great World War I, and 116,000 of them never came home. When they arrived back in the United States in 1918, thousands of them died from the flu that they had contracted in France. They called them ''doughboys'' because of the look of their uniform. One such person was an individual by the name of Frank Buckles.

Frank Buckles lied to get into the United States Army. He was 16. And he went from recruiter to recruiter to recruiter and finally convinced somebody he was 21. He got into the United States Army and went over there with the doughboys to end the war to end all wars. He drove an ambulance and rescued other Americans who were fighting that great war. He said, We were typical cocky Americans. No one wanted us around until the French and the British needed some help winning that war. And just 19 months after the first Yanks arrived, the guns fell silent.

Yes, that war ended on November 11, 1918. But that wasn't all for Frank Buckles. After he was discharged from the United States Army in 1918, he found himself in a place called Manila in the Philippines on December 8, 1941, when the Japanese attacked—the day after Pearl Harbor—and Frank Buckles was captured by the Japanese. For the next 39 months he was held as a prisoner of war in a Japanese concentration camp. He was finally freed on February 23, 1945, the day the Japanese had ordered his execution.

Frank Buckles is the last surviving doughboy from World War I. On Monday, he was 109 years old. He lives not far from here. Until he was 101, he drove his tractor on his farm in West Virginia. At this time I would like to insert into the RECORD a letter he wrote to the American people on Memorial Day of last year.

LAST WORLD WAR I VET FRANK BUCKLES' MEMORIAL DAY LETTER TO AMERICANS

(The following is a letter from Frank Buckles to the American Veterans Center and National Memorial Day Parade on Memorial Day, 2009.)

DEAR AMERICANS: Though I am unable to be in our great nation's capitol today to pay honor to the many men and women who have fought and died protecting our freedom, I want you to know the depth of my gratitude to our service members and the deep personal significance Memorial Day has to me.

In 1918, I was sure there would never be another world war. But just 23 years later—the day after Pearl Harbor—I became one of 2,000 civilians who would spend the next 3 and a half years in a Japanese POW camp in the Philippines.

I was born in 1901 during the McKinley Administration in the heartland of America. I was thirteen when World War I broke out in Europe. For me the decision to join the service was an easy one. The hard part was finding someone who'd let me join.

I was just 16 and didn't look a day older. I confess to you that I lied to more than one recruiter. I gave them my solemn word that I was 18, but I'd left my birth certificate back home in the family Bible. They'd take one look at me and laugh and tell me to home before my mother noticed I was gone.

Somehow I got the idea that telling an even bigger whopper was the way to go. So I told the next recruiter that I was 21 and darned if he didn't sign me up on the spot! I enlisted in the Army on the 14th of August 1917. As a 16-year-old boy, you think you're invincible and I wanted to go where the action was.

One of the older sergeants told me the fastest way to get to France was to go into the Ambulance Corps. So that's what I did. There was never a shortage of blown-up bodies that needed to be rushed to the nearest medical care. The British and French troops were in bad shape—even guys about my age looked old and tired.

After three years of living and dying inside a dirt trench, you know the Brits and French were happy to see us ''doughboys.'' Every last one of us Yanks believed we'd wrap this thing up in a month or two and head back home before harvest. In other words, we were the typical, cocky Americans no one wants around, until they need help winning a war.

But that's what makes America special—as much as we want to avoid war, we're ready to sacrifice everything if that's what it takes to make sure the bad guys don't win. America's entry into the war was decisive. Just 19 months after the first Yanks arrived, the guns fell silent.

The Armistice commenced on the 11th hour of the 11th day of the llth month and battered troops on both sides crawled out of their trenches for the last time. When the armistice came, I thought the Europeans would be dancing in the streets. After the Armistice, I was assigned to deliver German POWs back to their homeland. Looking at their war-weary faces, I never dreamed that one day I'd find myself in the same position—but in much worse circumstances.

On December 7, 1941, the Japs bombed Pearl Harbor. Even before Congress declared war on Japan, young American men were lining up to enlist. At the time, I was working in the Manila office for a shipping firm called the White Star Line.

White Star was the line that had owned the *Titanic*. White Star also owned the *Carpathian*—the ship that had rescued the Titanic's survivors . . . and the *Carpathian* was also the ship that had taken me to the battlefields of France in 1917. You know, looking back I think I should have seen all those White Star connections as an omen of things to come. But I didn't.

The Axis war in Europe and Asia had been going on for the last several years. But General MacArthur had assured us that Manila was the safest city in the Orient. MacArthur was a great general, but this time he guessed wrong.

On December 8th, just one day after Pearl Harbor, a Japanese invasion took control of Manila. The Japanese took thousands of us foreigners to Los Banos, a prison camp 40 miles southeast of Manila. Along with 2,000 other foreign civilians, I was designated a prisoner of war.

For the next 3 and a half years, my fellow POW's and I had only two things on our minds. We wondered when MacArthur was going to return and how we were going to find something to fill our stomachs. The starvation at Los Banos was so bad, it is surprising that any of us survived. When The 11th Airborne finally freed us on February 23, 1945, we all looked pretty much like skeletons with skin on.

America goes to war to free, to liberate, to protect, and to bring justice to bear. I hope this Memorial Day, you take the time to thank the veterans you meet for their service to this country—the sacrifices that they have made to preserve your freedom.

May God bless you and God bless America!

FRANK BUCKLES,
Corporal, World War I,
U.S. Army (Retired).

After World War I was over with, that generation went into the Roaring Twenties, then the Great Depression, and then they were the fathers of the Greatest Generation that went off to the great World War II.

I mention Frank Buckles for several reasons. He's the last surviving doughboy. This is a picture of him that was taken not too long ago in front of the D.C. World War Memorial that's on the Mall. Now Frank Buckles is spending

the rest of his life trying to do something for those doughboys in World War I. You see, on the great National Mall we have a memorial for the veterans of Vietnam, for the veterans of Korea, and for the veterans of the Greatest Generation, the World War II Memorial. But there is no memorial for the doughboys of World War I who served in these United States. In fact, this monument, this memorial for D.C. World War I veterans, is in the weeds. It's not taken care of by the Park Service.

And so what we are planning and what Frank Buckles desires is to have an expansion of this memorial and expand it to include all of those who served in the great World War I. He says, I feel as the last survivor a responsibility to bring recognition to all of the millions who fought in that war and are gone. I intend to give all my efforts and time I have left to see that a national memorial of World War I joins the other memorials on the National Mall. I am dismayed that this country has erected memorials for World War II, Korea, and Vietnam, yet there is no memorial for the war to end all wars.

So what we should do, Members of Congress and Mr. Speaker, we should erect a memorial for that war that occurred in the last century. We should erect it for the doughboys of that generation; for Frank Buckles, who is 109 years old, the last surviving doughboy. We owe it to them. There are no lobbyists for the World War I Memorial. Everybody's died. The only lobbyists are Members of Congress and schoolchildren throughout this country, like Creekwood Middle School in Kingwood, Texas, that's raising money to pay for the memorial on the National Mall.

And so what we as Members of Congress do and need to do is to honor these great Americans that served in that great war—that war that we don't even talk much about in our history books anymore. We owe it to them. We owe it to Frank Buckles. We owe it to those doughboys.

And that's just the way it is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SESTAK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SESTAK addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

TACKLING THE DEFICIT OF TRUST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, this week, the President unveiled his 2011 budget, along with the promise to cut nonsecurity discretionary spending for 3 years. I actively support the President's initiative to rein in spending and to tackle our ever-growing deficit. However, the President and Congress must go further. In order to understand our next steps, we must understand how we got here.

Eight years of fiscal irresponsibility, a blatant disregard for pay-as-you-go budgeting, and sky-high tax cuts have left us with a debt that is over 50 percent of GDP. To add insult to injury, we work in a town that thrives on pet projects and individually directed spending. We recklessly spend on defense projects that are intended to keep us safe—the government's number one duty—but actually help make us vulnerable and that are often untested and ineffective. In a March, 2009, GAO report assessing selected weapons programs, researchers estimate that cost overruns totaled nearly $300 billion. GAO continued to recommend that DOD move towards sound, knowledge-based acquisitions.

The President should continue on this path toward reform spending by recommending cutting programs like expensive warships, planes, and flawed missile defense systems that don't help in the fight against terror. Congress must also reassert its constitutional right to provide for the common defense by denying money to produce any weapon before it is thoroughly tested. If we are smart with our dollars, we will not only be safer but we will be stronger.

We're fighting two wars while simultaneously attempting to reassert our power as a global economic influence. Now is not the time to pick and choose where we cut our spending. Now is the time to reinvent, streamline, and reform the way we do business in Washington. Now is not the time to protect sacred cows. Nothing should be beyond our scrutiny. Now is the time to subject tax expenditures to budget discipline. I agree with the President that we must extend middle class tax cuts, but end the support for those making over $250,000 a year. And we must refocus domestic spending so that our number one priority is job creation.

Next month, the Secretary of the Treasury will submit to Congress and the President an audited financial report for the U.S. Government. Similar to those required of publicly traded companies, this report projects our unfunded liabilities, or the present value of future expenditures in excess of future revenues. This report helps us understand the true expense of promising to pay Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid benefits at some future moment, even if no cash is disbursed today.

The 2008 report projects our unfunded liabilities at $56 trillion. Our large and growing deficits continue to increase government debt levels as a percentage of GDP to unprecedented and unsustainable heights. The most troublesome and crippling outcome of all, however, is that in this process of unethical and unabashed spending we have lost the public's trust. Without this trust, we simply cannot govern.

Tackling this deficit of trust must be our first priority. ''Let's try common sense,'' the President said. ''Let's invest in our people without leaving them a mountain of debt. Let's meet our responsibility to the people who sent us here.'' Our responsibility, then, is to take the more difficult road—the road that includes reform, the road that includes reinventing government, and the road that includes the Members of this House leading by example.

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.)

ENHANCED INTERROGATION TECHNIQUES

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. You know, Mr. Speaker, today we had a hearing before the International Relations Committee and one of the subjects that was brought up was enhanced interrogation techniques. And waterboarding was brought up. One of my colleagues said, Boy, that's torture. That's why we shouldn't be using that.

Now Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, who personally cut the head off of Daniel Pearl, personally killed him, and he was personally involved in the 9/11 attacks that killed 3,000 Americans, he was waterboarded. Before he was waterboarded, he said—and I want to read from a CIA memo. It said, ''In particular, the CIA believes that it would have been unable to obtain critical information from numerous detainees, including Khalid Sheikh Mohammed and Abu Zubaydah, without using enhanced techniques.'' Both of them had expressed their belief that the United States population was weak and lacked resilience and would be unable to do what was necessary for preventing terrorists from succeeding in their goals.

Indeed, before the CIA used enhanced techniques in its interrogation, he said, when asked about future attacks, simply, ''Soon you will know.'' Soon after he was subjected to the waterboarding, he became cooperative, and as a result we were able to stop an attack that was going to take place in Los Angeles where a plane was going to fly into a building.

Now we have said time and again that we don't believe in torture. And I don't believe in torture. But the definition of torture is in the eye of the beholder. They say waterboarding is terrible, and it's torture. But do you know—and I don't think many of my colleagues know this—that the Survival, Evasion, Rescue, and Escape training for our military personnel—and that's the Special Forces, the Navy SEALs, and pilots that fly in the military—they go through enhanced techniques like this, and they go through

waterboarding. They have for 30 years. Now maybe they're stopping it now, but they, for 30 years, since Vietnam, went through waterboarding as a training technique. Nobody called it torture then, and we certainly weren't talking about a terrorist who cut somebody's head off and helped design the attack on the World Trade Center that killed over 3,000 people.

CIA Director General Michael B. Hayden said on Fox News Sunday last weekend that the use of these techniques against these terrorists made us, the United States of America, safer. It really did work. And the thing that bothers me, instead of using enhanced interrogation techniques to go after these terrorists to find out what's going on, we're instead bringing them from Guantanamo to New York City. Well, they've stopped that now because it's going to cost $250 million, at least, and the mayor of the city said he doesn't want that to go on. But we were going to bring these terrorists that killed all these Americans and did all these horrible things like cutting off people's heads and hanging them from bridges in Fallujah, and we were going to bring them to New York. And we're providing them with legal help. We're providing them with guidance.

And this guy that flew into Detroit and tried to blow up an airplane with 230-some people on it, we gave him his Miranda rights. Then, after that, we went over to his home country and brought his mother and father back so they could talk to him to convince him to talk to the American intelligence people. Is that the way you conduct intelligence gathering—giving them Miranda rights, bringing them to the United States after they've done these horrible things to Americans? They're terrorists.

We are in a war against terrorism and within bounds we should use every enhanced technique we can come up with to elicit information from these terrorists before they kill Americans. We should be going after them with everything we have instead of providing legal defense for them. They are not Americans. They're terrorists who want to destroy the United States of America. And we as Americans need to realize that and do whatever is necessary, including using enhanced interrogation techniques like waterboarding, which we've done with the military—our military—in order to save this country and protect it from terrorism.

□ 1715

FINANCIAL RECOVERY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the economic pain in the Midwestern region of our country is not subsiding in any meaningful way. Approximately 600,000, over half a million Americans, are out of work in just our State alone and over 20 million Americans across our country. In our district, one county, Ottawa County, is suffering from an unemployment rate that exceeds 17 percent, and just yesterday another one of its largest employers, Silgan, announced it would close its plant.

There have been approximately 27,000 bankruptcies in just one county in my district. Bankruptcy is a desperate act, an act taken only when you see no other alternative. Today's New York Times talks about desperate measures that homeowners across our country are now taking. The front page article describes the growing number of Americans who are ''under water'' on their mortgages and the steps they are taking to cope with that situation. Being under water means you owe more on the house than it's worth. More and more homeowners who are under water are taking the desperate act of walking away from their homes, even in the winter.

When the real estate market started sinking in the middle of 2006, almost no Americans were under water on their mortgages. Now 3 years later, an estimated 4.5 million homeowners have reached what The Times calls ''the critical threshold'' where the home's value had fallen below 75 percent of the mortgage balance.

Frankly, as I predicted, the mortgage workout programs hastily adopted by this Congress are not working for the majority of Americans. Some would say this is purposeful to allow the five big Wall Street megabanks to further gain ownership over huge segments of the U.S. real estate market. The New York Times cites recent data that suggests the real estate market is stalling again, and the number of people who have fallen below this critical threshold is projected to climb to a peak of 5.1 million people by June.

Mr. Speaker, the figure would represent 10 percent of all Americans with mortgages: one in 10. This is unacceptable in America. And without improvement in the housing market, America is unlikely to see improvement in the overall economy because housing always leads us to recovery.

All of us are anxious to see more economic growth. The most recent gross domestic product showed that the American economy overall had grown at the fastest pace in 6 years, certainly better than the lost jobs of the Bush era. But now economists are saying that we're headed for a jobless recovery. That is unacceptable. Economist Peter Morici states that we will need 5 to 6 percent growth over the next 3 years to replace the jobs that have been lost during the recession, and Raymond Hodgdon, in his economic report out of Chicago, suggests the same number.

Our Nation got to these desperate times through the financial crisis. Our economy essentially functions on credit, and much of our credit was created through the securitization of loans which should lead to a discussion of the shadow banking system, a secretive, opaque netherworld where fraud can thrive even as it devastates the entire country.

Equally in the shadows is the Federal Reserve. Last week we had a hearing in the Oversight and Government Reform Committee with Secretary Geithner of Treasury on his role as president of the New York Federal Reserve Bank during the AIG bailout. The Secretary stated he had recused himself from such activities as the bailout of AIG once he was nominated as Secretary of the Treasury. But when I asked him for his recusal agreement for the record, he stated that there was no documentation. No recusal agreement exists—nothing legal, no waiver, nothing. He made decisions, and only he is accountable for them. There was a gasp in the room.

Beyond the shadowland of our Nation's financial system, our small community banks are struggling as bad loans from commercial and residential real estate continue to plague our financial system. The small community banks that have survived are trying to lend to small businesses which are the main engine of our economy, but they cannot do so if the big banks are holding credit hostage. And turning to TARP is not the answer for our community banks because it isn't Treasury's job to pick winners and losers in the commercial marketplace. That should be a market function.

The end result is that small businesses are dying too. The small community banks cannot loan to local small business. Without access to credit, small business is letting people go, too; and they're becoming unemployed. And meanwhile, the Wall Street banks are just getting bigger, using Federal money to gain an edge on their competition.

Mr. Speaker, this situation is simply unacceptable, and it's time for Congress to rework legislation to allow people to stay in their homes and to begin creating jobs in this country so we can actually bring the deficit down as people pay their taxes to the Treasury of the United States.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 3, 2010]

NO HELP IN SIGHT, MORE HOMEOWNERS WALK AWAY

(By David Streitfeld)

In 2006, Benjamin Koellmann bought a condominium in Miami Beach. By his calculation, it will be about the year 2025 before he can sell his modest home for what he paid. Or maybe 2040.

''People like me are beginning to feel like suckers,'' Mr. Koellmann said. ''Why not let it go in default and rent a better place for less?''

After three years of plunging real estate values, after the bailouts of the bankers and the revival of their million-dollar bonuses, after the Obama administration's loan modification plan raised the expectations of many but satisfied only a few, a large group of distressed homeowners is wondering the same thing.

New research suggests that when a home's value falls below 75 percent of the amount owed on the mortgage, the owner starts to think hard about walking away, even if he or she has the money to keep paying.

In a situation without precedent in the modern era, millions of Americans are in this bleak position. Whether, or how, to help them is one of the biggest questions the Obama administration confronts as it seeks a housing policy that would contribute to the economic recovery.

''We haven't yet found a way of dealing with this that would, we think, be practical on a large scale,'' the assistant Treasury Secretary for financial stability, Herbert Allison Jr., said in a recent briefing.

The number of Americans who owed more than their homes were worth was virtually nil when the real estate collapse began in mid–2006, but by the third quarter of 2009, an estimated 4.5 million homeowners had reached the critical threshold, with their home's value dropping below 75 percent of the mortgage balance.

They are stretched, aggrieved and restless. With figures released last week showing that the real estate market was stalling again, their numbers are now projected to climb to a peak of 5.1 million by June—about 10 percent of all Americans with mortgages.

''We're now at the point of maximum vulnerability,'' said Sam Khater, a senior economist with First American CoreLogic, the firm that conducted the recent research. ''People's emotional attachment to their property is melting into the air.''

Suggestions that people would be wise to renege on their home loans are at least a couple of years old, but they are turning into a full-throated barrage. Bloggers were quick to note recently that landlords of an 11,000-unit residential complex in Manhattan showed no hesitation, or shame, in walking away from their deeply underwater investment.

''Since the beginning of December, I've advised 60 people to walk away,'' said Steve Walsh, a mortgage broker in Scottsdale, Ariz. ''Everyone has lost hope. They don't qualify for modifications, and being on the hamster wheel of paying for a property that is not worth it gets so old.''

Mr. Walsh is taking his own advice, recently defaulting on a rental property he owns. ''The sun will come up tomorrow,'' he said.

The difference between letting your house go to foreclosure because you are out of money and purposefully defaulting on a mortgage to save money can be murky. But a growing body of research indicates that significant numbers of borrowers are declining to live under what some waggishly call ''house arrest.''

Using credit bureau data, consultants at Oliver Wyman calculated how many borrowers went straight from being current on their mortgage to default, rather than making spotty payments. They also weeded out owners having trouble paying other bills. Their estimate was that about 17 percent of owners defaulting in 2008, or 588,000 people, chose that option as a strategic calculation.

Some experts argue that walking away from mortgages is more discussed than done. People hate moving; their children attend the neighborhood school; they do not want to think of themselves as skipping out on a debt. Doubters cite a Federal Reserve study using historical data from Massachusetts that concludes there were relatively few walk-aways during the 1991 bust.

The United States Treasury falls into the skeptical camp.

''The overwhelming bulk of people who have negative equity stay in their homes and keep paying,'' said Michael S. Barr, assistant Treasury secretary for financial institutions.

It would cost about $745 billion, slightly more than the size of the original 2008 bank bailout, to restore all underwater borrowers to the point where they were breaking even, according to First American.

Using government money to do that would be seen as unfair by many taxpayers, Mr. Barr said. On the other hand, doing nothing about underwater mortgages could encourage more walk-aways, dealing another blow to a fragile economy.

''It's not an easy area,'' he said.

Walking away—also called ''jingle mail,'' because of the notion that homeowners just mail their keys to the bank, setting off foreclosure proceedings—began in the Southwest during the 1980s oil collapse, though it has never been clear how widespread it was.

In the current bust, lenders first noticed something strange after real estate prices had fallen about 10 percent.

An executive with Wachovia, one of the country's biggest and most aggressive lenders, said during a conference call in January 2008 that the bank was bewildered by customers who had ''the capacity to pay, but have basically just decided not to.'' (Wachovia failed nine months later and was bought by Wells Fargo.)

With prices now down by about 30 percent, underwater borrowers fall into two groups. Some have owned their homes for many years and got in trouble because they used the house as a cash machine. Others, like Mr. Koellmann in Miami Beach, made only one mistake: they bought as the boom was cresting.

It was April 2006, a moment when the perpetual rise of real estate was considered practically a law of physics. Mr. Koellmann was 23, a management consultant new to Miami.

Financially cautious by nature, he bought a small, plain one-bedroom apartment for $215,000, much less than his agent told him he could afford. He put down 20 percent and received a fixed-rate loan from Countrywide Financial.

Not quite four years later, apartments in the building are selling in foreclosure for $90,000.

''There is no financial sense in staying,'' Mr. Koellmann said. With the $1,500 he is paying each month for his mortgage, taxes and insurance, he could rent a nicer place on the beach, one with a gym, security and valet parking.

Walking away, he knows, is not without peril. At minimum, it would ruin his credit score. Mr. Koellmann would like to attend graduate school. If an admission dean sees a dismal credit record, would that count against him? How about a new employer?

Most of all, though, he struggles with the ethical question.

''I took a loan on an asset that I didn't see was overvalued,'' he said. ''As much as I would like my bank to pay for that mistake, why should it?''

That is an attitude Wall Street would like to encourage. David Rosenberg, the chief economist of the investment firm Gluskin Sheff, wrote recently that borrowers were not victims. They ''signed contracts, and as adults should also be held accountable,'' he wrote.

Of course, this is not necessarily how Wall Street itself behaves, as demonstrated by the case of Stuyvesant Town and Peter Cooper Village. An investment group led by the real estate giant Tishman Speyer recently defaulted on $4.4 billion in debt that it had used to buy the two apartment developments in Manhattan, handing the properties back to the lenders.

Moreover, during the boom, it was the banks that helped drive prices to unrealistic levels by lowering credit standards and unleashing a wave of speculative housing demand.

Mr. Koellmann applied last fall to Bank of America for a modification, noting that his income had slipped. But the lender came back a few weeks ago with a plan that added more restrictive terms while keeping the payments about the same.

''That may have been the last straw,'' Mr. Koellmann said.

Guy D. Cecala, publisher of Inside Mortgage Finance magazine, says he does not hear much sympathy from lenders for their underwater customers.

''The banks tell me that a lot of people who are complaining were the ones who refinanced and took all the equity out any time there was any appreciation,'' he said. ''The banks are damned if they will help.''

