Regular season scoring champion Evgeni Malkin won MVP honors by leading all playoff scorers, and goalie Marc-Andre Fleury once again proved he belonged among the game's elites with his dominating performance in net.

Head Coach Dan Bylsma took over in midseason when the team was out of playoff contention and led them not only to the playoffs but to a championship. And in winning the title, Sidney Crosby became the youngest team captain to hoist the Stanley Cup in the 115-year history of the trophy.

As in all successful organizations, the leadership of the Penguins starts at the top. The incomparable Mario Lemieux will now have his name engraved on the Cup for the third time, this time as team owner. Just as he did when he came into the league as a player, Mario Lemieux took control of a franchise threatened by bankruptcy and relocation. But from that, he built a championship team that leads the league in television ratings, merchandise sales, and sellouts.

Yes, Madam Speaker, these Penguins can fly. Congratulations go out to the entire organization for completing the hat trick of champions, winning their third straight Stanley Cup. The 2009 Pittsburgh Penguins have earned their well-deserved place alongside the greatest sports legends in the City of Champions.

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.)

## REDESIGNATING THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY AS THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY & MARINE CORPS

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. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to announce that 290 of my colleagues in the House from both parties have joined me as colleagues of cosponsors of H.R. 24—legislation to redesignate the Department of the Navy as the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps. I'm grateful for the widespread support for this change among my House colleagues, and I also thank Chairman IKE SKELTON who will include the language of H.R. 24 in the National Defense Authorization Act markup tomorrow.

For the past 7 years, the language of this bill has been part of the House version of the National Defense Authorization Act. Each year, the full House of Representatives has supported this change. This year, I'm also grateful to have the support of Senator PAT ROBERTS, a former marine, who introduced the same bill in the Senate, S. 504. With his help, I'm hopeful that this will be the year that the Senate supports the House position and joins in bringing proper respect to the fighting team of the Navy and Marine Corps.

Over the course of the Marine Corps history, including their present-day service in Afghanistan and Iraq, those three words, ''and Marine Corps,'' have been earned through blood and sacrifice. The Navy and Marine Corps have operated as one entity for more than two centuries, and H.R. 24 would allow the name of this department to illustrate that fight.