Joe Figliola has heard that message. He bought his house in Elgin, IL, in 2004, then refinanced twice to get better terms. He pulled out a little money both times to cover the closing costs and other expenses. Now his place is underwater while his salary as circulation manager for the local newspaper has been cut.

''It doesn't seem right that I can rent a place somewhere for half of what I'm paying,'' he said. ''I told my bank, 'Just take a little bite out of what I owe. That would ease me up. Isn't that why the President gave you all this money?' ''

Bank of America did not agree, so Mr. Figliola, who is 48, sees no recourse other than walking away. ''I don't believe this is the right thing to do,'' he said, ''but I've got to survive.''

[From Enlighted Economics, January 2010]

HODGDON ECONOMIC COMMENTARY

ECONOMIC RECOVERY 2010?

Economic Outlook

The Dow Jones (19%), the S&P 500 (24%) and NASDAQ (44%) were all up significantly in 2009. The stock market seems to be forecasting strong economic growth in 2010 and beyond. Unfortunately, it will require roaring economic growth (8%–10%) to justify these stock prices. This will not happen. Most economists are forecasting economic growth of 2%–4% (probably optimistic). This level of growth is too low to reduce the unemployment stock (20 million). It requires economic growth of 3%–4% just to absorb new entrants into the job market. The current level of unemployment is 10%. This level is understated because it does not include everyone that is unemployed. The real rate of unemployment is 17%.

The average first year economic recovery coming out of a recession is 6%. Usually the greater the recession, the greater the first year recovery, that will not happen this time.

The financial crisis that caused the economic collapse was the result of 30 years of inflated credit. This artificial credit took the form of securitized bank loans (The Shadow Banking System).

By 2008 the unregulated Shadow Banking System was larger than the regulated banking system ($12 trillion). This inflated the role of consumer spending (70%) in the economy. The Shadow Banking System no longer exits and will not return, without serious financial regulatory reform.

In other words, the inflated level of credit that was artificially supporting the economy has been withdrawn and it will not return because the credit ratings and in many cases the securities themselves were fraudulent to begin with. The economy runs on credit. If you withdraw $12 trillion in credit from the economy, the economic trajectory will be lower than it was before.

Consumer spending will not return to 70% of GDP either or anything close to it. Historically, each 1% decline in consumer spending

cuts U.S. imports by 2.8%. The economy is on life support and the consumer will not come to the rescue this time.

All the money the Fed is pumping into the economy is propping the economy and the stock market up but it is not restoring the economy to previous artificial levels. And those artificial levels were not so great to begin with. For example, GDP growth for the decade just ended was slightly less than 2.0%. Core inflation for the decade just ended was about 2.4%.

Thus, real economic growth was slightly negative for the first decade of the new millennium. Let's call it zero to account for rounding errors. Not surprisingly, stock market growth for decade just ended was also zero.

This is why banks are not lending and borrowers are not borrowing. Banks are using Fed money and low interest rates to restore their balance sheets and to reduce their risk exposure. Repaying debt in 2010 will continue to be attractive to borrowers and reducing risk exposure will continue to be attractive to lenders.

With consumer spending and lending remaining well below recent levels and unemployment remaining at historic levels, there is no chance of a roaring economic recovery. This also raises serious doubts over conventional concerns about inflation.

Inflation is a function of velocity not money supply growth.

THE MONETARY EQUATION IS: MV = PT

Velocity increases when economic growth is very strong. Velocity declines when the economy contracts. There is no chance of velocity increasing anytime soon under current conditions.

Deflation remains a greater concern, which is why the Fed will not increase interest rates before the end of the year. Excess capacity in the U.S. and worldwide along with velocity continuing to fall will keep inflation low.

Real Estate Outlook

Excess inventories of houses for sale, the mortal enemy of prices, remain huge. And inventories may rise. A quarter of homeowners with mortgages are under water and 40% of homeowners who took out mortgages in 2006 are under water.

Since building costs don't change much over time, the volatility in house prices is really fluctuating land values. The collapse in land values the past two years will probably persist. The 30% decline in house prices nationwide has put the 5 percenter's way under water. It took three decades for the financial sector to expand its leverage to the levels reached in 2007. Deleveraging will take at least 10 years.

Due to bad commercial as well as residential real estate loans, small banks are dropping like flies. Since small banks are the primary lenders to small business and since small business is the engine of job growth, it seems likely unemployment will remain high and slow economic growth will continue.

Excess capacity in commercial real estate and big refinancing requirements in coming years beginning in 2010 will continue to plague hotels, malls, warehouses and office buildings. Moody's/REAL Commercial Property Price Index fell 44% last October from 2007. Retailers closed 8,300 stores last year exceeding the previous peak of 6,900 (2001).

Most of the really bad loans in residential and commercial real estate were made in 2005–2006. Those loans will have to be refinanced in 2010–2012. It is estimated that as much as 50% of these commercial real estate loans will not roll over in 2010.

Economic Summary

Thus, the economic weather report for 2010 is for slow economic growth, high unemployment, falling real estate prices, continued deleveraging, more small bank failures and a huge supply of bad residential and commercial real estate loans needing to be refinanced. This is not a clear skies ahead or a return to business as usual forecast, as the stock market seems to have been forecasting.

Financial Outlook

The economy will eventually adjust to this lower economic trajectory but it will take time. The only thing that could speed up this process would be to identify the cause of the financial crisis (The Greatest Securities Fraud in History) and fix it.

Unfortunately, the Obama and Bush Administrations have covered up the cause of the financial crisis in order to protect those responsible. Perhaps the Financial Crisis Commission, which is investigating the cause of the crisis will identify the real cause of the crisis and recommend positive corrective actions. Absent that, we are looking at a sustained period of slow economic growth.

Throughout this crisis, President Obama, a gifted public speaker, has consistently spoken on behalf of ''Main Street'' but acted on behalf of ''Wall Street''. This strategy is based on the belief held by politicians and the investment banking cartel, which caused the financial crisis and is in complete control of the Administration, that you can fool ''all the people all the time''. It will come as no surprise that all of the President's key financial advisors work for or are surrogates for the investment banking cartel.

President Obama proposed prohibiting Big Banks from engaging in Proprietary Trading and Proprietary Hedge Funds.

''Main Street'' was not impressed and ''Wall Street'' laughed

The reason ''Wall Street'' laughed is that proprietary trading and proprietary hedge funds had absolutely nothing to do with cause of the financial crisis and taking it away does nothing to help ''Main Street'' or curtail ''Wall Street's'' subsidized risk taking. While it is true that investment banks benefit from access to the Fed's discount window and bank deposits for trading purposes. This is the result of the repeal (1999) of Glass-Steagall, which was the ultimate cause of the financial crisis, along with the economic structure of the financial industry (cartels, oligopolies and duopolies). In other words, the President learned nothing from Massachusetts. Tinkering with symptoms of the financial crisis rather than its causes is just not good enough.

Moreover, it is not the size of banks that is the problem; it is their configuration and lack of regulation. That is the mixing of unregulated investment banks (gambling casinos) with regulated commercial banks is the problem. It is the combination of investment banks and commercial banks that makes banks ''too big to fail'' not their size.

There is no systemic risk from the failure of a stand-alone investment bank. The repeal of Glass-Steagall, which ushered in a decade of unparalleled risk taking and fraud by permitting investment banks and commercial banks to combine for the first time in 70 years created the ''too big to fail'' problem.

In the process of tinkering and ignoring the real problem the President managed to embarrass Paul Volcker, a great public servant, by making him take credit for this foolishness. This was not Volcker's Proposal. Volcker's Proposal was to bring back the Glass-Steagall Act, which was repealed by the Financial Destruction Act of 1999.

While it is true that Glass-Steagall would prohibit commercial banks from engaging in proprietary trading and hedge funds, it would prohibit a lot more than that. It would prohibit commercial banks from engaging in all investment banking activities. Proprietary trading and hedge funds are crumbs on the floor by comparison.

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.)

HONORING THE U.S. COAST GUARD CUTTER ''INGHAM''

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of the most decorated ships of the United States, the U.S. Coast Guard Cutter *Ingham*. For 52 years, the *Ingham* protected our shoreline. Entering service in 1935, the *Ingham* delivered critical assistance to the United States in World War II, Korea, and Vietnam.

The *Ingham* protected Allied ships that were ferrying supplies to Great Britain during the Second World War. With the American flag flying high on her mast, the *Ingham* battled stormy weather, dodged German U-boats, sank an enemy submarine, and eluded enemy aircraft. The *Ingham* also served in the Pacific, acting as the amphibious flagship for four of the Philippine Islands invasions. It was from aboard the *Ingham* that General MacArthur planned and oversaw the critical capture of Corregidor.

More recently and closer to home, in 1980 over 125,000 Cubans fled north from the oppressive Castro dictatorship in battered rafts and stormy weather. The *Ingham* was instrumental in rescuing many refugees adrift in these makeshift rafts and bringing seven refugee vessels to safety, saving 122 lives.

She is the only ship in our history to receive two Presidential citations and has been awarded an astounding 14 Battle Stars and 19 ribbons. The *Ingham* and the many crew members who have served both on and below her decks are a testament to our great Nation. A total of 912 casualties are honored on a memorial plaque on her quarterdeck. Having paid the ultimate price for our freedom, these men and women earned our respect.

When the *Ingham* was decommissioned in 1988, she was the second oldest American warship afloat. Now a floating museum, it is through the exhibits and memorials within the *Ingham* that we can honor and remember all of those 912 service men and women and all that they have done in the service of our Nation.

The *Ingham* is a national historic landmark and serves as a national memorial to all Coast Guard men and women killed in action. It is through the leadership of former Key West Commissioner Bill Verge, a retired U.S.

Coast Guard Reserve member and a Vietnam veteran who serves as the executive director of the U.S. Coast Guard Cutter *Ingham* Memorial Museum, as well as Beth Nowell, development director for the museum, that the residents of Key West and I were able to welcome the *Ingham* to our maritime family with open arms. Towed in to stand tall alongside the active USS *Mohawk*, the *Ingham* will be open to the public as a living and breathing museum.

This historic ship has saved so many lives and helped shape the course of American history. She and her crews have performed every mission in the best tradition of the United States Coast Guard. I give thanks to the unwavering dedication and work of the crew of the *Ingham* for over half a century of service. The *Ingham* is a demonstration of what it means to be an American and why we should always be proud to say so.

So please come to Key West and see for yourself this beautiful museum, a testament to the brave men and women of the U.S. Coast Guard.

SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I recently got some first-hand experience with the way in which the right-wing propaganda machine operates. The pattern appears to be to begin with a lie and then have that lie multiplied through an echo chamber that repeats it and repeats it.

In this case, a man named John Fund, who is an editorial writer at the Wall Street Journal, one of the most right-wing of our publications these days, on the editorial page just told a lie about me in November of last year. He gave a speech at Restoration Weekend. I don't know what they were restoring, but it certainly wasn't respect for the truth. And he said, ''Democrats were very rattled by the November 3 election results. What do liberals do when they lose elections? They change the rules. In January, CHUCK SCHUMER and BARNEY FRANK will propose universal voter registration.'' ''There'll be felon reenfranchisement too.'' ''The Feds will tell the States, 'Take everyone on every list of welfare recipients you have, take everyone on every list of unemployed you have.' ''

It's a lie. He made it up. It's not even a misinterpretation. It's not a quote taken out of context. It is a total myth. There is no such bill. There wasn't in November. Then right-wing echo chamber picks it up. The Washington Times, the voice of the Reverend Moon, says, SCHUMER and FRANK ''have plans to ram through legislation that will produce universal voter registration.'' And they say it will be on the floor of the House in 2 weeks. It's the lie repeated. Glenn Beck joined in. Rush Limbaugh joined in.

This begins with a totally fictional accusation by John Fund with no basis whatsoever. It is then repeated by Glenn Beck and repeated by the Washington Times and repeated by Rush Limbaugh. None of them have checked what we were talking about, none of them seeing if it was accurate.

I was asked by a constituent why I had done that. My response was, Done what? I didn't do it. So I checked into it, and I found that the source of this was Mr. Fund's totally irresponsible myth in November. So I wrote to Mr. Fund—and I put this letter in there—and said, I was puzzled to hear you say this. I checked. I now write to tell you that you are entirely wrong in your assertion about me, and in the absence of your being able to show any basis on which you made such a statement, to ask you to acknowledge that fact.

He is not only a liar; he is a coward. He wouldn't do it. My staff member, Mr. Gural, asked him, called him up and said, Well, what was this based on? He said, Oh, I made a mistake. Well, have you issued a retraction? Mr. Gural asked him. Oh, yeah, he said. Can we see a copy? Mr. Gural reasonably asked. Oh, I told a couple of people.

So here we are. Mr. Fund makes it up. It's a lie. It's a myth. There was nothing there. And it's to discredit all Democrats. His right-wing cohorts then echo it and echo it. The next thing you know, it's going to be coming on the floor in the House in 2 weeks. People hear it, and it's all over the blogs. This is the Democrats' disregard for the electoral process. And when we call Mr. Fund's attention to the fact that this was a lie, what does he say? Whoops. But he's not going to tell anybody about it.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the only case of this. And I know this has happened before; but because I was directly involved here, I am in a position to document this. It begins with a lie from this editorial writer from the Wall Street Journal. It is then a lie repeated by all of his right-wing colleagues. And then when he is nailed in the lie, he simply blithely refuses to do anything about it.

I hope people will take from this the lesson to be very skeptical when these right-wing propagandas—Limbaugh or Beck or the Washington Times or the Wall Street Journal editorial board—propagate these vicious smears.

PARTIAL TEXT OF JOHN FUND'S SPEECH AT RESTORATION WEEKEND NOVEMBER 21, 2009

Democrats were very rattled by the November 3rd election results. What do liberals do when they lose elections? They change the rules. In January, Chuck Schumer and Barney Frank will propose universal voter registration.

What is universal voter registration? It means all of the state laws on elections will be overridden by a federal mandate. The feds will tell the states, ''Take everyone on every list of welfare recipients you have, take everyone on every list of unemployed you have, take everyone on every list of property owners, take everyone on every list of driver's license holders, and register them to vote regardless of whether they want to be.''

By the way, there'll be felon re-enfranchisement too. At that point, you have destroyed the integrity of the registration process.

Now they will sell this very cleverly. They will say, ''Well, OK, ACORN did have some problems with voter registration. We shouldn't have these third party rogue groups out there. So let's put ACORN out of business. Let's register everybody.''

Now the problem, of course, is there are a lot of duplicates. And there are a lot of people on those rolls who are illegal aliens. It's not a clean list. They don't care. So, this is the issue you haven't heard about. There's a reason you haven't heard about it. They don't want you to hear about it.

The path between the day this bill is introduced and the day it hits the House floor will probably be less than two weeks. Get ready for it. You can stop it. Don't get me wrong. But this is their stealth bill that is even more sneaky than the health care bill.

[From the Washington Times, Jan. 7, 2010]

EDITORIAL: LETTING CROOKS & ILLEGALS VOTE

Democrats have a political death wish. At least that's how it looks. There's no other explanation for their feverish push to take over the health care system when a huge majority of Americans are opposed to the plan. But facing an angry public, Democrats are scheming to find ways to manipulate the electoral process so they can cling to power even when voters want to kick the bums out.

Sen. Charles E. Schumer, New York Democrat, and Rep. Barney Frank, Massachusetts Democrat, have plans to ram through legislation that will produce universal voter registration. No matter what they claim, the rule changes will make it possible for illegal aliens to register to vote and for others to register multiple times.

The proposal is to register everyone on every welfare list, everyone getting unemployment insurance, everyone with a driver's license, everyone who has had run-ins with the legal system, everyone owning any property—basically everyone on every list the government keeps. People will be registered to vote whether or not they want to be registered. If individuals are on any public record, they will be automatically registered.

Obviously a lot of illegal aliens have driver's licenses, and many get other government benefits. Quite a few have rap sheets. People's names and other identification information are frequently recorded differently across these different lists, which means that one could be registered a separate time for every slight variation in how their personal information is kept on file.

The legislation is also expected to give felons the right to vote. Why Democrats insist on letting someone who has raped multiple women vote on social policy is beyond us. According to Democrats, robbers who have preyed on helpless victims—and even murderers—have the judgment to tell us how law enforcement should be run in this country.

In May 2005, Public Opinion Strategies surveyed felons who had their voting rights restored and nonfelons who voted in Washington state. Even after accounting for the voters' race, gender, education level, religious habits, employment, age and county of residence, the book Freedomnomics found that ''felons were 36 percent more likely than nonfelons with the same characteristics to have voted for [John] Kerry [a Democrat] over [George W.] Bush [a Republican] and 37 percent more likely to be registered Democratic.''

For years, Democrats have fought against requiring photo IDs at polling places. The

practice, which is simply a way to make sure voters are who they say they are, is used in about 100 other countries. Mexico, for example, has cracked down on voter fraud and is strict about requiring photo identification to vote. If Democrats have their way, it will be easier for Mexicans to vote in America than in their own country.

It speaks volumes about Democratic unpopularity that they have to look to criminals and illegal aliens to try to shore up their voting base.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 13, 2010.

Mr. JOHN FUND,
The Wall Street Journal,
New York, NY.

DEAR MR. FUND: I was puzzled during the last couple of weeks to be asked why I was supporting something called ''universal voter registration,'' which supposedly would allow all sorts of undesirable people to register to vote. I was puzzled because I have had absolutely no involvement in such a proposal.

I asked my staff to check the source of the rumor, and we discovered that it is you. Apparently last fall, you invented a story that Senator SCHUMER and I planned to introduce such legislation. I've since learned that Senator SCHUMER is working on legislation regarding voting, but I am told that it does not remotely resemble your version of it. But more importantly to me is that I have had no involvement with this whatsoever, with Senator SCHUMER or anybody else.

You simply made this up with regard to me. I must tell you that I was not surprised, because this sort of fictionalized attack on political opponents has sadly become characteristic of many on the right. And once you lied about me in this regard, several of your right-wing colleagues in the media, including Rush –Limbaugh, Glenn Beck and the Washington Times, repeated it.

I should note that, again not surprisingly, you made no effort to check with me or anybody who works with me to find out if what you said was true. You made your assertion with no factual basis and without any effort to verify it. To me, that qualifies as a lie.

So I now write not simply to tell you that you are entirely wrong in your assertion about me but, in the absence of your being able to show any basis on which you made such a statement, to ask that you acknowledge that fact.

BARNEY FRANK.

WE THE PEOPLE, BY CALEB MATHENA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, now more than ever, young people across this country understand the gravity of the issues that we face today as a Nation. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take some time this evening to share a poem that was written by a ninth grade student in Washington State. This ninth grade student just happens to be my grandson. His name is Caleb Mathena, and he has written a poem. He sent me the poem and said, Papa, what do you think about this? I didn't know that he was writing this poem, but I was pleased to get it; and I am pleased to share it with those who are listening. It's called ''We the People.''

''We the people of freedom and choice, we elected our main voice, hired to keep our country strong, our rights secure and list of options long. Why is it then that this has happened? Why have they disregarded us in this matter? Thinking they know what's best or what we need, speeding through without the heed of what we choose, of what we demand, forgetting they are merely hired hands, easily removed, easily replaced.

''Perhaps that is what's best for these United States, knowing not humility, only selfish ideals. Now reacting blindly, regardless of how others feel. Secretly dealing, concealed by closed doors. Instead of candidly conveying, betraying what was promised before. What has it come to? Has it come to this? Where We the people are just dismissed?

□ 1730

As for me, I know that I won't be silent, won't just stand by. I will not watch as my country, our country is taken. I cannot nor will not sit back. I will not forsake it.

If we all stand up and state our thoughts, if we have the courage to secure our rights that our Founders painstakingly sought, if we wisely decide who would honestly be truly honest and unselfish leaders for our great country, surely then the land in which we live will remain free, free for my children's children to admire and see and say, ''If my forefathers fought obtaining liberty for me, then I can surely do likewise to the utmost degree.''

Mr. Speaker, this young man speaks words far beyond his 15 years on this Earth. He talks about liberty and freedom. This is the people's House, and sometimes we forget who we represent. Sometimes we forget who we work for. We work for the people of these United States. We must listen to these words and the words of our constituents; listen to the words of Caleb Mathena, a 15-year-old student, and all the people and citizens across this country; listen to the words of our constituents in our districts across the country and respect their wishes to preserve and protect the freedom that has been so bravely fought for by so many.

HONORING A LEGEND—BEN SPIES

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, here on the floor of the House of the United States House of Representatives, tribute must be paid to the incredible achievement of a constituent of the First District of Texas, from Longview—he's already a legend—Ben Spies. Ben won the 2009 FIM Superbike World Championship.

This brave and talented Texan started racing as an 8-year-old child with the Central Motorcycle Roadracing Association and, for good reason, has earned himself the nickname ''Texas Terror.'' Ben is the second youngest rider to win the American Motorcyclist Association Superbike Championship, and the fourth youngest rider with 20 AMA Superbike wins. He holds the third most all-time AMA Superbike wins, and boasts the longest AMA Superbike winning streak.

After coming off his third straight AMA Superbike Championship, Ben successfully beat the expected winner, Noriyuki Haga, at the 2009 FIM Superbike World Championship by six points with 11 poles in the 14 round series for a total of 28 races. The discipline, dedication and success that Ben has displayed to the sport of motocross racing over the past 16 years has truly set him apart as a true champion.

Ben Spies is to be congratulated upon his winning the 2009 FIM Superbike World Championship. He has no doubt blazed a trail for future successes with his steady hand, nerves of steel, and balance like nowhere found here in the House of Representatives.

May God bless and protect an American legend, Ben Spies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BROUN of Georgia addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HONORING THE FOUR CHAPLAINS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate a sacred memory in our Nation's history. It was 67 years ago today when a terrible event occurred and a brilliant event occurred. It was 67 years ago, February 3, 1943. We now call this memory the Four Chaplains Day and honor this day in our Nation's memory because of the valor and because of the strength that was exhibited by four members of our armed services, four chaplains.

It was the *U.S.A.T. Dorchester*. The ship was a coastal liner converted to a U.S. Army troop transport for World War II, and it was with more than 900 men on board. It was a freezing night when the *Dorchester*, one of three ships in a convoy, was torpedoed. It was freezing, and it was about 1:00 in the morning when a terrifying shot was fired by a Nazi submarine 100 miles off the frigid coast of Greenland, and the ship quickly began to sink in the cold, cold waters. Many Americans were killed by the explosion. Others were trapped below deck.

As everyone started to panic, the four chaplains on board remained calm. They quickly passed out life vests to the young troops on board. They helped the wounded. They prayed with the

troops that were on board. But then, tragically, when all the life vests had been distributed, there were more men than life vests, and the four chaplains, without skipping a beat, removed their own life vests that they had on their bodies and they handed them to the young troops who had none.

And as the ship went down, the four chaplains linked arms. And witnesses said they saw the chaplains, as young soldiers, fighting against the cold, swimming in the water. They saw the four chaplains with linked arms who embraced each other in a circle in the waters. They prayed for the troops who lost their lives and for those who would survive, and they prayed until the chaplains were no more.

The four chaplains were a Catholic, two Protestants, and a Jewish rabbi. Their names were Father John Washington, Catholic; Reverend Clark Poling, Dutch Reformed; Rabbi Alexander Goode, Jewish; Reverend George Fox, a Methodist. These four chaplains gave more than their spiritual guidance to the troops. They gave their lives on February 3, 1943.

It was a decade later that President Dwight Eisenhower remarked, he said, and I quote: And we remember that only a decade ago aboard the transport *Dorchester*, four chaplains of four faiths, together, willingly sacrificed their lives so that four other Americans might live. In the three centuries that separate the Pilgrims of the *Mayflower* from the chaplains of the *Dorchester*, America's freedom, her courage, her strength, and her progress have had their foundation in faith.

Eisenhower concluded: Today, as then, there is need for positive acts of renewed recognition that faith is our surest strength, our greatest resource. And in 1960, Mr. Speaker, Congress created a special Congressional Medal of Valor, never to be repeated again, and gave it to the next of kin of the immortal four chaplains. The Distinguished Service Cross and the Purple Heart were awarded posthumously in 1944.

May the greatest example of this greatest love fulfilling scripture that says, greater love hath no man than this, but that he lay down his life for his friend, may this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, this Congress, and the American people never forget the sacrifice of the four great chaplains. And may God forever bless and extend to them his peace for their memory.

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to enter and extend their remarks in the RECORD on this topic.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oho?

There was no objection.

Ms. FUDGE. I appreciate the opportunity to anchor this Special Order hour for the Congressional Black Caucus, the CBC. Currently, the CBC is chaired by the Honorable BARBARA LEE from the Ninth Congressional District of California. My name is Representative MARCIA L. FUDGE, and I represent the 11th Congressional District of Ohio.

CBC members are advocates for human rights and equality, nationally and internationally. Our members have played a significant role as local and regional activists, and continue to work diligently to be the conscience of the Congress.

As Members of Congress, CBC members also promote legislation to aid neglected citizens throughout the world. We understand that the United States, as a bellwether, has the ability to positively impact our neighbors abroad. This is why tonight we turn our attention to the grave situation in Haiti after last month's devastating earthquake.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my colleague and friend from the great State of New York, Representative CLARKE.

Ms. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, let me also thank Congresswoman FUDGE for her outstanding work in managing the time of the Congressional Black Caucus, the Special Orders, and for her expertise and talent that she lends to all of the subject matter.

This particular Special Order on aid to Haiti is of great relevance to me. As we all know, on January 12, 2010, a 7.0 magnitude earthquake rocked the Caribbean nation of Haiti, leaving most of the nation in utter devastation. Critical infrastructure was destroyed, and the death toll continues to rise as I speak, with reports estimating over 150,000 people perished.

As one of my local council members, Mr. Jumaane Williams, stated, or phrased it, in Brooklyn, New York, we were victim to a 7.0 emotional aftershock as members of our vibrant Haitian American community come to grips with the utter death, destruction, and devastation faced in their homeland. As a Brooklyn native whose roots are firmly planted in my Caribbean heritage, this tragedy has hit home in more ways than I could ever imagine. New York is home to the second largest population of Haitian immigrants in the United States, most of whom reside in my district.

I would like to take an opportunity to just recognize the Congressional Black Caucus for the leadership that they've taken in Congress in ensuring that we remain focused and committed to assist Haiti and to tend to the injured, orphaned, hungry, and dispossessed as Haiti continues with its recovery efforts.

I would like to thank Chairwoman BARBARA LEE of the Congressional Black Caucus for her longtime leadership and commitment to fighting on behalf of Haiti. I also want to applaud her hard work in bringing the resolution to the floor that we just passed expressing condolences to and solidarity with the people of Haiti in the aftermath of the devastating earthquake of January 12, 2010.

I'd also like to thank Chairman CHARLES RANGEL and Majority Whip JIM CLYBURN for working quickly to get H.R. 4462 passed in the House. This legislation would allow all individuals who choose to donate during this time of crisis in Haiti to claim an itemized charitable deduction on this year's—2009, excuse me—tax return.

As Haiti continues to recover, my heart goes out to my Haitian sisters and brothers as they endure this tragedy. I also express my deep sympathy and support for their families.

Through all of the devastation, all of the trauma, the 11th Congressional District of New York, like the rest of this Nation and the global community, has demonstrated a unity of purpose in mobilizing goods, services, and volunteers to help their families and relations in Haiti.

While I will continue to applaud the humanitarian efforts for Haiti, it is important that we do not allow compassion fatigue to set in.

□ 1745

We must continue to uphold our commitment to helping our neighbors in the Caribbean. As a representative with the second-largest population of first- and second-generation Haitian immigrants located in my district, my office has been inundated and overwhelmed with calls from concerned constituents worried about their loved ones and their homeland. While my office has been vigorously working with the State Department to meet the needs of our constituents, there are many concerns that still need to be addressed.

For many Haitian Americans, a major issue is family reunification. Most of their family members have lost everything, many are sick, injured, and living on the streets; babies and the elderly are vulnerable to disease; a majority of them are traumatized by their experiences.

And since my constituents are blessed to live in the United States—many of them have obtained their citizenship—they have the capacity to take care of their family members, they have the wherewithal to console, comfort, and nurse their families back to health and support their material needs.

The only thing that impedes this reunification is that their family members are not American citizens and-or legal permanent residents and do not rank highly on the immigration priority list.

I would encourage the administration to address this issue and work to reunite family members who are suffering from this devastation.

And in response to this tragedy, on January 15, 2010, the Obama administration—which is to be commended for its quick action and its steadfast commitment—has granted temporary protected status to Haitian nationals currently in the United States. Unfortunately, there are those who try to take advantage and exploit those who seek to change their status, and I am concerned that there are fraudulent entities offering services and inflating the prices of the TPS application process for Haitians seeking it.

It is important that we empower our residents affected by the devastation with the information and resources they need to access this status. That is why just last week I joined my colleagues in the New York City congressional delegation, State delegation, and New York City delegation in the opening of the Haitian Family Resource Center at the Brooklyn armory. The center will be a one-stop resource center for families who have been impacted by the earthquake. It will offer Creole-speaking translation services, immigration assistance, and help with completing immigration applications, child guardianship, and custody services, legal assistance, and help in locating family members, mental health services, coordination of volunteer efforts, and daily accurate briefings on the status of relief efforts.

Know that I will continue to work closely with my colleagues, the Obama administration, and Caribbean officials to help this Nation recover from this natural disaster.

I want to thank you once again, my colleague, for sharing this time where we can share information with the Nation about what is taking place in Haiti and ask that they continue to hold this Nation, our Caribbean neighbors, in their prayers

Ms. FUDGE. Thank you very much.

I just want to, as well, thank you for your passion on this issue and for all of the work that you have done, as you say, representing one of the largest Haitian-American groups in this country. So I would like to say thank you for all of us members of the CBC.

Mr. Speaker, as members of the CBC, we extend our deepest sympathy and our support to the people of Haiti. The nation, of course, recently experienced the largest recorded earthquake in its history. On January 12, the quake devastated many parts of the country, including the capital of Port-au-Prince. To put the earthquake in some kind of scale, it had a magnitude of 7.0 and a series of strong aftershocks. There have been at least 52 aftershocks at 4.5 magnitude or above. The damage is severe and catastrophic.

The government of Haiti is reporting an estimated 112,000 deaths and 194,000 injured. The New York Times reports that 225,000 homes were severely damaged or collapsed, and nearly one-third of the country's population are currently at risk of long-term displacement and vulnerability.

In total, it is estimated that 3 million people have been negatively affected by the earthquake.

In the immediate wake of the earthquake, Haiti's President Rene Garcia Preval described conditions in his country as unimaginable and appealed for international assistance. Humanitarian assistance from the United States and from all over the world has been generous.

The United States in the first two weeks following the earthquake sent aid workers focused in three areas. First, these workers immediately searched for survivors and provided rescue assistance. Teams with heavy-lifting equipment, medical equipment, and triage supplies were moved into the country. Volunteers next addressed Haitians' critical needs for food, clean water, and sanitation, medical assistance, and emergency shelter. And thirdly, they provided emergency relief experts to set up infrastructure and logistics operations.

Numerous Americans have provided donations to fund these efforts. Also, the Congressional Black Caucus joined President Obama in calling for continued financial aid for Haiti's quake survivors. The sheer scale of the relief effort in Haiti has brought together a tremendous capacity and a willingness to help.

The massive humanitarian relief operation underway in Haiti has been hampered by a number of significant challenges, including a general lack of transportation, extremely limited communication systems, and damaged infrastructure. The relief effort is expected to last for many, many months and recovery and reconstruction will begin as soon as possible.

President Barack Obama assembled heads of U.S. agencies to begin working immediately on a coordinated response to this disaster. The U.S. Agency For International Development, better known as USAID, through the Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance, is the lead agency within the U.S. Government responding to this disaster.

On January 14, the administration announced $100 million in humanitarian assistance to Haiti to meet the immediate needs on the ground. The Department of Homeland Security has temporarily halted the deportation of Haitians and granted temporary protective status for 18 months to Haitian nationals who were in the United States as of January 12, 2010.

President Obama has pledged an aggressive coordinated effort by the U.S. Government. The State Department, Department of Defense, Department of Homeland Security, Coast Guard, and USAID have already mobilized to ensure that critical resources are positioned to support the response-and-recovery effort, including efforts to find and assist American citizens in Haiti. Members of the Congressional Black Caucus have proactively engaged to facilitate aid to Haiti.

Recently, I joined my colleagues in the House of Representatives to unanimously pass H.R. 4462. The resolution would allow individuals who made charitable contributions to those in Haiti to claim an itemized charitable deduction on their 2009 tax return instead of waiting until next year. The legislation also allows those who made donations via text message to use phone bills as proof of donation.

I was proud to be an original cosponsor of this bipartisan legislation. Representative MEEK coordinated a letter to Speaker PELOSI, Minority Leader BOEHNER, Appropriations Chairman OBEY, and Appropriations Ranking Member LEWIS requesting robust emergency funding to assist Haiti.

Immediate U.S. assistance to Haiti in the wake of the catastrophic earthquake is vital to support stability in that very fragile country. Representative MAXINE WATERS is introducing a bill to require the Treasury Department to cancel Haiti's debts. The government of Haiti cannot afford to invest in humanitarian relief, reconstruction, and development efforts while continuing to make payments on debts owed to multilateral financial institutions like the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, and the Inter-American Development Bank.

Even before the earthquake, debt service payments to these institutions were a tremendous burden that interfered with the ability of the government of Haiti to meet the needs of its people.

The bill requires Secretary Geithner to support three specific actions that should be a part of the international community's response to this very, very terrible tragedy. The first is the complete cancellation of all remaining debts owed by Haiti to multilateral financial institutions; secondly, the suspension of Haiti's debt service payments to these institutions until such time as the debts are canceled; and thirdly, the provision of additional assistance to Haiti in the form of grants so that the country does not accumulate additional debts.

Representative MEEK, in coordination with Chairman SKELTON and Representative MACK, have introduced a resolution to commemorate the efforts of the United States Armed Forces, of local first responders, and other members of Operation Unified Response for their swift and coordinated action in response to the earthquake in Haiti. I am proud to say I have supported each of these initiatives.

There has been an outpouring of international support for Haiti. The first priority has been saving lives. That means getting water, food, shelter, medicine, and other basic supplies to victims. Beyond the essentials are issues of security and debt repayments, both of which can undermine rebuilding efforts. The United Nation's Secretary General Ban Ki-moon sought approval from the Security Council to send an additional 3,500 security officers to Haiti. The officers are needed both to maintain public order and to

guard deliveries of food and aid. So far, violence has been scattered, but fears of violence grow as the difficulties of living without water, food, and shelter mount.

As World Bank President Robert Zolick has said, outside support should be in the form of grants. Through grants, money can be appropriated according to goals and capacity while easing Haiti's debt burden. For example, Haiti owes about $38 million to the World Bank. Mr. Zolick, however, announced that no debt repayments would be due for the next 5 years, and the World Bank is seeking to cancel all of Haiti's remaining debt owed to it.

Many relief organizations are accepting donations to send to Haitians. Cash donations are the most efficient and effective way to help the relief effort in Haiti right now. They allow humanitarian organizations to purchase—often within the affected region itself—the exact type and quantity of items needed by those affected by the crisis.

You can find organizations and ways to help through the White House's Web site, which is www.whitehouse.gov or visit the U.S. Agency for International Development's Web site at www.usaid.gov, which has a list of nongovernmental organizations and instructions on how to help.

Mr. Speaker, Haiti is the world's first black-led republic and the first Caribbean state to achieve independence, in 1804. Haiti is still plagued by violent confrontations between rival gangs and political groups. Current President Rene Preval won the presidential election in February 2006 with 51 percent of the vote.

Haiti's serious underlying social problem, the wealth gap between the impoverished Creole-speaking majority and the French-speaking minority—1 percent of whom own nearly half of the country's wealth—remains unresolved.

Even prior to the earthquake, Haiti's infrastructure had all but collapsed and drug trafficking has become a major problem.

□ 1800

Today, Haiti is the poorest, least developed country in the Western Hemisphere and prior to the earthquake was ranked 149 out of 182 countries on the United Nations Human Development Index.

We've all seen the pictures on the TV of the children of Haiti. It is heartbreaking. We all recognize the urgent need for assistance to the smallest of the earthquake's victims. The outpouring of sympathy has led many to consider adopting a Haitian child. However, Mr. Speaker, the U.S. State Department recently announced that new adoption applications are not being processed. At this time, the main priority is reuniting children with their families. The process of determining whether a child is an orphan is a long and complicated one. The recent adoptions that have been processed were Haitian children who had previously been matched and cleared for entry into the United States.

Since last week, the U.N. Children's Fund, UNICEF, and its partners have identified and registered some 200 unaccompanied children found in orphanages and wandering in neighborhoods in Port-au-Prince. Based on the given information and photographs taken, workers will begin to trace the families of these children, if they exist. A similar registry was used after the 2004 tsunami in Indonesia and more recently in cyclone-hit Myanmar.

For now, the best assistance that individuals can provide is to make a financial contribution to a reputable relief or humanitarian organization working in Haiti.

Days after the earthquake, Secretary of Homeland Security Janet Napolitano announced the designation of Temporary Protective Status of Haitian nationals who were in the United States as of January 12, 2010. This designation will allow eligible Haitian nationals in the United States to continue living and working in our community for the next 18 months. TPS will provide a temporary refuge for Haitian nationals who are currently in the United States and whose personal safety would be endangered by returning to Haiti. Granting TPS to Haitians would provide them with the ability to work legally and contribute to the reconstruction of their country until it is safe for them to return.

Haiti has enormous potential, but rebuilding the country requires a coordinated strategy. Here in the U.S., we can support the transition from humanitarian assistance to reconstruction through cash-for-work programs, so Haitians can be paid for clearing roadways and reconstructing infrastructure. Haiti can also boost its private sector by investing in and building the infrastructure for power grids, ports and roads. Also important is revitalizing agriculture so that Haitians can replace food aid programs with food harvested from their own farms.

To jump-start the Haitian economy, in 2008 Congress passed the Haiti Opportunity through Partnership Encouragement Act, better known as the HOPE Act, which provides special rules for the duty-free treatment of select apparel imports which is Haiti's dominant manufacturing sector. With access to the United States market through this agreement, Haiti can create jobs in its apparel and agricultural sectors.

Haiti's reconstruction must create jobs for Haitians, grow the Haitian economy, instill confidence in the government, and be managed transparently. This will require Haitians to unify, since foreign assistance can only go so far. The Haitian people working with their government must come together to rebuild a newer, stronger Haiti.

The difficulties faced by Haiti should not deter us from providing assistance. Our leadership and moral strength is only enhanced when we help others. Truly, we lift as we rise.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my good friend, distinguished colleague and one who knows much about the Haiti situation, Mr. DONALD PAYNE from New Jersey.

Mr. PAYNE. Let me express my appreciation to the gentlelady from Cleveland for calling this Special Order. She has been such a tremendous resource to the Congressional Black Caucus. And as we know, the Congressional Black Caucus has been very involved in Haiti for many, many years. For the 22 years that I have been a Member of this Congress, Haiti has always been number one on the agenda. And we went through the years when there were dictatorships, and then the elections and President Aristide being elected to office, and then his being deposed and the military, General Cedras, Biamby and those folks took over. And then President Clinton having the foresight to restore President Aristide; 22,000 U.S. troops went to restore democracy without us having even one casualty. And the current situation where President Aristide left and the new government of Preval. So we have been involved throughout the years.

Let me tell you that when we heard the news of the earthquake, 7.0 on the Richter scale, only 6 miles deep, bringing it so close to the surface it made the magnitude even greater, the aftershocks that continued, we immediately said we must do something and do something quickly and do something drastic. So since the earthquake, the Congressional Black Caucus has mobilized to holding emergency meetings regarding Haiti with USAID, the Department of State, nongovernmental organizations, and other stakeholders in the region to get a sense of the effort on the ground in order to take information back to our constituents and organize the legislative efforts in Congress.

On Wednesday, January 13, the CBC international task force called an emergency meeting with the CBC staff regarding the devastation in Haiti. USAID Deputy Administrator John Brause briefed staff about the U.S. response and the extent of the situation. Counselor Cheryl Mills, chief of staff to Secretary of State Clinton, briefed CBC members on January 13 and January 15. The Congressional Black Caucus held a Haiti disaster assistance meeting with Members to discuss legislative efforts and opportunities that we could then move right into effect.

Various members of the Congressional Black Caucus hosted conference calls with their constituents to provide them with updates about relief efforts that were being made in our respective districts. We had tremendous interest in different parts and in our State of New Jersey, New Jersey for Haiti was formed, www.nj4haiti.org. And that organization, which I cochair with Senator Lesniak, said that we needed to move quickly into action. And Stan

Neron, who is a social service worker in the city of Elizabeth was able to get the United Way of the Greater Union County to be partners in arranging drives for supplies and listed organizations that could receive contributions, Red Cross and other organizations, that were already doing work throughout the land.

And so as I indicated, the CBC jumped into our meetings at the conference calls. We had a Special Order following news on January 12. Immediately, members of the Congressional Black Caucus came to the floor to discuss the earthquake in Haiti and relief efforts and what we intended to do. And the following day, on the 14th of January, Congressional Black Caucus members were briefed via a conference call with David Meltzer, senior vice president for the international affairs of the American Red Cross. On the 15th of January, Congressional Black Caucus members were briefed through a conference call by the State Department for updates. And so we just remained very active.

The week of January 18 to 22, the Congressional Black Caucus leadership introduced and passed two bipartisan measures on Haiti in Congress. Tuesday the 19th, Chairwoman LEE, on behalf of the caucus, introduced legislation expressing condolences to and solidarity with the people of Haiti. And in the aftermath of this devastating earthquake, Chairman CHARLIE RANGEL of the important Ways and Means Committee introduced a bipartisan piece of legislation, H.R. 4462, that would allow individuals making a charitable contribution after January 11 and before March 1 to victims of the earthquake in Haiti to claim these charitable deductions on their 2009 tax returns. Absent this change, taxpayers would need to wait until next year to claim a deduction for these contributions on their 2010 tax forms. And so this will speed up deductions eligible for 2009.

The bill also makes it clear that taxpayers making a charitable contribution to victims of the Haiti earthquake through text messages would be able to rely on the cell phone bill while claiming charitable deductions, the first time any activity or action of this nature has been done.

The CBC international task force held a staff meeting to discuss the next steps on Haiti on that day of January 19 and the committee that I am privileged to chair. On Wednesday, January 20, the CBC members were briefed by Ambassador Raymond Alcide Joseph, Haiti's Ambassador to the United States.

The legislation that we had, we are also in the process of developing. What we have done in our meetings, we've taken a look to see what we can do with the U.S. citizenship and immigration services to discuss TPS and humanitarian parole and other important items. The CBC looked at other issues. Representative HANK JOHNSON'S office drafted a letter to Secretary Clinton and Gates detailing details about the use of security contractors as a part of ongoing relief. Congresswoman WATERS is working on Haiti debt cancellation of bills, and Representative MEEKS from New York is dealing with a Marshall Plan on Haiti. I intend to ask the Earth Institute at Columbia University, Dr. Sachs, to come to brief the Congressional Black Caucus about the future of Haiti and planning: How should new Haiti be planned? How should Port-au-Prince be redone? How should satellite cities be created? Because we feel that this is an opportunity now to right many of the wrongs that had happened in the past.

The House Foreign Affairs Committee will have a hearing on Haiti in the next few weeks, and Congressman MEEKS will be holding a hearing on international financial institutions and how they can assist Haiti. Congressman JOHN CONYERS has been in contact with the Air Force liaison. He is going to participate when the time is right in CBC members taking trips to Haiti to see firsthand what we should do. We've been reluctant from going down en masse because we wanted to have our agency people on the ground be free to do things that need to be done. However, when the time is right, we will have a large delegation of members of the CBC to go.

As you know on the 21st of January, the CBC held a press conference to discuss the congressional response to the earthquake. Our CBC met with TransAfrica, its director, Nicole Lee, and Melinda Miles working together for Haiti, NGOs that have been on the ground for many years to find out what is the position of the NGOs and how do they see the situation and how can they better assist as we move forward. CBC facilitated a call with NGO leaders working in Haiti with the Department of State to discuss NGO's experiences and concerns as the U.S. builds and executes recovery and relief and the rebuilding of Haiti. And we found that very instructive for the NGOs and for the Department of State.

On the 19th, the CBC international task force held a staff meeting to discuss the priorities again as relates to it. Congressman CUMMINGS, the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation, held a briefing regarding the United States Coast Guard and its ongoing work in Haiti.

□ 1815

We held a press conference at the Haitian Embassy. The CBC went and met with the Haitian Government and we talked about various problems. We wanted to take a look at the TPS guide. We looked at the CARACOM memo. We discussed Haiti's debt relief numbers from Treasury. We have dealt with the CBC constituency outreach guide. And these were all things, as I indicated, that the Congressional Black Caucus has done.

As I wind down, I just want to once again remind Americans that Haiti has been a tremendous part of the growth and the development of our Nation. As I have mentioned on the floor before, it was back in the late 1800s when the enslaved people of Haiti had a rebellion against the Government of France, and Napoleon's army, after 12 years' struggle, lost the war to Haiti; Haiti becoming the first country where enslaved people overthrew the power, European power, and became a republic, just the third republic ever in the world at that time.

So we have a tremendous amount of regard and respect for Haiti as they defeated the French, therefore causing France to lose much of the wealth that it gained from Haiti. Half of the sugar and coffee and cocoa, other products in Europe, 50 percent of them came from Haiti alone. Haiti produced more wealth to France than all of the 13 original colonies gave to the U.S. Government.

And so Haiti, once it became independent from France, France became cash poor. But it still had land in the Louisiana Territory and, as a result of their defeat, were forced to sell the Louisiana Territory, negotiated by Jefferson, to the United States. And that opened up the West for the United States.

As a matter of fact, France had armies of 20,000 persons where the U.S. Army was just about 5,000 strong. So the French had a more powerful military here in the Western Hemisphere and would have been a problem for the United States had not the treaty been made and France being forced to sell the Louisiana Territory.

Many other Haitians are involved in our history. The Battle of Savannah, where Haitians fought for our independence, valiantly losing lives but helping to turn the tide of the Revolutionary War. We know that Jean Baptiste Pointe du Sable, popularly known as the Father of Chicago, was a Haitian colonist in North America, mixed French and Haitian ancestry, and he was the person that discovered Chicago and was really called the Father of Chicago back in 1968. So there are so many people of Haitian descent, and Haiti itself, that has a great deal to do with our development.

Finally, let me just mention this last point, that when World War II began, the U.S. started to become concerned about the dependence of rubber from a territory that was going to be controlled by the Japanese. By 1942, the Indonesians, the British-controlled rubber plantations provided 99 percent of the commercial rubber for the world. In the earliest stages of World War II, the United States realized the disastrous consequence if rubber plantations fell to Japan. This would cut off to the United States and its allies rubber supplies, an absolutely critical commodity, as you know, not only for the economy, but to keep a war effort moving forward.

The United States made some presentations in 1940 and 1941. We started to

increase our rubber stockpiles. However, botanists went to Haiti to attempt to grow rubber trees in Haiti. The Haitian rubber project was not supposed to be a part of the war effort, but it really was. It was not something that was necessary if we were not concerned about rubber being cut off from the United States. What happened, though, is that much of the land was denuded. Natural habitat was destroyed. Ebony trees and plants that were natural in Haiti were taken out, and the attempt to grow rubber trees was started on large portions of land. There were some Haitian botanists who said that it would not work; however, the U.S. insisted on trying the experiment.

Today, one of the biggest problems in Haiti is erosion. It is because of deforestation, because people are dependent on wood for homes and heating. However, this dastardly situation started actually by the United States for the war effort with the attempt to grow foreign seeds that would not grow in that kind of topography. So, once again, as we look at the tremendous erosion that is abundant in Haiti today, the beginning of it happened to be at the time when the United States felt that it needed to have the growth of rubber trees in our hemisphere in a place that was close to the United States.

And so even, once again, as we look at how Haiti has impacted on the United States, this consequence of a negative development on the part of the U.S. Government I think once again is a reason that we should have a strong passion for our sister country Haiti.

So we will continue in New Jersey to continue to move forward with all of the many people that are involved. We look forward to having a mass at the basilica near the end of the month of February. Our Governor is going to provide an office that we can work with to try to be sure that people who may be coming with TPS and other problems, family unification, parole, adoption, that we will be able to service these people who are crying out for help.

So with that, I see one of my colleagues here from the great State of Texas, Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE, who has really done a tremendous amount of work in this area and sits on important committees and certainly has a great deal to contribute.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from Texas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LUJÁN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader, approximately 16 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Let me thank, first of all, the chairman of the Africa Subcommittee and Global Health Committee of the Foreign Affairs, Mr. PAYNE. There is no doubt of his recounting of the enormous history that has been involved around Haiti, but also the track record of the Congressional Black Caucus. So let me continue my remarks, and I will yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I note on this Congressional Black Caucus hour that two of our members have come to the floor: the chairwoman, the Honorable BARBARA LEE, and the member from California, chairwoman of the Financial Services Committee and recent returnee from Haiti, MAXINE WATERS.

So I will just recount, as the chairman just did, Chairman PAYNE, a lot of the work that we have done here in the United States. But also, in case many wonder why we are continuing this effort and why we have made a commitment as members of the Congressional Black Caucus to never give up and to never give out on Haiti and to view this as a long-term recovery and restoration is because the damage is so devastating. This reflects the early stages of the collapse of whole neighborhoods, literally the collapse of Port-au-Prince, and the devastating disaster that the people still face.

Today, as we are looking at recovery, there are Haitians lifting stones by hand, one by one, to remove some of the debris that is already there. Knowing that between 150,000 to 200,000 are known or expected dead, we know that behind this rubble there are lost loved ones who have yet to be accounted for. Some 4,000 Americans are unaccounted for. U.N. workers are unaccounted for. And so when we talk about this today or next week or maybe in March or in April, maybe in June, you will understand the magnitude of devastation.

I know that many of us can recall briefly the earthquake around northern California and San Francisco and Oakland. We remembered a baseball game that was either in session or not, one of the more stark earthquakes, and remember the response, the fear, the stopping of the game, the damage. But this was a 7.0 on the Richter scale. And to see all of the beauty of this island destroyed, all of the history. This is one of the islands that has some of the greatest history that one could imagine and people who are proud. This is where people live now. This is where our children live. This is where babies are born, on the streets of Port-au-Prince and elsewhere.

So we are not here for a reason that is made up. We are here because, as we speak, these are the homes of people who are living in a devastating condition. No, this was not a rich nation, but people worked every day. They wanted to provide for their families. They were not interested in handouts. They wanted to build their nation. Now, today, unlike we have ever experienced, we can see the overwhelming devastation here in Haiti. And, again, the tragedy is, who is still not found?

So I rise today to comment on the question: Why is America responding and why is the Congressional Black Caucus a conscience of that response?

Today, we were able to hear from the newly appointed USAID administrator as invited by the chairwoman, BARBARA LEE, and attended by forty-plus members of the Congressional Black Caucus, tightly fitting in a room, listening intently to how we can move this tragedy forward and helping the people.

America is responding. We will continue to respond with immediate humanitarian assistance to help the people of this struggling island to rebuild their livelihood. There is still no estimate of death or destruction, but the damage to buildings is extensive, and the number of injured or dead is estimated to be in the hundreds of thousands. We can already see that this is a continuing example.

We look forward to Haitians helping themselves. The United States Government has already contributed $402 million in earthquake response funding for Haiti and has already deployed approximately 17,000 in military personnel, somewhat like the military personnel that was in Hurricane Katrina.

This is not an effort to remove the sovereignty of Haiti, and we are working very closely with President Preval, and we understand the sovereignty of this nation-state and we respect its leadership. And so we are moving quickly toward a Government of Haiti-led effort. The U.N. World Food Program will provide commodities, nongovernmental organizations will manage distributions, and U.S. military will provide security escorts, but it will be led by the Haitian Government.

America and her allies have already initiated a comprehensive interagency response to the earthquake, and we believe it is important, as we mentioned today, that there be one general of all of these agencies: the State Department, Department of Defense, the Department of Homeland Security, the Coast Guard, and, of course, USAID. There has to be a way of organizing this effort.

I am very pleased to make note of the fact that in the meeting I made a request to the USAID administrator to respond to all of the churches that have been calling Members of Congress and calling the State Department, all of the faith community, churches, parishes, mosques, and others, and synagogues and other houses of faith who want to help. The USAID administrator indicated that they would appoint a faith liaison to be able to work with all of the religious bodies in order for them to do the right thing.

Right as we stand here today, there are a group of religious persons who are now held by the Haitian Government. To our knowledge, they are still there. Their representation was that they wanted to help the children. I don't disregard that fact. I am sure that there were good intentions. But we know, in the protection of these children, we must have order. We must have a regulation, regular order, if you

will. There must be a process of giving relief and helping these children who are now orphaned. And the Haitian people love their children.

So I am looking for ways of temporarily deploying children for medical help. There must be an airlift for the second stage of surgeries that these children with broken arms and legs and bodily injury and gangrene have the ability to come for temporary care.

□ 1830

But we cannot have an irregular process of people going forward to try to secure these children. We want to help these religious leaders, who we believe had wonderful and good intentions. There are those in my community who have reached out to me to try and help them. But as we help them, we have to make sure that there is a precise way of dealing with the children.

Within days of last week's devastation, the Southern Command deployed a team of 30 people to Haiti to support U.S. relief efforts. There are many from around the world that are helping, and there are many who are working individually.

So I would make the point that we want to continue working with our faith community. When you hear us, there is a reason. They are in need for more resources. There is clearly a need of a long-term recovery and building Haiti against this kind of devastation. And yes, I will continue to work to secure and protect the children of Haiti.

I close by yielding to the gentlelady by saying this. Allow me to thank the diaspora, all of the Haitian Americans all over the Nation. Let me particularly thank, with a heavy, heavy emphasis on their dedication, the Haitian American community in Houston, Texas, and all of the help that they have done. We look forward to them being able to go home to check on their relatives and to be of help. And let me thank the medical doctors of the Texas Medical Center, and two airplanes, doctors and nurses that I was able to secure to come down to Haiti and help within 48 hours of the earthquake. Let me make note of the Houston Rotarians as well, who are there to be of help. We will not give up on the people of Haiti and the nation of Haiti.

I rise today in order to highlight America's humanitarian response to the earthquake that struck Haiti on January 12th—just over 3 weeks ago. I want to commend each agency involved in the humanitarian response.

As you know, on Tuesday, January 12th, a massive, 7.0 magnitude earthquake struck Haiti near the capital of Port-au-Prince. There is still no official estimate of death or destruction, but the damage to buildings is extensive and the number of injured or dead is estimated to be in the hundreds of thousands.

America is responding, and will continue to respond with immediate humanitarian assistance to help the people of this struggling island nation rebuild their livelihoods. I send my condolences to the people and government of Haiti as they grieve once again in the aftermath of a natural disaster. As Haiti's neighbor, I believe it is the United States responsibility to help Haiti recover, and build the capacity to mitigate against future disasters.

To date, the United States Government has contributed nearly $402 million in earthquake response funding for Haiti. It has also deployed approximately 17,000 military personnel in support of the relief effort. Subsequently, as part of the new Government of Haiti-lead effort, the U.N. World Food Program will provide commodities, nongovernmental organizations will manage distributions, and U.S. Military will provide security escorts.

America and her allies have already initiated a comprehensive, interagency response to the earthquake. The State Department, Department of Defense, Department of Homeland Security, Coast Guard, USAID—all worked overnight to ensure critical resources were positioned to support the response and recovery effort, including efforts to find and assist American citizens in Haiti.

Within days of the devastating earthquake, U.S. Southern Command deployed a team of 30 people to Haiti to support U.S. relief efforts in the aftermath of one of the largest natural disasters in the western hemisphere. The team included U.S. military engineers, operational planners, and a command and control group and communication specialists arriving on two C–130 Hercules aircraft. Since, there has been a tremendous interagency response with support and partnering with U.S. Embassy personnel as well as Haitian, United Nations and international officials to assess the situation and facilitate follow-on U.S. military support.

Our friends in the international community must also be commended for their efforts. The United Nations is releasing $10 million from its emergency funds. The European Commission has approved C3 million ($4.37 million) with more funds likely. Countless other nations from Germany, to China, to Israel to Mexico to have also pledged support. I commend each of these nations for coming to our neighboring nation in dire need of assistance.

Many of my constituents have asked what they can do to help, or how they can find their loved ones. Those who are interested in helping immediately can text ''HAITI'' to ''90999'' and a donation of $10 will be made automatically to the Red Cross for relief efforts. The donation will be charged to your cell phone bill.

The outpouring of support and funding from the American people was both instant and sustained. According to the Washington Post, the text messaging effort raised $5 million in its first day, breaking the previous one-day record of about $450,000. Text-message donations continue to play a larger-than-expected role in the push for earthquake relief in Haiti. As of late Sunday, the American Red Cross said that it had collected pledges of about $103 million, including $22 million through the text donation program. Each donor should be proud of their contribution to help their brothers and sisters in Haiti.

Financially, 2009 was not an easy year for many Americans. Although thousands of jobs were created and we are back on the road to economic recovery, Americans lived on tighter budgets than usual. On January 20th, Congress passed H.R. 4462 which accelerated the income tax benefits for charitable cash contributions for the relief of victims of the earthquake in Haiti. This legislation will allow those Americans who have generously donated money to Haiti to receive their tax break this year instead of next year.

In January of 2005, Congress enacted this type of relief for individuals that made charitable contributions to victims of the Indian Ocean tsunami that occurred in late December of 2004. That bill (H.R. 241 in the 109th Congress) passed the House of Representatives without objection and subsequently passed the Senate by unanimous consent. I hope that this legislation, like our response to the 2004 tsunami, will encourage Americans to contribute more money to Haiti. As Haiti starts on its long recovery, every dollar is critically important. Americans have responded in great numbers, and I am proud to represent such a compassionate and generous nation.

Americans are not only giving their money, they are also giving their time and expertise as well. Immediately after the earthquake, I arranged for a team of seven doctors, six nurses, two techs, and two search and rescue volunteers to fly to Haiti and provide immediate humanitarian support. This team led by Dr. Richard Toussaint from Forest Park Medical Center in Dallas, Texas arrived in Haiti just after noon on Saturday. From there, the doctors made their way to Hospital SacreCouer where, in roughly two days, they performed about 70 amputations, surgically treated about 150 patients, and saw about 600 patients total. I commend this team of medical personnel for their selfless actions and willingness to spend their own time and money to come to the aid of people they had never met.

Additionally, I hosted a Houston-based Haiti relief effort called ''Texans helping Haitians'' with city leadership and the Haitian community in the aftermath of this horrible disaster. Groups included in the effort to provide supplies and medical assistance to Haiti were: Texas Medical Center, Texas Dental Association, Search and Rescue Organizations, the Haitian Multicultural Association, Haitian Caribbean Organization of Texas, Caribbean Impact Foundation, and Haiti Counts.

I also helped coordinate the safe return of six Houston Rotarians that were stranded in the mountains and we are now working with Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance on the transport of orphans to awaiting families here in the U.S.

Recently, I proposed a plan that would increase the ability of the U.S. to assist Haiti in its efforts toward reconstruction and stabilization to Dr. Rajiv Shah, the Administrator of the U.S. Agency for International Development.

This plan would create an oversight position within the USAID that would coordinate and regulate faith-based and non-profit organizations operating in the reconstruction efforts in Haiti. I also recommended the creation of a U.S. civilian corps, an extension of the American Peace Corps, that would be tasked the specific mission of assisting reconstruction efforts in Haiti. This civilian entity would serve as a supplemental contingent which could be incrementally dispatched as needed by U.S. Government agencies or nongovernment organizations.

Once again I stand in solidarity with the people of Haiti and will do everything in my power to assist them with rebuilding their country and livelihoods.

I will be happy to yield to the gentlelady from California to manage the rest of the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) is recognized for the remainder of the hour, approximately 10 minutes, as the designee of the majority leader.

Ms. LEE of California. Thank you very much.

Let me thank the gentlelady for yielding and for that very powerful presentation, and for your leadership and commitment to especially the children of Haiti.

Good evening. It has been just over three weeks since a devastating earthquake rocked the nation of Haiti, devastating its capital city Port-au-Prince and the surrounding area. The damage seems unfathomable, yet it is real. The loss of life is staggering and the destruction of homes and infrastructure is tremendous.

As Chair of the 42-member Congressional Black Caucus, I want to reiterate that our thoughts and prayers continue to be with the people of Haiti during this difficult time.

Since the earthquake of January 12 many members of the Congressional Black Caucus have stood on the floor of this House to talk about and bring attention to the needs of the people of Haiti and the Haitian American community. We will continue to speak out and speak up on their behalf because the needs are urgent and they are real.

The Congressional Black Caucus has a long history of working with Haiti, and many of us have traveled to the country multiple times. Beyond our personal involvement with Haiti, the United States and Haiti share a long and historical relationship that began with the trans-Atlantic slave trade, which placed millions of people of African descent in human bondage throughout the Western Hemisphere.

Our brothers and sisters who found themselves in Haiti led the way to freedom and independence for the African Diaspora in the Caribbean and the Americas when they established the world's first ''Black-led Republic,'' established by former slaves. It was also one of the first nations in the world to break the bonds of colonialism, providing inspiration to millions of oppressed peoples around the globe.

Haitians fought for their independence—and literally paid for their freedom by paying substantial tributes to their former colonizers, creating a financial hardship that has endured for generations and directly contributes to Haiti's underdevelopment today. The world has a historic and moral obligation to help the people of Haiti in their time of need.

During the current crisis, the CBC has worked closely with the Obama administration and nongovernmental organizations to provide whatever assistance we can to the humanitarian relief efforts underway. Just today, we met with USAID Administrator Rajiv Shah to voice our concerns and offer our continued partnership as the administration continues its ongoing emergency relief and begins to formulate a longer-term agenda for reconstruction.

And a week ago, members of the CBC met with Raymond Joseph, Ambassador of Haiti to the United States. During this meeting we communicated two overarching messages.

First, we reaffirmed our continued, ongoing commitment and solidarity with the Haitian people.

Second, we emphasized that the CBC would like to coordinate our work with that of President Obama's administration, the Government of Haiti, and the Haitian people to develop an overarching relief, reconstruction, and development agenda.

Given the CBC's long history with Haiti, our members have many ideas and initiatives—legislative or otherwise—that we believe can assist the government and the people of Haiti in relief and recovery and reconstruction efforts.

These include efforts to promote debt relief and to coordinate aid distribution on the ground.

But most importantly, we must establish a comprehensive assistance framework in partnership with the Government of Haiti and in coordination with other donors to promote the long-term development of Haiti. In short, we need a Marshall Plan for Haiti, with Haitian nongovernmental organizations and the Haitian Diaspora playing a vital role in its formulation and implementation.

To offer just one example, last year I introduced H.R. 417, the Next Steps for Haiti Act. This legislation would create a professional exchange program to assign U.S. professionals, particularly in the Haitian Diaspora, to provide technical assistance to Haiti in critical development-related fields—such as healthcare, infrastructure, and disaster preparedness.

Initiatives such as these could go a long way towards empowering the Haitian people to rebuild and work towards the betterment of their country.

Moving forward, we are committed to working with the Haitian government and organizations on the ground—who know their country oh so well—to meet their short-, medium-, and long-term needs of their country. Once the cameras are gone, and Haiti is off the front pages and the 24-hour news cycle, we will continue to be there. We, the CBC, are in it for the long haul.

I would like to yield now to the gentlelady from California (Ms. WATERS), a Member of Congress who is not only a legislator, but also a great humanitarian. We saw her very recently in Haiti, as she went to Katrina to help those during the search and rescue phase, and is back now to join us tonight on the floor to talk about not only her recent experiences, but her long-standing commitment to Haiti and her work on Haiti. Thank you very much.

Ms. WATERS. I would like to thank the chairlady of the Congressional Black Caucus, BARBARA LEE, for the leadership that she has provided on this issue since this disaster. But of course BARBARA LEE has been involved in assistance to Haiti public policywise and with the other kinds of disasters that have confronted Haiti over a long period of time. And so I join with her in all of the efforts to do what we can to assist the poorest nation in the Western Hemisphere, Haiti.

I have spent a good part of my career trying to be of assistance public policywise and again when these disasters have struck Haiti. And so when the earthquake took place, we were all stunned, and we all immediately began to make inquiries of the USAID and the U.N. and the Red Cross, and all of those agencies responsible for disaster relief. And all of those inquiries and briefings having been going on every day, headed by Congresswoman BARBARA LEE.

I decided at one point I had to go to Haiti. I just had to be there to talk with some of the people that I have worked with over the past, to talk with President Preval, and to see what we could do additionally to be of assistance to our agencies.

I want to just tell you that USAID is working very, very hard. The U.N., working very, very hard. And I want you to know that USAID employees were sleeping on cots inside the embassy. Many of their homes were destroyed. Still, there were six missing persons when I was there from USAID and the State Department. In addition to that, the U.N. lost 40 people, but yet they got up every day with this disaster, doing the best that they could. Are there problems? There certainly are, problems with logistics and coordination, all of that.

You have seen the images on television. You know how terrible this destruction was. The number of people, the thousands of people, up to estimates of 250,000 who have lost their lives. Well, it is worse than you even see on television. The destruction is massive. Looking at the buildings, they are just pancaked, the buildings that are in rumbles, the stone and debris that is in the street. It is absolutely heartbreaking and painful to experience.

However, we are doing everything that we can possibly do to give support. I have concentrated on debt relief for Haiti. Yesterday I introduced legislation to require the Secretary of the Treasury to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States within the multilateral financial institutions to cancel all of Haiti's remaining debt. The bill has 30 cosponsors, including Chairwoman BARBARA LEE, DONALD PAYNE, and others.

I sent a letter to Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner, urging him to support debt cancellation for Haiti. My letter was signed by 94 Members of Congress, including Majority Leader STENY HOYER, Financial Services Committee Chairman BARNEY FRANK, and Foreign Affairs Committee Ranking Member ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN. Canceling Haiti's debt will free up the country's meager resources, allowing it to begin meeting its immediate and long-term needs.

Debt cancellation is critical for Haiti's future, and it is an important component of the overall aid we can provide. There is not enough time this evening to go through all that we need to share about debt relief, but this is a beginning.

Ms. LEE of California. Thank you very much. I want to thank the gentlelady from California again for her leadership, and also for once again leading

the effort on debt relief. Because Haiti certainly should not have to repay any loans given the devastation that it has faced not only during this recent disaster, but in the past.

Congressman ED TOWNS, chair of the Government Reform Committee from the great State of New York, with a large Haitian American population, large Caribbean American population, also a minister, who has been a strong voice on behalf of the Haitian people throughout his life. Congressman ED TOWNS.

Mr. TOWNS. I would like to thank the gentlewoman from California, the chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, for her leadership.

Of course I know that the time is running out, but I really wanted to take at least a minute to thank some people that I know have worked real hard to do whatever they could do to relieve in terms of every way to create an atmosphere and climate to get people involved in helping the people of Haiti. Gregory Jackson, who heads the Brownsville Recreation Center in Brooklyn, New York, has been very involved in terms of collecting all kinds of items. Vivian Bright, who heads the women's caucus, she has been collecting things to send to Haiti. And of course I want to salute them.

And then I want to thank Dealmed. Dealmed has put together all kinds of medical supplies. And of course I want to thank Warren Cohn for taking them down. And of course I want to thank the Bedford-Stuyvesant ambulance service, who went to Haiti right away and were able to save lives. And of course not only that, they were able to deliver babies and all of that. So I just want to thank them for their work, and to encourage them to continue.

Let me just say that there are 125,000 people from Haiti that live in New York. And we are not going to forget Haiti. We are going to make certain, the Congressional Black Caucus has indicated over and over, that we are going to be there.

Ms. LEE of California. Thank you very much. And let me again thank you for your leadership, Congressman TOWNS.

I want to just close this evening by first saying that as chair of the 42-member Congressional Black Caucus, I want to reiterate tonight that our thoughts and our prayers continue to be with the people of Haiti during this very difficult period. We know the Haitian people are resilient people and that they will move forward in rebuilding their country.

But we want to make sure that the people of Haiti understand that the Congressional Black Caucus stands with the people of Haiti as they move forward during this next phase of recovery and reconstruction. And we will be doing everything in our power to make sure that once, unfortunately, Haiti does not make the front page of the news, or the 24-hour news cycle ends with Haiti as the lead story, we will continue to be there. This Congress will continue to be there working as we move forward to develop a Haiti Marshall Plan. Thank you again.

I yield back the balance of my time.

THE FEDERAL BUDGET AND THE ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, our topic this evening, and one that I think has received some coverage in the media, and is something that is of concern to many Americans, is the level of spending in the Federal Government, the budget that has been proposed, the size of deficits, and overall where the American economy stands. These are all very important topics. These topics could not be more timely.

The President has just released his new budget for the next couple of years. We can take a look and see exactly what the numbers are. So these questions, probably even more so because of the high level of unemployment, have a quite a number of Americans asking some very serious questions and have, I would say quite honestly, a number of people in elected office here in Washington, D.C., extremely concerned about the fact that we are not doing what we should do in terms of fiscal responsibility.

Now, one of the things that happens in the political world, and this may be a surprise to some people, but perhaps not to others, and that is that sometimes there is a significant gap between what people say and what they do. And so I prepared a few charts here just to give us an introduction to this subject about the budget, about spending, and about what is really true and what is really a significant factor, and what are more peripheral kinds of questions or issues.

Now, the first statement was made by the President, President Obama, in his State of the Union address here in this chamber not very many days ago. This was his comment. He said, ''The true engine of job creation in this country will always be America's businesses, but government can create the conditions necessary for businesses to expand and hire new workers.'' Now, this particular statement is quite true. In fact, it corrects an extreme misconception that some in government would love to have passed onto the Americans, but in fact is not true. And that is that government never can create jobs.

Well, you say, Congressman AKIN, how is it that the government can't create jobs? Can't they take taxpayers' money, go out and hire somebody, and if they hire somebody doesn't that person have a job? Well, the answer is yes, but really no. What happens is when the government hires one person various economists would disagree a little bit on the exact number, but you take about 2 or 2.3 jobs out of the private sector for every job that you create in the public sector. So the government really doesn't create jobs, it simply takes money away from other people to hire someone. So when you say that the government is going to create jobs, that is actually economically false.

What the President says here is true, ''The true engine of job creation in this country will always be America's businesses.'' That is true. In fact, he went on to acknowledge that it is not just any business, but it particularly is small businesses. Someone has figured the statistic that 80 percent of American jobs are in companies that have 500 employees or less. So small business, that is 500 employees or less, is very much the place where jobs are created.

Now, we have some people in politics that are always blasting those rich guys, those people that own businesses. And we are going to tax the rich guy and make sure that he pays for everything. Well, there is only one little problem with that theory. And that is that a lot of the people that own those small businesses are reasonably well to do because they have successfully put a business together, have managed it, have taken considerable risks, have spent a whole lot of sleepless nights worrying about balancing the books, but somehow, in spite of all of that, they were successful. And they wake up 10 years later, after they created a small business, and they find out that they are a millionaire. Now, they may have started sleeping under a park bench somewhere, and a husband and wife look at each other, and there is a smile, and they look and they realize that their dream has come true.

□ 1845

The American Dream worked for the owner of some small businesses. And what that means is, because those people do have money, they can reinvest that money in their own business. And when they do, they'll add a wing on the building, add some new machine tools or a new process or new idea, and create jobs in America.

So what the President is saying is true—the true engine of job creation in this country will always be America's businesses. But government can create the conditions necessary for businesses to expand and to hire new workers. The government can do that. Maybe it would be more accurate to say that unless the government gets in the way, that's the natural cause of small businesses, to grow and to add additional jobs.

What are the kinds of things that the government can do to try to create those jobs? Well, they want to create an environment. It's a little bit like if you're trying to grow a plant, what do you want for a plant to grow? Well, you've got to have some water, you've got to have some sunshine, you've got

to have the right temperature. You've got to have the soil conditions and chemistry more or less right. In the same way you can grow jobs in America if you keep certain basic factors and functions in perspective. We're going to go into that in a minute. But let's take a look.

This statement being true—these are the words, but here in fact are the actions of what is being proposed as you go further into the speech. First of all, what is being proposed are $2 trillion in tax increases over 10 years; $2 trillion in tax increases. We're going to talk about that in a minute, because who's going to pay those $2 trillion? Where's that money going to come from? You bet, it's going to be taxpayers.

And then we have this job-killing cap-and-tax legislation. My chart says cap-and-trade. People want to call it cap-and-trade. They really want to call it the global warming tax. But this cap-and-tax legislation puts a big tax on energy. Now guess who uses energy, aside from homeowners, aside from people who drive cars. Of course, small businesses. They use energy. Depending on the type of small business, some use a great deal of energy. And so you have here a proposal which is about an even portion of government redtape and government taxation. If I had to judge the bill, I think the redtape may be more onerous than the taxation, which is bad enough. The combination of the two are deadly to small businesses and deadly to job creation. We'll get into that in a minute.

What else is being suggested? We're going to have new taxes on employers who don't offer the government health insurance plan. So now what we're going to say to people if you're a businessman, Yeah, we're going to tax you on your energy, but we've got another tax, too, for you. That is, we're going to tax you on health insurance. And, guess what? You're going to pick up a big piece of the tab for this government-run health insurance plan, which supposedly only costs $1 trillion.

Now that's not talking about the amount of cost shifting that's going to go to various State governments. But you have an extremely expensive proposal for government to take over one-fifth of the U.S. economy with this mandated, top down—I think I remember 400 or 500 times in this 3,000-page bill you have the ''shall.'' The government shall do this, shall do that. And so this is another proposal which the President says he wants to move forward with. And then it increases taxes on small business owners who make over $250,000. Well, a whole lot of small business owners can make over $250,000. But, again, as I have mentioned, if you put the taxes on these people, they'll pay their taxes but they're not going to put that money, that tax money, back into their business to create jobs.

And so what we have here is the words that recognize that businesses create the jobs, and particularly small businesses create the jobs, but then in terms of action what we're doing is we're doing the very worst possible thing that you can do in terms of creating jobs and helping our economy. Let's take a look. You know, economics can be pretty boring sometimes. I try to make it as simple as I can.

I'd like to talk to you this evening a little bit about job killers. If you want to kill a plant, you don't give it any water. If you want to kill a plant, you let it freeze. There's certain things you can do that makes it so that a plant dies. If you want to kill jobs, there's certain things you can do to kill them and there's also things you can to create them.

Let's talk about the first factor. It wouldn't surprise you perhaps that the one that I would think of first is taxes. Now how does taxation affect small business people? Well, it's this way. If you tax them more and more, they're going to have less money to put into their business and so they're going to have less money to hire people. And that's the same effect I was talking about. The government can tax and hire somebody, but when they do, they're taking that money away from the small business. And so while you add some government worker, you lose two employees from the local company.

And so tax increases are absolutely deadly, and they are going to be a big factor in unemployment. No big surprise. Other people have recognized this. This is not that complicated. This is not rocket science. This is not laser science. This is not quantum mechanics. It's simple lemonade stand-type economics. And other Presidents have recognized the problem. And so what did they do when they got into a recession and they're having trouble with unemployment? Well, JFK understood. He cut taxes. Ronald Reagan understood it. He cut taxes. And George Bush during the recession also cut taxes. In each of those situations the economy responded fairly rapidly to those tax cuts. And why? Because the small businessman is starting to get some money to plow into his business. So, first of all, taxes are a major factor. And if you raise taxes a lot, you're going to kill jobs.

What have we just got over here? We've got $2 trillion in tax increases. We've got the cap-and-tax bill, the thing on taxing energy with all sorts of redtape in it. We also have the employers—the socialized medicine bill. Where the government to a large degree takes over health care, a trillion-dollar tag on that has to be picked up by a lot of small business people. And then you have, if that's not enough, increases on anybody making over $250,000. That hammers small business people. And this list doesn't even mention the fact that the tax cuts on capital gains, dividends, and death taxes, which were put in place during the beginning of the last recession under Bush to help the economy, those are going to expire. So they're going to compound this problem. So here we have words. We understand that jobs are created in businesses, but we don't really understand because our actions are saying we're going to do just exactly what it takes in terms of tax policy to kill jobs.

The second factor if you want to kill jobs is redtape. Redtape means that it's more cost for businesses to do their work. If the government says, Yeah, but you've got to write a report; you've got to do this; to check with this; got to go to court to take care of this; you better do that; all of that red tape may not be a direct tax, but the net effect is it's costing a whole lot of time for an employer to try to comply with government redtape. Do you think we've got a fair amount of redtape in America?

Think about the amount the average citizen has in their own life and then multiply that significantly for the average business. And so redtape is another big factor. We have words. This sounds good and in fact this is even true. The trouble is the actions are the exact opposite.

I recognize that I've been joined by a good friend of mine, Congressman BISHOP, and I'd like to yield you some time if you'd like to talk a little bit about the budget. I'd like to get into tonight a couple of different things that have been said, comments that have been made about this budget. First of all, I want to get a scale of how big it is. Second of all, I'd like to talk a little bit about can you blame it on the previous administration. We keep hearing that it was President Bush's fault that we're in the economic problems. And then I'd like to get back to the job creation question. But I think you've got some specific examples from your district where there were jobs that we're talking about, and particularly an employer that is affected by this budget. Could you share with us, please?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Well, I thank the gentleman from Missouri for yielding. Yes, this presents a particularly interesting conundrum that we do have here. The President has talked about how our most important element is to create jobs. And it is. For our people we need jobs. I recognize, though, that much of what we have in this budget that you have already mentioned does not create jobs. It actually has a stifling impact on jobs.

Some things, though, in which jobs are our responsibility, we also have put a stifling influence just on the decisions we make. This budget is $3.8 trillion. That's a whole lot of money. It's $1.6 trillion more than we have. That's a whole lot of money that's going to go there. And in every one of the budgets that takes place it's about choices. In our own families we do the same thing. We have certain things we want and certain things we need. My problem with this budget right now, specifically in the areas that I am deeply concerned, is that we have a lot of stuff in here that we want that's being funded

and a lot of things that we need that is not being funded.

One of the few constitutional responsibilities we have in this country is defense. Last year, you and I were down here with others very frequently talking about missile defense. It is essential for this country. We cut missile defense. Once again, it was about prioritization. I think and I believe you thought we put our priorities in the wrong place. And you don't build a missile without people. When we cut our missile defense program, we took jobs away.

Unfortunately, in this particular budget, once again we go after another kind of missile program and have decided to take it out. What it simply means is this budget decides to go after NASA and take away the Constellation program and specifically the Ares 1 rocket. Now I hate to say this, but Time magazine determined what were the Fifty Best Inventions of the Year. And the number one invention was the Ares rocket. This is our process to replace the space shuttle. This is how we are moving into space exploration in the future. I hate to say this. I think space exploration is one of the core responsibilities of the Federal Government.

But in taking this out what you are doing is cutting 7,000 jobs nationwide of people involved in space, engineering, math, and science, which—once again, the President wants to encourage kids to study and to go into engineering, science, and math, but we don't have any responsibility of trying to encourage that on the real side. And where the problem comes is the people that make the motors for these rockets make the motors for our missiles.

Mr. AKIN. Let me just get the connect, because you're building up to something here. What you're saying is that there are solid rocket motors that are being built in America, which are very high-tech, and they're being built by a particular company. And they're used for the space program but they're also used for something else. Is that correct?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. In defense.

Mr. AKIN. In defense. So it's not just space. It's also our defense.

I yield.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Both of those are core responsibilities of the government and one that this administration has decided to cut. And it's not necessarily that they are companies that are making these—there's actually two companies in America that do make those motors; one hasn't made any in a couple of decades. But it is people that do it. When you cut these programs—when you cut the missile defense last year and you cut this rocket program this year, the people with the expertise that we need to build the defense of this country are going to be gone. They're either going to find another job or, unfortunately, they're going to go on unemployment so we can pay them for not doing their jobs that we need to defend us.

This is one of the travesties of this particular budget. And it would be okay with me, perhaps, if they had come up with a new plan, a new role for NASA, something they are going to move us forward with, but they did not. All they did is simply cut the program, throw people out of work—if it goes through, I should say. We still have the right to say what it is. But this budget would cut the program, throw people out of work and, more importantly, fail for us to defend this country, which is our constitutional responsibility. It would fail to allow this country to move forward in space exploration and in defense because the industrial base of this country would be gone.

The acquisition guys over in the Pentagon understand it. They say it's not necessarily about jobs, it's about the kinds of jobs. And therefore it is important for the future of this country to have the right kinds of jobs in the industrial base. And it's not simply a spigot you can turn on when once again we decide, oops, maybe we had the wrong idea and we need more missiles to defend us against the Iranians and the North Koreans and who knows what else might be out there. You can't just pick it up again. If you lose the capability, you lose the capability. And, I'm sorry, in this budget we lose the capability we need to defend this country.

It's not just about the amount of money. It's about where we put our priorities and do we do what we need to do first and then cover the wants. I'm sorry; we're paying a lot of money for a lot of wants. Let me give you a simple example. If you took what we spent in the stimulus last year for ACORN alone, you could fund this program again and still have close to $2 billion left over.

□ 1900

Mr. AKIN. Wait a minute. You are telling me that the ACORN program, the one where we've got people going to jail for voter fraud and all other kinds of strange and weird behavior, registering illegals, registering people that don't exist, turning them out to vote, and even on videotapes, we see them encouraging people to build brothels and to bring in underage illegal immigrants, that organization? You are saying that funding could be instead directed?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. That program got more funding in the stimulus bill that was passed last year than it would take to carry on with this program moving forward.

Mr. AKIN. What you have said—and I just want to reinforce. There is a difference between jobs and jobs, is what you are saying. Some of these things are very high-tech kinds of jobs. They require building companies over a good number of years, building capabilities, putting that team together, and you've got to have enough work to keep that team operating or else they just have to dissipate and go somewhere else. And if we need that capability for the defense of this Nation, that, in many of our opinions, is the primary function that we must perform here. There are a lot of other things that might be nice if the Federal Government did it, but if we have invading armies riding across our country, we're not very effective.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I think you are exactly right, and that's why, with all due respect, this is like a double disappointment to me. Not only are we spending too much and taxing too much, but we are not spending it in the right place.

Mr. AKIN. We're not even spending it in the right place. You know, that's a very, very visible kind of thing. You can see a solid rocket voter has a lot of technical kinds of aspects, how those have been developed, and we have an advantage on that from a technology point of view. Now you are basically saying that we're going to give that up for spending it on what, on something like ACORN? That's why a whole lot of people out there are really wondering what we're doing down here.

Congressman, thank you for joining us. I notice that we are joined by Dr. BURGESS, a good friend of mine. We're talking about the budget and about job creation and how those things connect. I also was trying to take apart a little bit because we hear some good words, and yet the actions of what we're doing don't seem to fit. So if you can join us, please.

Mr. BURGESS. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. When I heard what you were doing, I wanted to come down here and talk. You know, a week ago we heard from the President here in the House of Representatives, and he talked about this recession that he inherited. Okay, it's almost as if no President has ever had to deal with a recession before.

I don't know about you, but 20 years ago, we had a pretty bad recession where I lived in north Texas. In fact, I remember it very well because—I'm a doctor—the medical group that I was in was under such stress from this recession that it splintered apart, broke up. I found myself on January 1, 1990, beginning a whole new venture as a solo practitioner in obstetrics and gynecology in my town. And quite honestly, I wondered how I would make it. The recession was rough. We didn't have anyone coming down from Washington with a big bag of dollar bills saying, You guys doing all right? You need some more cash? We'll be glad to front it to you. At that time, the bad actors were the savings and loans that had imploded. But real estate markets had fallen, energy prices had fallen, and Texas was certainly upon hard times.

The reason this came to mind was the story recently about the number of people in the administration who worked in a private sector job, and the number is astonishingly low. It's in the mid-single digits. No wonder when this administration looks around for solutions, their tendency is not to go to

people who have actually done things in the past that have been creative and successful and created new jobs.

In February of 2000, I had ended my first month in this new medical venture, and I didn't have any money. I couldn't take any money home certainly because I didn't have any money, and I had nurses on my payroll that were depending upon me. Their families were depending upon me. It was a tough time. It was hard to borrow money. I went down to the bank and borrowed $12,000 to meet payroll for that 2-week interval. The banker was not kind to me. He charged me 14 percent interest.

Mr. AKIN. Whoa, whoa, whoa. Stop just a minute. There wasn't somebody with bailout money from the Federal Government to come just give you some free money?

Mr. BURGESS. No, my bailout was my friendly banker who said——

Mr. AKIN. Fourteen percent interest?

Mr. BURGESS. For a 6-month loan.

Mr. AKIN. You can say that with a smile on your face today, but that banker wasn't too good a friend.

Mr. BURGESS. It was $12,000 to meet—I realize here that $12,000 doesn't even calibrate as budget dust with what we do. But $12,000 was an enormous sum of money to me at the time. I'm not going to be able to take a paycheck home, but I had to be able to pay my employees. No money was coming across the counter because I'm an OB/GYN. You've got to wait a few months before the delivery occurs, and you get paid for the work. I was so scared—

Mr. AKIN. Sort of one of those 9-month lead time type of things.

Mr. BURGESS. Correct. I was so scared about what the future held for me. I did some mental calculations, and if it cost me $25,000 a month just to pay my employees, what is my world going to look like in June? I'm borrowing for operational expenses, and I have got no way to really catch up that slack. Well, to make a very long story abbreviated, money did start coming in over the counter. That was the last money that I ever had to borrow.

But boy, I'll tell you what, when we come down here and we talk about this budget, I remember just how I felt those days. How was I going home to face my family? No paycheck. You talk about tightening your belt, there just wasn't a belt to tighten. We didn't have anything. I knew I had to continue to perform for my patients because I was obligated to do that. I knew I had to continue to perform for my employees because I was obligated to do that. I didn't ask any questions. I didn't whine about it. I went down and did what I had to do, which was borrow $12,000, and it scared me to death. It scared me to death.

And we're going to borrow $1.9 trillion tomorrow just to meet our debt obligations for the next, what, 14 months? Are you kidding me? And the problem is, we've got an administration where no one has ever worked in the private sector. No one's ever had to go down and borrow that money, put their name on the line. No one's ever signed a paycheck on the front. All of their paychecks are signed on the back. That's our problem. Their natural tendency is to look for the government to get bigger because that's where the solutions come from.

No, the solutions come from the private sector, the small business entrepreneur, the doctor, the cardiologist, the saddlemaker, air conditioner repairman. That's what has made this country great. That's where the recovery of our economy lies, and we are fixing to kill the goose that laid the golden egg with this massive debt.

What's going to happen when we have to monetize $1.9 trillion? What's going to happen to the interest rates? I paid 14 percent in February of 1990. You know what, that might look like a pretty good deal 10 years hence when we get to monetizing.

Mr. AKIN. You know, Dr. BURGESS, what you have communicated here, aside from being a doctor—we always put doctors sort of in a special category and maybe a little bit of an elevated platform. But what you have communicated is just the heart of a guy that has a business and how much risk you took and how you plowed into unchartered territory, just trusting that you could generate that business and then get the business going. And afterwards, you had employees. You provided a great product for people, and there are a whole lot of Texans who are thankful to Dr. BURGESS for delivering them. But you gave us an understanding of how that whole system works. And just like your one example, there are really thousands upon thousands of business owners that are looking at this thing, and saying, What in the world is going on?

Now we've talked about words and then actions. Here are some words, but families across the country are tightening their belts and making tough decisions. The Federal Government should do the same. Hey, that sounds pretty good. That's what you were just talking about, Doctor, that families have to tighten their belts and take a good look and make choices between one thing and another.

Congressman BISHOP just made a brilliant explanation of why the Federal Government is making lousy choices. Not only are we spending too much, taxing too much, borrowing too much, but we're also doing it for the wrong reasons. And that just doesn't make a whole lot of sense.

This is starting to get to the point where I think things are going to get interesting. We're going to bring on another witness, a fantastic young man who really does know something about budgeting. The big question I think that comes to a whole lot of Americans' minds is this question: When is too much too much? When do we get to the tipping point where the whole thing, just like a table, dumps and the whole economy just basically falls to pieces? You know, just like in your business, if you had borrowed too much, you could have pushed it too far. You intuitively knew that.

What happens when we start getting into this? We're saying that families across the country are tightening their belts, but we, sure as the dickens, are not because with our actions, we're going to double the debt in 5 years, raise the deficit to a record $1.6 trillion this year. That's 10.6 percent of GDP.

Let's put this into perspective. It's one thing to have a deficit during a year; but when you compare the deficit to the overall product of the whole Nation, that's a significant statistic. And last year, we set a record. The year before we set a record. During the time George Bush was finishing and NANCY PELOSI had this Congress, we had a $450-something billion deficit. That was big. That was 3.1 percent of GDP. That was too much spending. And then we come back around to '09 and what do we do? We go from $4.5 billion—oh, billion isn't a big number anymore. Let's try trillion—to $1.4 trillion of deficit. That's three times more with the current President, and when you look at it as a percent of GDP, 9.9 percent of GDP.

So now we've learned our lesson, right, for 2010. Certainly that was too much. No. No. We're going to go for $1.6 trillion instead of $1.4 trillion and 10.6 percent of GDP. When is enough enough?

My good friend Congressman HENSARLING, I don't want to pick on Texas too much, but you have really taken the lead on a number of these economic issues. We need some help tonight, and we need to ask that question, When is too much too much? Please help us.

Mr. HENSARLING. Well, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I certainly appreciate his leadership tonight on an issue that is of great concern to every American. Every American who has children, every American who has grandchildren and are wondering, What is Washington doing drowning them in a sea of red ink? Again, when you say, How much is enough, we are already there. So I think it's been somewhat of a surreal experience for the American people as of late to see Washington go mad.

Never in the history of our Nation, do I believe, have I seen such an explosion of spending of deficits and debt. As a lot of the public know, the President of the United States on Friday came and spoke to the Republicans in the House, and I give the President credit for doing it. I think it speaks well of his character that he would come and speak to us, something that our own Speaker I don't believe has ever done.

I had the opportunity to speak to the President at that exchange, and I asked our President, I said, Mr. President, your last budget that you submitted tripled the national debt over 10 years and took the cost of government

from its historic level of roughly 20 percent of our economy up to 25 percent. I mean, we haven't seen such levels of government since World War II, the cost of government relative to the economy. I asked the President that question, and the President didn't answer. The President declined to answer the question on Friday. But you know what, he answered the question on Monday, and he answered the question with this document because on Monday, the President submitted his proposed budget for the United States of America for the next fiscal year and for the 9 years following.

Guess what we found out in this document? What we found out was that the answer to the question is a resounding ''yes.'' President Obama has now said to the American people loud and clear, Yes, I will triple the national debt over 10 years. I will triple the national debt. Yes, I will take the level of government to levels we haven't seen since World War II, up to 25 percent of our economy. This is a breathtaking document. The levels of debt, the levels of deficit, the levels of spending are simply breathtaking. The largest budget in the American history, $3.8 trillion.

Mr. AKIN. I would like to just butt in. I do butt in a few times. And before you jump a little bit further, one of the things that the President said—because I was at the meeting when you asked the question. One of the things that we heard was, Well, you know, I inherited a lot of this stuff. It was like saying, It's not my fault that I'm spending all of this money.

And this is hard for me to understand. I'm thinking, Look, you've got the previous President. He spent, with the Pelosi Congress, about $450 billion, which you and I, gentleman, thought was too much. It was too much deficit, and we didn't like that. In fact, we vote against a lot of that kind of spending. But that is, in a sense, water over the bridge or down the river or wherever the water goes. Now he is taking that and triples it in his very first year.

□ 1915

How can you blame the guy that came before you when you were three times doing more than he did? Could you explain that, because I don't get it. How can you blame that on someone else?

Mr. HENSARLING. Well, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and it's an important point to make. Simply because, as opposed to leading, too often, frankly, we see the President, we see the Speaker, we see our colleagues on the other side of the aisle saying, Well, the truth is, you Republicans spent too much money.

Well, guess what? I agree. But only Congress, only Congress can spend money. Congress has the power of the purse. The only money the President can spend are those monies that are authorized by Congress. Now, the President can propose. The President may be given pots of money by Congress that he can allocate. But, ultimately, it is Congress that controls the power of the purse under our Constitution.

Now, we had 12 years where Republicans controlled Congress, wrote the budgets, wrote the spending bills. And I wasn't proud of the deficits that occurred in those years, but they averaged about $104 billion a year.

Mr. AKIN. So, gentleman, just taking a look at some notes I had, this would be about from 1996 to the year 2007, and you total that up at about $1.2 trillion. So that's 12 years of Republican deficit spending, more or less.

Mr. HENSARLING. Well, if the gentleman would yield, I think the most important point here—and we shouldn't spend, obviously, a lot of time on the blame game. The American people want solutions. But what we typically hear from our friends on the other side who aren't offering a solution to the fiscal crisis is that it's your fault.

Here's what I would say. I'm sorry that Republicans spent as much as they did, but our average deficit when we controlled spending was $104 billion. We've now had 3 years for Democrats to control spending, and the average deficit is $1.1 trillion.

And so, what I would tell the gentleman and the American people is that what was an annual deficit under Republicans has turned into a monthly deficit under Democrats. And again, I'm not proud of the spending. Many of us on this floor fought our own party leaders for more fiscal restraint. But as far as an order of magnitude, I mean, you can't even compare the two. When it comes to spending and deficits, Republicans are rank amateurs compared to Democrats.

Mr. AKIN. I'd like to interrupt you just so you can say that again, because that's really hard to get your mind around. In other words, what you're saying is that what Republicans spent in 1 year, the Democrats are averaging in 1 month, so they're 12 times faster spending money.

You have a chart, I see.

Mr. HENSARLING. Again, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Now, this covers the last several years of when Republicans controlled the budget. It's in the blue, and you can see declining budget deficits until the Democrats took control of Congress.

Mr. AKIN. So the blue in your chart were Republican, and those were the budgets, and the amount that's above the line was how much our deficit was, right?

Mr. HENSARLING. Correct.

And so, again, I'm not proud of the fact that there were deficits under Republican control, but look at the 3 years once the Democrats came into control. Look at what happened in 2007. Look at what happened in 2008. Look at what happened in 2009. And again, it just goes to show that what was an average annual deficit under Republicans has now become an average monthly deficit over Democrats.

Now, I know the President, again, is fond of saying, well, it's not my fault. I inherited a mess. Well, I have two observations. You know what I would say to the President? Yes, Mr. President, you're right. You inherited a mess. I agree. But guess what? When it comes to trillion dollar deficits, you inherited it from a Democratic Congress. And also, Mr. President, if I recall properly, you were a Member of that Democratic Congress. You were a United States Senator and your voting record was about as pro-spending as there was. So to some extent, if I had the opportunity to speak to the President again, I'd say, Mr. President, you kind of inherited the problem from yourself to some extent. But even if you didn't—let's just say that the administration is absolutely blameless—then why, Mr. President, are you making it worse?

Mr. AKIN. It's not just making it worse; it's tripling it in the very first year, tripling it from 450 billion all the way up to 1.4 trillion.

I'd like to come back to you, Congressman HENSARLING. I want to ask you that question that I was getting at, and that is—I think a lot of Americans want to know this—when do we hit some tipping point? Does anybody know? Is there a certain point here where we have to really pay attention, that we're going to get things so far out of kilter that the whole deck of cards is going to fall and there's nothing we can do? I'd like to get back to that.

But we have another guest from Florida joining us, Congressman POSEY, and I'd just encourage you to join us on this question about the budget, the tremendous level of spending, the tremendous level of taxing, and the tremendous level of debt that we're picking up.

Mr. POSEY. Well, I thank the gentleman from Missouri for recognizing me.

That's only half of it, and what they are spending and wasting is in the wrong direction. We just want to talk a little bit about the wrong direction Congress is going, and I hope they won't go further in the wrong direction as they continue to follow the President in the wrong direction.

Now, I want to just remind you that when the President was in my district campaigning, he made a pledge—it's all over the Internet right now—that he would close the gap between the space shuttle program and the Constellation program. Initially, it was 3 years that we were going to outsource jobs to Russia to launch our astronauts. It was $30 million per astronaut for ours and all the international other astronauts that we promised to launch. The gap was 3 years. The gap grew to 4 years, 5 years, 6 years, looking at 7 years now or maybe more. The cost the Russians are going to charge us now is $50 million per astronaut. And when we have

no more shuttles and no alternative launch vehicle of our own, Lord only knows what they're going to charge us.

But back to the campaign promise. The President promised that he would close this gap, the time period between the shuttle's last flight and the first Constellation flight of the Aries, where we could launch men on the Aries.

Mr. AKIN. So, in other words, for people that are not that familiar with the space program, what we're moving from is the old technology of the shuttle, which we see launched in those beautiful pictures with the hydrogen and oxygen central fuel on the main rocket engines and then the two solid boosters. So you see those two tanks on the sides of the aluminum, and I think it's ammonium chlorate or something. So you've got two solid motors, and you've got the hydrogen-oxygen in the center, those three take off. We're replacing that, right, with a new vehicle? Is that what you're talking about?

Mr. POSEY. Correct. And the new rocket would allow us to go back to the Moon as well as back and forth to the international space station as well as, ultimately, to Mars, our manifest destiny, if you would.

Mr. AKIN. So this is a more powerful system?

Mr. POSEY. More powerful than the Saturn V back in the Apollo days, actually, carry more people.

So the President promised that he would close this gap because, as the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) mentioned, we will lose, if we don't close that gap, 7,000 of the best and brightest space team members this country has ever seen, and he would ensure that we remained first in space.

Now, space is the only thing the United States of America is universally, unequivocally, undeniably respected for around the globe. A lot of countries respect us for a few things. Some respect us for nothing. Some respect us for a lot of things. But the only thing that we're universally respected for, bar none, is our space program. We are first in space. And it's a matter of national security. And it's a matter of economic security. We know all wars aren't fought with bullets and bombs anymore.

So the President made these two promises. They were witnessed and they're online. He also said, we need to lead in this global marketplace in high technology development, and we need to encourage more children to go into math and science. We know now that we are only training one-tenth the number of engineers that we need, and half of them are foreign students that we expect to go back to their own countries. And we know China is graduating 10 times more of these high-trained, highly specialized engineers than we are. That's not a good end game, by the way.

Mr. AKIN. I want to get you to your point. What you're saying is he made a promise that we're going to close this gap. Now, does the budget close the gap or not?

Mr. POSEY. Well, we'll get there. The first thing that happened is he accepted the resignation of Michael Griffin, the inspirational genius behind the Constellation program and the Aries rocket. And for 6 months, when they were having the meetings, the NASA chair remained empty without an administrator.

Mr. AKIN. So first of all, no administrator to replace him, which doesn't look like something is on the fast track.

Mr. POSEY. Six months later we got General Bolton. He's the new administrator, and he's a first-class guy and he'll do a good job. But as soon as Bolton was named, the President created a commission known as the Augustine Commission to tell us how we continue to explore space under current budget conditions.

The Augustine Commission met a number of times. They reported to the Science and Technology Committee, and they basically said in their report, you can't do that on the cheap. You just can't do what needs to be done to keep America first in space, much less close the gap. You can't do it on the cheap. It's going to take about another $3 billion a year.

Well, we were certainly looking forward to that extra money being put into the program. For as little as 1 percent of the failed stimulus plan spending, we could have flown that shuttle for 5 years and closed that gap.

Mr. AKIN. So 1 percent of the stimulus bill, which was, I think, about $800 billion or so, was it, the one that didn't work, at least the rocket motor probably would have gone. This one, we lit it and it fizzled.

Mr. POSEY. Well, you know, the stimulus bill was all about supposedly employing people. Now, these are not low-wage jobs in the space industry. I think the average, with benefits, is about 80,000 per, spread out all across this country, and no State is spared the benefit of space technology that's been developed. However, while we are having people train to hold road signs that say ''Stop'' and ''Go'' to regulate traffic, we are getting rid of, literally giving the pink slips to the brightest and greatest scientific minds that we have.

And I want to take you back to Apollo and tell you what's going to happen to those people. We had the best engineers in the world who were laid off in Apollo literally pump gas at gas stations until their homes were foreclosed, and then they were forced to move on, never to return to the space program again. We had to completely rebuild the space program again, as Mr. BISHOP very eloquently discussed a little while ago.

Mr. AKIN. I was just going say that you are really, in a sense, making the same case that Congressman BISHOP just made; that is, you get some very, very highly trained people, you get the program all set up, it takes years, a whole lot of research to do it, and then you just cut it off at the knees.

I do have to move along because I wanted to recognize Mr. BISHOP on this point, and I promised I'd get back to Congressman HENSARLING. So let me come back to you, but we are getting a little close on time.

Congressman BISHOP.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I appreciate the gentleman from Florida and what he's saying. I think we're saying the same thing.

There are some core responsibilities the government would have to do, and the government has promised that they would do these. And the people working on the NASA side are the same kinds of people we need on the defense side. And one would think, as Mr. HENSARLING showed the amount of money that's being thrown around in this particular budget, with all that, with $3.8 trillion, you could at least cover the needs, at least cover what we have to do.

Mr. AKIN. And gentlemen, both of you have made a very significant point. You're saying 1 percent of that stimulus bill—there wasn't a stimulus bill, of course. It didn't work, and stimulus bills don't work very well anyway. But 1 percent of that would have taken care of that promise, would have kept those very high-tech jobs in Florida, and would have——

Mr. POSEY. Around the country.

Mr. AKIN. Around the country. Okay. And of course the rocket motor, the solid rocket technology, these are places where the priority needs to be, the thing that—what government can provide for the national defense. It's not State governments. This is something that should be fundamental to our thinking down here.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. If I could ask the gentleman from Missouri, because I appreciate you said the key word of ''priorities.'' Before we actually deal with our priorities, we have to look at what is in this budget and what isn't in this budget, and I think what the gentleman from Texas is going to show is we could have done better for the American people in this proposed budget, and we must. The status quo is not acceptable. The way we've been doing things is not acceptable. There has to be a better alternative.

□ 1930

I would be happy to yield.

Mr. AKIN. I would like to yield to the gentleman from Texas, Congressman HENSARLING. I think you have a chart. You want to give us a visual picture. We've been talking some boxcar kinds of numbers, but sometimes a simple graph is worth an awful lot.

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding one more time.

Again, the President, that budget that the President has submitted to the American people is simply breathtaking; breathtaking in its spending, breathtaking in its deficits, breathtaking in its debt.

This is a budget that will ultimately put us on the road to bankruptcy.

There is no other way around it. And I am not exaggerating these points. But look at the trajectory of the spending under the President's proposed budget. And as we continue to run deficits, the red ink is there for a purpose. We have never seen spending at these levels.

Now the gentleman asked a question earlier. At what point do we reach the point where that red light is blinking? We're there. Most economists believe that you cannot sustain a debt to the economy or GDP ratio of over 3 percent, that anything over that long term is unsustainable. The President is proposing a $1.6 trillion deficit, the largest in American history for this budget, which would weigh in at 10.6 percent of our economy, largest debt to the economy ratio since World War II. The deficit never falls below $700 billion under his proposed budget plan. They average a trillion.

The deficits under this proposed budget will average a trillion dollars a year. And so the gentleman asks, is this sustainable? And the answer is no.

And what I really don't understand is we had Dr. Peter Orszag, who is the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, who writes this budget for the President. Had him before the Budget Committee yesterday. And in open committee, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget who wrote this said, Yes, it is unsustainable. He himself admits that long term this spending plan of the President of the United States is unsustainable for the American people, which begs the question, well, then, Mr. President, why don't you put a plan on the table to solve the problem? Where's the leadership?

This is a man who was elected to be President of the United States of America. His own director of Office of Management and Budget says this is fiscally unsustainable.

So what do they bring to the American people? They bring a ''commission.'' I am happy to look at a commission if it's fair, if it's real; if it's not just a political figleaf. But it begs the question again. What the administration is counting on is we're going to have some commission, and they're going to propose something and maybe Congress will enact it and we will save money that way.

Again, I would say to the President, With all due respect, Mr. President, where is your plan? If you know that you're on the road to bankruptcy, why don't you put a plan on the table that solves it?

What else does the President suggest? They talk about a vaunted freeze. Well, unfortunately there is no freeze in the budget. After the $1.2 trillion stimulus plan, after several hundred billion of omnibus spending plans, another omnibus spending plan, after the proposed almost $2 trillion takeover of our health care system, after a proposed $800 billion carbon tax, after increasing spending on what we call nondefense discretionary—basically the nondefense component of what Congress votes on every year—that has increased 84 percent in the last 2 years.

And my point is to the gentleman of Missouri is that after this explosion of spending, what we hear is the rhetoric of where we have a spending freeze. But guess what? When you look at it, 87 percent of the budget is not subject to the so-called freeze.

Second of all, the President decides, I am not even going to turn on the freezer for a full year. I am going to wait a full year before I turn on the freezer, and then I am going to turn it right back on after just a few years on 13 percent of the budget.

So when you crunch the numbers, what you discover is what the President's bold plan is to provide fiscal responsibility at a time of fiscal insanity is that he proposes to grow government by 49 percent over the next 10 years instead of 49.3 percent. Now, if that's a freeze, I would hate to see a spring thaw.

I will yield back.

Mr. AKIN. You've really answered the question. We are on some very, very shaky ground economically, and you're saying we're already there.

The thing that is frightening is—and this is something that just kind of amazes me—we got punished by voters to a large degree, from Republicans and Democrats, that said you guys are spending too much. And then what happens is we come down here and triple the rate of spending. No wonder people are mad. It's like the people in this Chamber are tone deaf.

Now, you certainly are not, gentlemen, and I am very thankful. I know the American public is thankful for the fact that you hold the line, and you're making clear what the priorities are and the fact that we can't just run out of control. It's a little bit like the guy that says, I am going to stop smoking next month; I am going to stop eating too much next month, and just continues with a pie eating contest.

Mr. HENSARLING. If the gentleman would yield one more time.

Not only has there been this explosion of debt and deficit, there is nothing to show for it but the deficit and debt. Where are the jobs? We're told that if we have this massive stimulus program that jobs would be created, unemployment would never go past 8 percent—and we are still mired in double-digit unemployment.

Mr. AKIN. The answer to that, as you know, it was a stimulus package. It stimulated the creation of a lot of government handouts and jobs, but it isn't going to fix the unemployment problem.

Congressman POSEY from Florida, I thank you for coming out tonight. Your expertise, particularly the expertise in your district. And Congressman BISHOP, and I just have got a minute or two and I will close with you in a couple of minutes.

Mr. POSEY. Just three quick points.

Not only are they spending too much, obviously, but they're spending it in the wrong direction. They're touting an extra $6 billion that they're going to put into NASA to create 1,500 jobs. But I told you how 7,000 of them are going to be lost. How did that make any sense to anybody? It doesn't pass a straight-face test.

I love commercial launches. I support commercial launches, nongovernmental rockets, and the development of them. But we cannot give up a manned space flight program that works, and it's cost effective for us right now.

So I implore Congress to keep the President's promises honest and fulfill those promises that the President made. The President obviously is not willing to do that. I hope Congress is.

Thank you, sir.

Mr. AKIN. Thank you very much.

One of the things is we talk about this deficit budget and all, I think a lot of Americans may not understand we've got something stalking us here. People talk about this, that, and the other thing. If you want to talk about the fiscal concern that we need to be watching in our country, it comes from Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security.

This is the budget that is being proposed. This is how much money we have in terms of receipts. This is the money that is coming into the government. This is what we're proposing spending. And if you take a look at that, more than half of that is Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security.

Those programs are called entitlements. What that means is we wrote some laws a long time ago. It's like a machine and somebody's turning the crank and it spends money, and it's spending more than half of what this budget shows and quite a bit more than what we have in terms of receipts. So that is a big question. And that is one of the things that we must deal with.

Congressman HENSARLING has been very direct in the fact that we need some solutions. We don't need to be on the same drug and drag it out until we're completely on our back. We have to start taking a look at these problems, take some sober-minded solutions and start moving forward with a plan. We've not seen that. We think American people want that leadership.

Mr. HENSARLING. I want to make it very clear. This isn't just us saying it. Listen to this. The Wall Street Journal yesterday, ''All of this spending must be financed, so deficits and taxes are both scheduled to rise to record levels.''

CNBC, ''The deficit for this year would be 10.6 percent of the total economy, a figure unmatched since the country was emerging from World War II.''

The New York Times, ''The budget projects that the deficit will peak at nearly $1.6 trillion in the current fiscal year, a post-World War II record. It would then decline but remain at economically troublesome levels in the remainder of the decade.''

CNBC, ''Part of a record $3.8 trillion budget that would boost the deficit beyond any in the Nation's history.''

It is unacceptable. We have better alternatives.

Mr. AKIN. Thank you, Congressman HENSARLING and Congressman POSEY. And I thank you, also, Congressman BISHOP, for joining us tonight.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that concludes our hour.

A REDUCED ROLE FOR THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS NEEDED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, tonight I come to talk about a variety of issues.

You know, clearly the country faces tough times, clearly our States face very, very difficult times. And over the last few months we have had the opportunity to go and to listen to our constituents at the State level talk about some of the issues that are important to them.

My home State of Michigan is struggling today with 15 percent unemployment—the highest unemployment rate in the country. And one of the things that we consistently hear about is, you know, Washington made us do this. I hear people talking about, you know, our State needs to raise taxes. Why? So we can get the Federal highway dollars. And what we forget is that those are our dollars to begin with. Those aren't Federal highway dollars. Those aren't Michigan highway dollars.

As a matter of fact, for 53 years, a State like Michigan has received 83 cents on the dollar—83 cents for every dollar that we sent to Washington for our gas tax. And now Washington tells us in tough times, to get that money back, you have to put up a State match. That is wrong.

In 2001, President Bush passed—with this Congress' help—legislation calling for an improvement in K–12 education. It was called No Child Left Behind, and it put the Federal imprint on our K–12 education system across the country and across the State of Michigan. That's wrong.

Why? Why do we need the Federal Government telling us how to run our schools at the State and at the local level? It's a community issue. It's a family issue. It's not a Federal issue. It's also not very efficient.

Just like in the highway bill, the Federal Government forces a State like Michigan to build things we don't need. We build overpasses, but they're for bicycles. We build fences not to protect motorists but to protect turtles.

You wonder and say, why are we doing this? This is our money. This is not the priority for our State to get our State moving.

So you have got issues with highways, you have got issues with education.

And it's not only that the money is being spent unwisely, but it's also being spent inefficiently.

Let me talk about No Child Left Behind, K–12 education.

I see my friend is going to join me. I welcome him. And, you know, I am talking a little bit about the bureaucracy and the need to return to federalism, and let me yield.

□ 1945

Mr. AKIN. If it's all right, if you take a look at what's happened, over the last 50 years, this government here has just grown like Topsy. For a while, you and I were in the majority. We passed some conservative bills, and we did the best we could. They were mostly blocked by Senators. But I think what the public really wants is I think they want something different out of this city. I think that what they really want is for the Federal Government not to threaten them anymore. I think they want us to deconstruct. You mentioned the No Child Left Behind.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Let me reclaim my time for just a second. I want to make it clear to the people in the Chamber, and I want to make it clear to the people around the country and the people in Michigan, No Child Left Behind was a bill that I voted against because I believed in parental control, I believed in local control, and I believed in State control. I just want to make that clear because I might not have done that as I was describing what this Congress was doing.

I had voted to get rid of the Federal highway program or to basically deconstruct it. I want to deconstruct the Education Department and return the rights back to the States so the States can focus on what they need to do, but more importantly that the Federal Government can focus on what it needs to do, trade policy, national security and those types of things. I will yield back.

Mr. AKIN. Congressman, I really respect you for that vote because what I think a lot of people listening this evening might not understand is Congressman HOEKSTRA took the very first House bill of a Republican administration, it was their pet bill, and you had the guts to stand up, as a Republican, to the Republican administration, and say, no, because I believe education is a local control kind of issue.

Now I have to relay an amusing story because I voted ''no'' on it too, and some staffer made a mistake and invited me to the bill signing ceremony. So I actually sat in the bill signing ceremony for No Child Left Behind after having voted ''no'' the same way you did.

And I think that is precisely what the public wants. They want to take this place apart. Education can be done fine at a State level, and in my opinion, as a former State representative, I would say it ought to be done at the local level. But certainly we don't need a bunch of Washington bureaucrats telling us how to educate our kids. I couldn't respect you more for that independence of thought and the clarion understanding that that is just not a Federal priority.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Reclaiming my time, I think you and I have had a discussion about this. But I really do believe, and I want to build off the thought that you had, is that our constituents want us to deconstruct Washington. They don't want us to tear it down. They want us to constructively go through the process and shed the things that are not Washington issues, move them back to States, move them back to communities, and move it back to individuals. And if we don't do that, they want to be able to hold us accountable.

You and I sat through much of 2009 where we saw an abomination probably much bigger than No Child Left Behind, the health care bill, which was going to take from you and from me, from our doctors, our hospitals, and our States the right to set our own health care agenda. And we were going to probably construct, not deconstruct, but construct a new building here in Washington, D.C., probably several new buildings, filled with bureaucrats, who were then going to make the decisions that you and I historically made about our health care. I will yield.

Mr. AKIN. You are going to wonder where I'm going with this perhaps. Here is what I'm thinking about. I'm a guy that was an engineer. I like geology. And they talk about earthquakes. And they have a scale of how bad an earthquake is. And if you use a Richter scale, an earthquake of about 7 or 8 or 9 is one whale of an earthquake. And if you were to rate how bad legislation is in Congress, the one that you chose to talk about, that health care bill, I would rate that as probably the worst bill I have seen in 22 years. And it is high enough on that Richter scale that when it got done, American civilization would have been shaken so badly, there wouldn't have been much of it left. That was really a bad one.

My rating number two, and I just want to see where you are on rating these things, whether you are the same scientist that I would be, and I would say that that cap-and-tax bill was another one that would be not quite as bad but still a real mess of a bad bill. What do you think?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I have seen this up close and personal in Michigan. And you may have remembered over the last 18 months that as President Obama was developing his economic strategy, he had the Governor of Michigan sitting next to him quite frequently. And I thought that's a good strategy because he could then ask and say, Governor, did you try this in Michigan? And if the answer was ''yes,'' he would say, well, we won't do that at the Federal level.

But it seems to be that whether it's cap-and-trade, cap-and-tax, whether it is health care, what we have seen is in

Washington, we have adopted many of the same policies that our Governor in Michigan adopted, and the end result is we have seen unemployment grow, we have seen huge deficits that at the end of the year are fixed but they are cut, they are massive cuts in the size of government, we are losing population, so we are seeing our citizens leave.

And now we are starting to see that at the Federal level. We are going to have a whole set of massive new tax increases that the President and the Democrats in Congress are going to let the tax cuts expire, meaning it's an effective increase in taxes. Was it 41 new taxes in the budget? I don't remember what the number was. Do you know?

Mr. AKIN. Well, there were quite a number of them. Some of them were small. But you add the whole thing together, you're talking about trillions of dollars in tax increases.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Trillions of dollars. And you and I at the beginning of 2009 we saw unemployment at just under 8 percent.

Mr. AKIN. But if we didn't pass that stimulus bill, we might see unemployment go over 8 percent is what we were told.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Right. And we are now at?

Mr. AKIN. Ten-something, and that's not counting the people that have given up looking for a job.

Now what you're talking about is it used to be said that America was a great experiment. And to a degree, we could be an experiment, because different States could try things, and if it was a lousy idea, if you had any brains, you wouldn't repeat a dumb idea. And so we tried this kind of government control of health care in Massachusetts and Tennessee, and here we turned around, and it didn't work worth a hoot for them, and we're trying to do this at the Federal level. And you're saying that in the case of Michigan you have a governor that seemed to have majored in some bad ideas, and you're saying, why in the world are you going to perpetrate ideas that don't work?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I want to talk with you briefly about an experiment. You and I have had the opportunity to briefly discuss this idea. What is happening right now in grass-roots America is very, very healthy. People are engaged. And as they have gone through the last year, they saw the passage of a stimulus bill, $787 billion, then they saw a cap-and-tax bill passed in the middle of the night where they added 400 pages in the middle of the night at the last minute.

Mr. AKIN. Three hundred pages at 3 o'clock in the morning. And we are sitting here in this Chamber trying to find a copy of the bill, and a copy of the bill doesn't exist as we are debating it. Now that's a new record, I suppose.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Then they give us a 2,000-page health care bill, and it gets over to the Senate and they give the Senator from Louisiana $300 million.

Mr. AKIN. Is that the ''Louisiana purchase''?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. The Louisiana purchase. Then we have the deal for Nebraska which says even though you're, as a State, you're pretty healthy—you only have an unemployment rate of under 5 percent—but you don't have to pick up this unfunded mandate that the other 49 States are going to get. As a matter of fact, those other 49 States, including the State of Michigan, are going to pay for your unfunded mandate because I need your vote. So you get your deal.

Mr. AKIN. What do you think the public thinks about that kind of thing?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Well, we know what they think because we saw it a couple of weeks ago in Massachusetts where they said this is absolutely wrong and we're going to stop it. And effectively what the people of Massachusetts did, in that momentous Tuesday night, they had the opportunity to change history, because after watching this House, this Senate and this administration for 12 months, they said, No more. They effectively recalled their Democrat Senator and replaced it with someone who they believed would listen more closely to their demands and their desires and to start deconstructing Washington.

That's the proposal that I have in that I said I've been through this before. I was through this in 1993 and 1994. I introduced legislation back then. I called it a voters' bill of rights. And as I was sitting with constituents in my district, and I heard them say, Congressman—most of them call me PETE—and they said, PETE, we call our Senators. We talk to them about the stimulus bill. We talk to them about health care. We talk to them about cap-and-trade. We talk about them bringing Gitmo to Standish, Michigan, and we always get the same thing. They answer, they are rude, and then they hang up. And then they said, PETE, there's nothing we can do to hold these folks accountable. The earliest we can do anything is 2012 and these bad things may happen.

And as I've been listening to them, I asked my staff to go back and get these voters' bill of rights, because I introduced them, we thought through them. It's populism. My colleagues here on the floor don't like it. But one of the lead things that we proposed in 1994, 1995, and 1996 was a bill that said one of the keystones of the voters' bill of rights says that when you call your Senator or your Representative, and they arrogantly answer the phone, are rude, then hang up, and then vote wrong, which traditionally means they are voting for bigger government and taking rights away from the individuals, rights away from the States, you now have an option.

The option is that when you leave the meeting where you're talking about this and someone gives you a piece of paper that has a few lines on it and you say, get some voters to sign those lines, and then at the top it says, this is a recall of Senator so-and-so, or a recall of Representative so-and-so, it allows the voters to exercise accountability throughout the process. I wrote an op-ed that hopefully we are going to get published soon. What it does is it allows the people to take back ownership of their government.

Michigan is a recall State. I had a mini-town hall meeting yesterday, and I ran into a township official. She is being recalled. It's very, very tough for people when they're recalled. But it clearly humbles people when they recognize that the voters can come back and if they don't like what we are doing, the voters can stand up and say, no, it's time for you to come home because you no longer understand who you work for, and it's time for us to have an opportunity to send someone to Washington that will listen to us.

Mr. AKIN. That's an interesting proposal. It shows a lot of imagination on your part. It doesn't make you popular with the establishment here; but then again, a bunch of us have been pretty establishment from the beginning because we understand that you do need to deconstruct. As you say, it's not to destroy all of government but to carefully prune out all of these things that have grown like Topsy through the years.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. It's about making it more efficient. You and I know that with No Child Left Behind, when the taxpayer from Michigan, the taxpayer from Lansing, the taxpayer from Detroit, the taxpayer from Holland and the taxpayer from Sault Sainte Marie sends a dollar to Washington for education, it goes through the bureaucracies. It goes through the State bureaucracies. And at every juncture, a PacMan comes out and takes a piece and takes another piece; and by the time it gets to the classroom, there may only be 60 to 65 cents left.

Mr. AKIN. Now you're starting with the assumption that the 65 cents is actually going to do some good and is not possibly harmful. And I would even bet that some of the programs coming out of Washington just in and of their nature are harmful.

One of the things that I think particularly the Washington establishment has misunderstood and perhaps some of our national media, they would like to write off a whole lot of Americans as, well, they are just a bunch of crazy TEA party people or something. What I have seen of that movement to me it seems like it defies party labels. And it is a very broad spectrum of Americans who are saying, enough already and this idea of deconstructing. I think they get sick of, we talked about 300 pages of amendments at 3 o'clock in the morning.

Here is another thing that sort of bugs me—and tell me what you think about it. We have this deal called a farm bill. It's really not a farm bill. It's this deal that is made between food stamps and farmers and this and that, and it's all put together, and it's set up from a political point of view to pass.

But what has happened is, if you really looked at the individual component parts, most people would say, I don't like it. And yet by packaging this stuff up, we end up with that much more Federal spending, and I think it's that kind of thing that those Americans are starting to pay attention to. I will tell you what should spook the people down here in the establishment: they are starting to read some of the legislation. And that's a scary thought.

□ 2000

Mr. HOEKSTRA. That's a scary thing, and that is exactly the type of process that people don't like. And they don't like the fact that when the President comes out and says during a campaign, when we get to the health care negotiations, it is going to be on C–SPAN so that we can see whether the gentleman is arguing for his voters, fighting for his constituents, or whether that person over there is fighting for the insurance companies or fighting for the unions or whatever. And it is kind of like, we get to there and you are watching C–SPAN at 11:30 at night, and someone walks up to the microphone and says, Hey, we have got a deal.

Mr. AKIN. What deal? Transparency?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. It is like, you are announcing this at 11:30 at night and there is only a few of us that have nothing better to do and we are watching C–SPAN so we know, but nobody else will, and they'll find out in the morning?

But that is the transparency. That is where I think this concept of recall gets real power. Recall says I think two things. It says to Washington, stop the midnight deals.

The other thing I think that provides a tremendous amount of power and authority is it tells Washington, stop the power grab. Stop taking the stuff away from the States and away from us as individuals.

We need to put something back in the process so that the ''rights of States'' has real meaning, has real teeth. Right now, we go through the appropriations process, the States are all at the pig's trough, the feeding trough, trying to get as much money as they can, get more than the next guy. It is kind of like, no, don't send the money here, ever. And if we have the opportunity for citizens to potentially recall their Representatives and their Senators, it creates potentially a whole new dynamic of putting States' rights back at the forefront.

Mr. AKIN. Let me ask you a question, because I know you are a proud resident of Michigan. I just want to say, speculatively, what would happen if you were the Governor of Michigan and somebody came to you with this health care bill, and the Congressional Budget Office, because it had been carefully written, said it was a $1 trillion bill, but when you looked at it, you said, ''Well it is $1 trillion to the Federal, but it has got unfunded mandates for the State of Michigan''? And you have probably got a balanced budget in some sort of amendment in Michigan. Wouldn't that make you frustrated if we are dumping the real cost of something down onto the States?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. You are exactly right, and this is where Governors need to stand up and say no. I think with the health care bill, I think wasn't there a movement in like 29 States or something where State legislators were saying, No, we don't want it.

And why? In the State of Michigan, we calculated, or Heritage or someone calculated that the unfunded mandate for Medicaid alone was $700 million.

Mr. AKIN. That is a huge amount for a State budget.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. It is a huge amount for a State budget. But it happens every program. You know, we promise health care for all. No child left behind. No worker left behind. Everybody has a job. We put a little bit of money into the pot and then we pass it down to the States, and then the States get it and they say, Whoa, we thought you were going to pay for all of this.

That has been the biggest complaint about No Child Left Behind. Right? All of these mandates, and you didn't give us the money to implement it. Give us more money. It's kind of like, No, don't give us more money. Let us keep our money. Get rid of the mandates, and we will run our own schools.

Mr. AKIN. That is a novel idea.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. It is a novel idea.

Mr. AKIN. You know, it was interesting. When we were looking at that No Child Left Behind, it was my first kind of introduction to insider ball in Washington, DC, and the Department of Education. And there were all of these programs in the Department of Education, and each one was funded.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Over 600. We counted them. Across the government, there were over, I think, 650 different education programs, and you say, Why?

Mr. AKIN. What we attempted to do, and I think you were part of negotiating, trying to get this bill to be something that we could be proud of. And I think the deal was, How about we do this? How about we let the local superintendent of his school take a look at all 600-something of these programs, take the money that he could get for all of them, and if he wants to, direct it all to one or two of his favorite programs that meet the needs of their individual schools instead of having the red tape of 600 different Federal programs?

And that seemed like a pretty logical thing, because each superintendent could take a look at their school and their own needs, and they could take the money and channel it in an effective way.

Guess what the establishment down here said?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. No. We don't trust them.

Mr. AKIN. Exactly. We know more what they are doing than they do.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. So what we do is we tell Ypsilanti, we tell Midland, we tell Traverse City, At least a portion of the money that you get from Washington, you will all run it the same way. And it is kind of like, Wow——

Mr. AKIN. Whether the program works or not.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. These are three very, very different communities with very different needs and challenges right now. Why are we trying to put them all into one straitjacket? Don't we really trust the local officials? And, more importantly, are you telling us you don't trust local parents to take ownership over their schools?

Dick Armey, our former colleague, used to say, The people that I want running my schools are the people who know the names of my kids. That is the local folks.

Mr. AKIN. That paints a picture. Doesn't it?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. It paints a picture. Because if you come to Washington and you ask, Do you know the kids in the fifth grade at South Middle School or West Middle School? And it is kind of like, What town?

Well, in Holland.

No, I don't. And they have gone through consolidation and all of that.

The names of the schools aren't that important. What is important is, Do you know the names of the kids at Muskegon Heights? in Bay City? in Mackinaw? And the answer will be, No. As a matter of fact, I can't even find some of those places on the map if I have to look, is what you will get from the Education Department.

I have always wanted to go to the Education Department and start with the Secretary, say, Mr. Secretary, what State are you from? Well, I know he is from Illinois. He is from Chicago. He is not far from Michigan. He actually probably understands the Midwest and he understands large, urban school districts.

Okay. Do you have anybody in your office, the secretariat or whatever that is from Michigan?

No, I don't think so.

Then you go to the undersecretaries. And, Do you have anybody that is from Michigan?

How far do I have to go down before I find somebody in the position of authority that is maybe from my State that may have a little bit of understanding of my State? Now, we have over 9 million people living in Michigan, so that person might understand a piece of Michigan but not the whole State.

And then you kind of go through and say, I wonder how long it would take me to find somebody from the Second Congressional District. Then, I wonder how long it would take me to find somebody from my hometown who understands that right now the community is facing a $2 million shortfall, that we have got issues with our public schools. The public schools are asking for a $70 million bond issue, and that they would understand the challenges. I don't think I will find anybody from Holland.

To Washington, our kids are a number at best. In Holland, it is ''Aaron.'' They know the names of the kids.

Mr. AKIN. Of course, that whole discussion suggests the Founders were a little smarter than we gave them credit for. There is nothing in the Constitution that justifies the creation of a Federal Department of Education in the first place. It was, I think, more of a concession to the NEA teachers union. And I am not sure if they got a very good deal anyway.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I can tell you, we worked with the NEA, the National Education Association. We worked with them, BARNEY FRANK and I. BARNEY FRANK, one of my colleagues from the other side of the aisle, we fought this issue, and he came at it from a very different standpoint than where I did.

Mr. AKIN. I would assume.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. We came at it from the right and the left. But we came together because we both saw the inherent problems with this bill, and we had an amendment that we were hoping that if the NEA, if the National Education Association had joined with us and supported it, I think we would have passed our amendment and we would have a very different No Child Left Behind framework than what we have today. But they were kind of neutral. They didn't take a position, which also tells something to our constituents: If you are not involved in the process, someone else will decide the future for you.

What the NEA found out is that they didn't participate actively in fighting this bill. And now, I just talked to a group of students, I think it was Monday morning, or they were at one of the lunches. There were 18 students there. They were there with their teacher. They were advanced AP students, out of school. They were there at lunch in Wayland, Michigan.

I said, I voted against No Child Left Behind. And that always surprises a lot of the teachers in my district, because they thought that I was just lockstep with the President. Of course HOEKSTRA voted with the President. No, I voted against the bill. And the loudest applause comes from the NEA member, the teacher, because he has seen what it has done to his local schools. And we have just gone through, and we are in the process of duplicating exactly what happened with No Child Left Behind with this new program called Race to the Top.

What does Race to the Top do? In Michigan—and I just kind of laid back a little. If people asked me, I would say, If I were you, I wouldn't go for the money. But the State went for the money because you had to do some reforms. The reforms were good. But if the reforms were good, we should have done them anyway. We should not have waited for Washington to bribe us to do this, because now that we are involved in this Race to the Top process, we are also finding out, well, this is No Child Left Behind all over again. Because what Race to the Top does is the same thing as No Child Left Behind. It promised a pot of gold at the end of the rainbow.

And now local school districts are starting to take a look at this and they are saying, This isn't so good. No one told us that we are going to get X amount of dollars, but that to implement the mandates that come with Race to the Top it is going to cost us more than X. So, actually, we are going to get this Federal money and we are going to get the mandates that come along with it, and now to implement these mandates it is going to cost us extra money to do it when we are already being squeezed.

Sounds like No Child Left Behind. Sounds like health care.

Mr. AKIN. The thing that surprises me, because I was a State legislator in the State of Missouri for 12 years. It seems like the States never seem to catch up to the scam.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. It is kind of like Charlie Brown. How many times are you going to pull the football away?

Mr. AKIN. It is kind of like Lucy with the football and Charlie Brown trying to kick the football. There is always a string on the piece of cheese, and they say, Come on, mouse, get the cheese. Then they reel the string in. And they have been doing this for I don't know how many years.

If you were Governor, wouldn't you think it would be smart in some States to say, I have seen this before. I really don't want you telling me how to run our schools. I don't want you telling me how to do the things that our State knows how to do for ourselves far better. You can just keep your money down in Washington, D.C. It is not a temptation to us anymore, and we are going to run a clean and efficient State where we really do things. Our objective is going to be one of the top performing States all across America, and this is a competition where we are going to start right now by saying no to a whole lot of government red tape.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. And what you will see again is the States becoming incubators of ideas. Missouri or Michigan, we will compete, and you will get some great ideas, we will get some great ideas. You will have some bad ideas and we will have some bad ideas. We will try them. Some things will work, some things will not. And then we will be looking around at the other States and saying, Hey, what are you doing that works? And when we find something that says, Your community is not exactly like ours, but if we kind of take what you have done, there is a lot of good stuff there, and if we put that into place in Grand Rapids, with a few tweaks, we think that is going to help us; we think that is going to help make our schools in Grand Rapids better.

□ 2015

Mr. AKIN. You know what is exciting is you are talking about that spirit of ingenuity that Americans have. One of the things people down here in the institutional part of our government, they think everybody has got to have a Ph.D. and be an expert in this or that. And what I have seen so often in Americans, you use just a little bit of common sense, and as you are saying, you take that ingenuity and that can do spirit and just get the red tape and the government chains off of them and let them start to solve their problems.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. The other thing that we will see is we will see that at a State level you can respond. When something doesn't work, you change it. You and I are both very familiar that there is a key component of No Child Left Behind that does not work. What is it? It says we are going to measure this year's first grade class and their performance, and we are going to compare it to last year's first grade class and their performance.

I say, well, you know, this could be 27 kids and this could be 27 kids, but they may be very, very different kids. And as a matter of fact, I was looking at that. And right after No Child Left Behind passed, I went to one of my schools, because they invited me to come in. And I knew where the school was, and I thought that this was in a relatively stable neighborhood. And they were explaining to me some of their issues. And they said Congressman, you know, we don't even have these 27 kids all year. We have 27 kids when we begin the year, we have 27 kids in this class when we end the year, but there may be 20 to 25 kids that have come in and out of this class. And you kind of look at them and say I thought this was a pretty stable neighborhood. They said you don't understand. We have got these types of things in the neighborhood, and this is a very transient population.

Mr. AKIN. How in the world could any statistics mean anything when you have got the situation you are talking about?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Right. But the standard has been in place for 8 years. Everybody knows it is wrong and it doesn't work. Technology has moved to the point where it says we can track Johnny individually. And if he moves from one school to another, we can track his specific performance. We ought to be tracking the specific performance of every kid in the classroom versus a group of kids that is in and out and all of that.

But after 8 years, what is the measurement? The same one that passed in 2001 that everybody agrees doesn't work. But it is what, it is implemented in all 50 States, and it is the criteria that determines whether you are a good school or you are—only Washington can use these terms—a failing school.

For the teachers that are in this school that have a 70 percent turnover of kids in their classroom during the year, you know, they may not measure up very well to the arbitrary standards that were put in place here in Washington, D.C., but they may be some of

our most committed and talented teachers because they are dealing with different kids in the classroom.

You know, every couple of weeks a new child comes in, a couple leave, and it is like, wow, this kid has different skills than the two that have left. I have got to figure out exactly, you know, is this kid excelling in math? You know, he has got great math skills, but I got to help him in reading. You know, you got to do a whole assessment. But the current model doesn't allow for those kinds of differences.

Mr. AKIN. Is that current model something that could be changed? Let's say you were to, a State were to basically say hey, we are going to start over again. We are going to do a different approach. Is that the kind of thing a State could really be innovative on, or has the Federal Government just got them locked down?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Absolutely. What you want to have happen is you and I both want accountability. But as technology changes, and as teaching changes, and as practices in the classroom changes, you know, I want Missouri developing an accountability model, I want Michigan developing an accountability model, I want Illinois developing an accountability model. And then every year I want to get together and say, you know, here is what is working for us, but we got some problems in this area. We just don't appear to be getting it right. What are you doing?

And then Missouri may come back and say, well, you know, we had those same kinds of issues 3 years ago, and here is what we did, and this appears to make our accountability system better. But you know, here is where we are running into a problem right now. So you have that learning going on, and then you get together and you say, you know, well, what is the best way to put in performance pay for teachers? How do you recognize the differences in a classroom where you begin the year with 27 kids in the classroom and at the end of the year they have the same 27 kids? You know, how do you measure teachers' performance in a classroom like that versus the teacher who is in a classroom where they have got the 70 percent turnover? You can't treat them the same. You can't have the same kind of measurement. You know, how do you deal with that? That is the kind of ingenuity and creativity that we need to be seeing going on across the country.

Someone sent me an email message tonight talking about the video learning, the high-tech learning and those types of things. And there are people that are experimenting with that at higher level, at the community colleges, our high schools and all that. You know, it is like somebody ought to really try that and see what works. Do a little experimentation.

Mr. AKIN. I couldn't help thinking about what you are saying and getting me excited a little bit about this. If I were in Missouri, I think it would be a Show Me Progress or something. They call us the Show Me State. And I think one of the ways that would really be pretty interesting and might change the paradigm quite a bit would be if you really want to give bonuses to teachers, why don't you let the parents of the students have a say in how their performance would be?

Because I will tell you, if you think back about all of your teachers that you have had, I can't remember too much stuff the teachers taught me, but I can sure remember the people and the characters that I respected because of the way they lived their lives. And there were some that were just really, really treasures. They were like State treasures. They were such wonderful people. And I still remember them to the day. And I think sometimes I am guilty, I should have gone back and thanked them for putting up with a little brat like me.

And if the parents have some chance to direct those bonuses, I am sure that would probably politically knock the train off the track. But there is an idea. Because those parents know whether their kids are getting the real stuff or not.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. And I am not saying that bonuses for teachers are the way to go. But we ought to be working with teachers, with parents, and with others to have these laboratories around the country. And that doesn't mean that every class is a laboratory and you are trying the whole thing brand new. It means what you are saying is every year, every month, every week we are going to be focused on having continuous improvement. That if we can learn from other States, if we can learn from other schools, if we can learn from other countries we are always going to be on the cutting edge of improving our schools.

Right now where are we? Where do our superintendents look? Where do our State education bureaucrats look? Now they have to look to some old bill that was passed in 2001 that tells them how to run their schools. You won't find that in business anymore. You won't find businesses operating on a model that was in place in 2001. If they were still operating in the same practices, the same technology and all of these kinds of things that they were operating on in 2001, guess what, in 2010 they would be out of business. They could no longer compete.

So whether it is education, whether it is infrastructure, you know, the whole gamut. You want to do the same thing with job training. You know, as a starter, I have got bills to do this. It is kind of like highway money goes back to the States, the gas tax money. It doesn't need to come here. Send a penny out of every dollar, let the 435 of us here fight over one penny of gas tax, not a dollar of gas tax.

All right. Then same thing with K–12 education. Send us the money back. We will get 35 cents more of every dollar to put into the classroom. And then it is really a win-win. You know, send me 90 cents of every education dollar. You save 10 percent, I get 25 cents more going into the classroom. It is a win for all of us. Get rid of the bureaucracy and the paperwork. Put the emphasis on the kids. And then do it with job training. I have got bills on all three of those areas. And the bottom line is if you don't do it, recall.

Mr. AKIN. Recall. You know, if you take a look at what the Federal Government was like when it was originally created, as I recall there were really only four laws. One of the laws was against piracy on the high seas. One of the laws was against counterfeiting, because the Federal Government printed the money. There was a law against being a traitor or a spy to your country. All of those laws had in common that it was really a Federal authority, as opposed to something that could be handled by the States. But the States had all the laws that hang him if he steals a horse or whatever the different State laws were. All of your laws almost were at a State level.

Where now what has happened is people somehow think that all of the intelligence moved to Washington, D.C., and they have got all of these Federal laws, statute books full. Then you have got all of these bureaucracies full of rules and regulations. Somehow we have got to start taking this place apart and sending that authority to the State level. And with all due respect, gentlemen, a lot could go to the local and the parental level as well.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Absolutely. You know, because you take a look at a State like Michigan, and I think it is probably the same in Missouri, and you take a look at the State and you say, well, my State this year is starting the year off with—or they are looking at their next budget year and they are saying we are going to have somewhere between a $1.2 and a $1.4 billion deficit for the next budget year, which they got to get done later this calendar year. And you look at it and say, well, you got a $47 billion budget. You know, finding $1.2, finding $1.4 billion in savings, you know, 2, 3 percent? That shouldn't be that hard.

And then you start looking at the reality and say, well, out of that $47 billion, 19 of it is direct money from Washington, D.C. All right. Well, that is off the table. Then you take a look at it and say, well, but you know, with that highway money we get that is part of that $19 billion, it requires that we have the State match. And this money that we got for K–12, you know, that comes from No Child Left Behind, it controls some of the spending of the rest of the budget.

And you start looking at it and saying, well, now all of a sudden I have got a $1.2 or $1.4 billion deficit and I have got maybe $10, $11 billion that I can work with. And it is like, no, there are

efficiencies that we can find in all of those areas if that money never left the State and we were given the authority.

Because you know, the other thing that we talk about, the money comes from Washington, but what then happens? That is not the end of the line. If the money comes from Washington, then—actually, Washington collects the money.

Mr. AKIN. It came from your and my taxpayers.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. You and I paid it and our constituents paid it. All right. And it is gone. It comes to this place here. We then decide what we are going to do with it.

Now, if our people in our communities or our States want to get the money back, a lot of times what do they have to do? What do they have? All of my school districts have what they call grant writers, somebody they pay $30 to $35,000 to, and there is a very good performance measure.

Mr. AKIN. Do they get the grant?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. You know, we are paying you $35,000 a year. If you get $36,000 in grants coming back to the school district, you have been a good investment. So they have to apply for the money. And they may not get it. But you know, a lot of times it is a competition to get the money. So a lot of the application money is wasted. The money then comes back to the State, goes to our local schools, we lose 35 percent. Once it is in the classroom, once it is being built to build a turtle fence or build a bike overpass that we don't need, then we have to send a report back to Washington telling them what we did with the money. I have always wanted to find the person who reads it. Okay. Does anybody really read the report?

And then every once in a while, and perhaps too often, you will find the next thing. You will find the auditor going back to a local school district or a local government agency and say, ''Prove it. Prove that you spent the money the way that you applied for it and the way that you developed and moved it forward.''

Mr. AKIN. I tell you there is plenty of work to do. And it just needs some energy, some innovation both in Washington, D.C., but also at the State levels. What is the situation in Michigan in terms of unemployment? Do you have the same kind of problems there that other people are facing?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Actually, we don't have the same kind of problems. Our problems are much more severe than anybody else's. We lead the country in unemployment. And we have done that for a number of years.

□ 2030

I think the last unemployment number in Michigan was 14.8 percent. But for the last 12 to 18 months we've been in the 14, 15 percent unemployment. Well above any other State. That really doesn't include the people that have stopped working. It doesn't include the people that are underemployed. It also doesn't include the number of people—when I come here to Washington every week, I'm always amazed by the number of people who are on the plane, or as I'm talking to the people in my district, the number of people who I run into and say, Pete, I'm in Michigan. I'm committed to Michigan. But I'm gone 2 weeks at a time from my wife and my kids because the only place I can find a job is somewhere else. I'm working somewhere other than Michigan. Some of them stay because they're so committed. Others stay because, obviously, in a State that has declining population, by definition you have a housing surplus, meaning that it's hard for them to sell their homes.

The vision that we have for Michigan is to bring Michigan back. Michigan is a great State. Missouri is a great State. This is a great country. I think you and I are committed to believing that with the right kind of leadership either at the Federal level or at the State level, there's no reason we ought to be enduring 10 percent at a national level or 15 percent at a State level. Go back to the principles that we employed back in 1994. It's accountability back to the people. That's what the Contract with America was all about. I tried to get recall as part of the Contract with America. I wish we had. I wish voters today had the opportunity to recall their representatives and their senators.

But what we did in 1995 and 1996, we didn't increase spending, we didn't do a stimulus bill like that, we didn't do cap-and-trade, we didn't do health care. We didn't do all these massive government spending programs. We basically froze spending. We cut taxes. We reformed government. We reformed welfare. And we did it with a Republican Congress and a Democrat President. We were able to focus on what the American people wanted, what they needed, and we had an era of prosperity that helped a lot of people. But the formula is simple: Give more money back to the American people, reform government, and control spending.

Mr. AKIN. You know, your simple little phrase—sometimes a simple phrase is very effective. You talked about, bring Michigan back. Or, bring Missouri back. The tragedy is that what you just said in a few sentences explains how to do it. It's not like this is that complicated. You don't have to be too bright to say, If you want jobs, you've got to have some company that's going to provide the jobs. And you don't have to be too bright to say that if you tax the hide off of the guy that owns the little business, he is not going to have any money to build a new wing or to buy a new machine tool or to add the new process to create the new jobs. It's not that complicated.

But the trouble is we get these people down here who are so institutional, and they think we know what to do. We're going to tax the rich guy and redistribute the money. And somehow that makes the economy better.

I mean that stimulus bill, the whole logic behind it was totally flawed. Yet, what you have just said in a sentence or two, gentleman, you put your finger on exactly what has to be done. And it's got to kill you to go back to Michigan. You love your State, you love the people in the State. And you understand what it takes to make it work. And people are just tone deaf.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I don't think people are tone deaf. I think people in the State sense that——

Mr. AKIN. The Federal Government is tone deaf.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Just like the gentleman demonstrated in Massachusetts, the people are not tone deaf. They think we are. And they know Washington is.

Mr. AKIN. That's what I meant.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Gentleman, that's the problem down here. Washington, D.C., as an institution has become tone deaf. And you've got solutions. You know what the solutions are. You can fix the problem in Michigan, you can fix the problem in Missouri. It's as simple as what JFK did, what Ronald Reagan did, what Bush did, and that is get off the spending, get off the taxing, and give the American public a chance.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Here's how we start our op-ed. I like our title. Of course, I helped write it. We call it ''Storming the Castle.'' On January 19, the people of Massachusetts stormed the castle of the political elite and toppled it to the ground. After months of abuse and neglect and being shut out of the lofty parapets of the U.S. Senate, they took a stand and sent a strong, undeniable message to the Democrat-controlled castle of American politics. Enough is enough.

I think that sums it all up. That's where the American people are today. That's where grassroots America is today. That's where they were in 1993 and 1994. In 1993 and 1994, they got involved. When I meet with these folks, I do ask them the question: How different would this country be today if the involvement that we saw in 1993 and 1994, the insightful, knowledgeable involvement—I mean these people understand the issues. They know where they want to go. If that involvement we saw in 1993 and 1994, and the involvement that we're seeing in 2009 and 2010, how different would this country have been if they had stayed involved through that whole timeframe?

And that's partly our responsibility by not motivating them enough and inviting them into the process. But if they would been involved in the process, we wouldn't be talking about whether we should be passing legislation or passing a constitutional amendment that would give them the authority to recall their Federal elected officials. We'd already have it. It would now be working its way through the States. I think it's so healthy to have these people involved in the process

and involved in a knowledgeable way, because they do recognize that if they don't show up, someone else will run this country. They recognize that government is run by those who show up on election day.

Mr. AKIN. You know, the interesting thing is, as you make government bigger, it makes the citizens smaller. And it's gotten to the point now where that government has got to be trimmed. And I think people are ready to do it. I would like to just say that I appreciate your leadership these years that I've shared in the Congress with you, Congressman HOEKSTRA, and for the fact that you have consistently, before it was popular, you have always been in this position of trying to deconstruct the unnecessary elements of the Federal Government. And I think that in a sense that you and I have seen a time where more voters are going to think, Boy, I wish there were more Congressmen Hoekstras in the way that they vote and the way they keep taking the tough choices, regardless of political party, to do what is right and send that decisionmaking back to the local citizens. Send that tax dollar, let him keep it in his pocket, and keep the government small.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I thank my colleague, Congressman AKIN. This is a time where we've got the great State of Michigan, the great State of Missouri, the Show-Me State. It's now time for this Congress to show the people of Missouri, to show the people of America, and to show the people of Michigan where we're headed. And if we don't do it, guess what? They will show us on election day. And they will storm the castle by saying, Enough is enough.

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

CORRECTION TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF FRIDAY, JANUARY 29, 2010, AT PAGE H427

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Member added her name to the following discharge petition:

Petition 5 by Mrs. BLACKBURN on the bill (H.R. 391): Edward R. Royce.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of medical reasons.

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 Mr. QUIGLEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SESTAK, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. QUIGLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. REICHERT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, February 10.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, February 10.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CASSIDY, for 5 minutes, February 9.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GOHMERT, for 5 minutes, today and February 4.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, February 10.

Mrs. BACHMANN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SHIMKUS, for 5 minutes, February 9.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 4, 2010, 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:

5934. A letter from the Administrator, Risk Management Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — General Administrative Regulations; Subpart X-Interpretations of Statutory and Regulatory Provisions received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5935. A letter from the NRCS Acting Farm Bill Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — State Technical Committees received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5936. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Business Systems-Definition and Administration (DFARS Case 2009-D038) (RIN: 0750-AG) received January 11, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5937. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2010; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5938. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes to Patient Limitation for Dispensing or Prescribing Approved Narcotic Controlled Substances for Maintenance or Detoxification Treatment by Qualified Individual Practitioners [Docket No.: DEA-275F] (RIN: 1117-AA99) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5939. A letter from the Program Manager, NRDAR Program (DOI Office of the Secretary), Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Natural Resource Damages for Hazardous Substances (RIN: 1090-AA97) received December 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5940. A letter from the Office Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Alternate Fracture Toughness Requirements for Protection Against Pressurized Thermal Shock Events [NRC-2007-0008] (RIN: 3150-AI01) received Janaury 11, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5941. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5942. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5943. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5944. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5945. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5946. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5947. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5948. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Politcal Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5949. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5950. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act

of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5951. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5952. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5953. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5954. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5955. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5956. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5957. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5958. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5959. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5960. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5961. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5962. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5963. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5964. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5965. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5966. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5967. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5968. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5969. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5970. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5971. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5972. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5973. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5974. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5975. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5976. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5977. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5978. A letter from the Assisitant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5979. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5980. A letter from the Assistant Dircetor, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5981. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5982. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5983. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5984. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5985. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5986. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5987. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5988. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5989. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5990. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5991. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5992. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5993. A letter from the Deputy Director, Acquisition Policy and Legislation Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision of Department of Homeland Security Acquisition Regulation; Restrictions on Foreign Acquisition (HSAR Case 2009-004) [Docket No.: DHS-2009-0081] (RIN: 1601-AA57) received January 5, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5994. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — International Fisheries; Western and Central Pacific Fisheries for Highly Migratory Species; Bigeye Tuna Catch Limits in Longline Fisheries in 2009, 2010, and 2011 [Docket No.: 090130102-91386-02] (RIN: 0648-AX59) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5995. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic; Red Snapper Closure [Docket No.: 090508900-91414-02] (RIN: 0648-AX75) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5996. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fraser River Sockeye and Pink Salmon Fisheries; Inseason Orders (RIN: 0648-XS30) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5997. A letter from the Director Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Mackerel, Squid, and Butterfish Fisheries; Closure of the Directed Butterfish Fishery [Docket No.: 0808041043-9036-02] (RIN: 0648-SX77) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5998. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Herring Fishery; Rescission of Prohibition on Atlantic Herring Fishing in Management Area 2 [Docket No.: 061228342-7068-02] (RIN: 0648-XT19) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5999. A letter from the Director Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Modifications of the West Coast Commercial and Recreational Salmon Fisheries; Inseason Actions #8, #9, #10, #11, and #12 [Docket No.: 090324366-9371-01] (RIN: 0648-XS52) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6000. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Vessels Catching Pacific Cod for Processing by the Inshore Component in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 09100091344-9056-02] (RIN: 0648-XT10) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6001. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Bluefish Fishery; Commercial Quota Harvested for New Jersey [Docket No.: 090206144-9697-02] (RIN: 0648-AT09) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6002. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Gear Restriction for the U.S./Canada Management Area [Docket No.: 080521698-9067-02] (RIN: 0648-XS87) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6003. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Herring Fishery; Total Allowable Catch Harvested for Management Area 1A [Docket No.: 061228342-7068-02] (RIN: 0648-XT07) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6004. A letter from the Deputy Director, Acquisition Policy and Legislation Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Prohibition on Federal Protective Service Guard Services Contracts With Business Concerns Owned, Controlled, or Operated by an Individual Convicted of a Felony [HSAR Case 2009-001] [Docket No.: DHS-2009-0017] (RIN: 1601-AA55) received January 5, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6005. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Public Assistance Eligibility [Docket ID: FEMA-2006-0028] (RIN: 1660-AA45) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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:

Mr. McGOVERN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1065. Resolution providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 45) increasing the statutory limit on the public debt (Rept. 111–411). 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 Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida:

H.R. 4577. A bill to direct the President, acting through the National Disaster Medical System, to reimburse States for expenses incurred in providing treatment for health conditions and illnesses resulting, directly or indirectly, from the earthquake in Haiti on January 12, 2010; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CANTOR:

H.R. 4578. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to allow vehicles operated by members of the Armed Forces (including reserve components thereof) serving on active duty and vehicles operated by law enforcement officials to use high occupancy vehicle facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 4579. A bill to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in phase one of the South San Diego County Water Reclamation Project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California):

H.R. 4580. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize the Metropolitan Medical Response System Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BIGGERT (for herself, Mr. BACHUS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. ISSA, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. PAUL, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, and Mr. HENSARLING):

H.R. 4581. A bill to require the Inspector General of the Federal Housing Finance Agency to submit quarterly reports to the Congress during the conservatorship of the Federal National Mortgage Association and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BACA:

H.R. 4582. A bill to require Federal agencies and certain government-sponsored enterprises to reserve residential real estate owned for purchase by owner-occupants and other buyers using public funds for a period of at least 15 days; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BOCCIERI:

H.R. 4583. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to require certain campaign-related communications which are paid for by certain tax-exempt organizations or political organizations to include a statement naming their five largest donors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 4584. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Labor to award grants for worker training, technology development, and applied research in the wind energy industry production and energy efficient construction, retrofitting, and design industries; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 4585. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a temporary payroll increase tax credit for certain employers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARCHANT (for himself, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. LAMBORN, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. POSEY, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. PITTS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. FLEMING, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Ms. GRANGER, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. AKIN, and Mr. BRADY of Texas):

H.R. 4586. A bill to require, as a condition for modification of a home mortgage loan held by Fannie Mae or Freddie Mac or insured under the National Housing Act, that the mortgagor be verified under the E-verify program; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.R. 4587. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to require spending

limits be imposed when the statutory limit on the public debt is increased; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H.R. 4588. A bill to provide that the detention facility at Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba remains open indefinitely and to require that individuals detained at the facility be tried only by military commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SALAZAR:

H.R. 4589. A bill to provide consistent enforcement authority to the Bureau of Land Management, the National Park Service, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Forest Service to respond to violations of regulations regarding the management, use, and protection of public lands under the jurisdiction of these agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SESTAK:

H.R. 4590. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to require the Secretary of Agriculture to ensure the safety of school meals by enhancing coordination with States and schools operating school meal programs in the case of a recall of contaminated food; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SESTAK:

H.R. 4591. A bill to promote labor force participation of older Americans, with the goals of increasing retirement security, reducing the projected shortage of experienced workers, maintaining future economic growth, and improving the Nation's fiscal outlook; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TEAGUE (for himself and Mr. PERRIELLO):

H.R. 4592. A bill to provide for the establishment of a pilot program to encourage the employment of veterans in energy-related positions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. BARROW, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. SHULER, Mr. JONES, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. CLAY, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. HARE, Mr. REYES, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. KAGEN, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 4593. A bill to amend part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to waive Medicare part B premiums for certain military retirees; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BROUN of Georgia (for himself, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. JONES, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. PITTS, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. DUNCAN):

H.J. Res. 75. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to balance the Federal budget; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WU (for himself, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DICKS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. SCHRADER):

H. Res. 1062. A resolution recognizing the Coast Guard Group Astoria's more than 60 years of service to the Pacific Northwest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. DUNCAN, Ms. JENKINS, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. AKIN, Mr. COLE, and Mr. WITTMAN):

H. Res. 1063. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that a mandate imposed by the Federal Government requiring individuals to purchase health insurance is unconstitutional; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BERMAN (for himself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. POLIS of Colorado, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. STARK, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SIRES, Mr. WU, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. HONDA, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H. Res. 1064. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the ''Anti-Homosexuality Bill, 2009'' under consideration by the Parliament of Uganda, that would impose long term imprisonment and the death penalty for certain acts, threatens the protection of fundamental human rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MEEK of Florida (for himself, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. MACK, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. COOPER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REYES, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. TAYLOR, Ms. WATERS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. NYE, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. LAMBORN, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. BOREN, Mr. OWENS, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. MASSA, and Mr. WITTMAN):

H. Res. 1066. A resolution recognizing the bravery and efforts of the United States Armed Forces, local first responders, and other members of Operation Unified Response for their swift and coordinated action in light of the devastation wrought upon the nation of Haiti after a horrific 7.0 magnitude earthquake struck Port-Au-Prince and surrounding cities on January 12, 2010; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Texas (for himself, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CONAWAY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. REYES, and Mr. GONZALEZ):

H. Res. 1067. A resolution honoring Colonel Robert Howard for his lifetime of service to the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H. Res. 1068. A resolution condemning the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran for executing human rights activists; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LANCE (for himself, Mr. HOLT, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. PASCRELL):

H. Res. 1069. A resolution congratulating Willard S. Boyle and George E. Smith for being awarded the Nobel Prize in physics; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Ms. NORTON:

H. Res. 1070. A resolution expressing gratitude and appreciation to the individuals and organizations that comprise the National Urban Search and Rescue System of the Federal Emergency Management Agency for their unyielding determination and work as first responders to victims of disasters and other incidents, including the victims of the recent earthquake in Haiti, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 293: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 311: Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 389: Ms. CHU, Mr. HARE, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 417: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. KILROY, and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H.R. 424: Mr. EHLERS.

H.R. 476: Ms. NORTON, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 501: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 519: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.

H.R. 574: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 618: Ms. HIRONO and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.

H.R. 734: Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.

H.R. 745: Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana.

H.R. 816: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 886: Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.

H.R. 1024: Mr. MAFFEI.

H.R. 1079: Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, and Ms. SUTTON.

H.R. 1189: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 1240: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1318: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 1343: Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 1378: Mr. REICHERT and Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 1402: Ms. BEAN.

H.R. 1551: Mr. INSLEE.

H.R. 1552: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 1616: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 1646: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 1826: Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. WATSON, and Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 1868: Mr. UPTON, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. GRIFFITH, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.R. 1175: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 1927: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 1964: Mr. HINCHEY and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 2243: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 2266: Mr. MELANCON.
H.R. 2305: Mr. GRIFFITH, Ms. FOXX, and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.
H.R. 2413: Mr. HINCHEY and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 2421: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. DRIEHAUS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 2533: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 2546: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 2547: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
H.R. 2565: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 2672: Mr. KAGEN.
H.R. 2737: Mr. TURNER and Ms. RICHARDSON.
H.R. 2799: Mr. COHEN, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. OLVER.
H.R. 2849: Mr. STARK, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 2850: Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee.
H.R. 2882: Mr. SESTAK.
H.R. 2906: Mr. DENT, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. PERRIELLO.
H.R. 2941: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 2964: Mr. GRIFFITH.
H.R. 3097: Ms. RICHARDSON.
H.R. 3202: Mr. SARBANES.
H.R. 3240: Mr. WAMP.
H.R. 3249: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 3286: Mr. MCINTYRE and Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 3308: Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 3381: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 3421: Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 3486: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
H.R. 3710: Mr. KISSELL and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 3721: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 3734: Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 3745: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 3749: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 3764: Mr. MAFFEI.
H.R. 3933: Mr. COSTELLO.
H.R. 3995: Mr. CONYERS, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. WU, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 4051: Mr. SESTAK, Mr. PETERSON, and Ms. FOXX.
H.R. 4085: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, and Mr. INSLEE.
H.R. 4099: Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 4127: Mr. AKIN, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. HENSARLING.
H.R. 4132: Ms. CHU and Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 4150: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. THORNBERRY.
H.R. 4153: Mr. ADLER of New Jersey.
H.R. 4196: Mr. KAGEN.
H.R. 4199: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. REHBERG, and Mr. GRIFFITH.
H.R. 4206: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 4241: Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee.
H.R. 4247: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. POLIS of Colorado, and Mr. PIERLUISI.
H.R. 4255: Mr. PETRI.
H.R. 4262: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 4263: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 4274: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4296: Mr. MCNERNEY and Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana.
H.R. 4302: Mr. FOSTER, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. CHILDERS, and Mr. CARDOZA.
H.R. 4312: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H.R. 4325: Mr. HINCHEY and Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 4359: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 4402: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. BACA, and Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 4403: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 4415: Mr. CASTLE.
H.R. 4476: Mr. DENT.
H.R. 4504: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 4505: Mr. CULBERSON and Mr. MASSA.
H.R. 4512: Mr. PERRIELLO.
H.R. 4517: Mr. FILNER and Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 4522: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 4527: Mr. PERRIELLO, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mrs. DAHLKEMPER.
H.R. 4530: Mr. WEINER.
H.R. 4531: Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. MASSA.
H.R. 4532: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. POMEROY, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 4533: Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.
H.R. 4542: Mr. LOBIONDO and Mr. ALTMIRE.
H.R. 4549: Mr. LUJÁN, Ms. FUDGE, and Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 4566: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. PITTS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. FLEMING, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. AKIN, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MCHENRY, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. ROONEY, and Mr. JORDAN of Ohio.
H.R. 4573: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. WATT, and Mr. OLVER.
H.J. Res. 13: Mr. FILNER.
H. Con. Res. 96: Mr. TURNER.
H. Con. Res. 137: Mr. WEINER.
H. Con. Res. 144: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H. Con. Res. 193: Mr. BARROW.
H. Con. Res. 198: Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. CARNEY, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. SHULER.
H. Con. Res. 233: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H. Res. 213: Mr. BERMAN, Ms. WATSON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ORTIZ, and Mr. RUSH.
H. Res. 440: Mr. OLSON.
H. Res. 510: Mr. LANCE, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, and Mr. OLVER.
H. Res. 947: Ms. WATSON.
H. Res. 949: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS and Mr. LATTA.
H. Res. 1016: Mr. HONDA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. HINCHEY.
H. Res. 1019: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. ROHRABACHER, and Mr. MCCAUL.
H. Res. 1026: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. HALL of Texas, and Mr. TERRY.
H. Res. 1032: Mr. GALLEGLY, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. SIRES, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. REYES, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. PAYNE.
H. Res. 1033: Mr. MACK, Mr. WU, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. KIRK, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. DENT, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WALDEN, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. CAO, Mr. COBLE, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. TIBERI, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. DEAL of Georgia.
H. Res. 1036: Ms. WATSON, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. WOLF.
H. Res. 1040: Mr. COHEN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. DICKS, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. WEINER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. RAHALL.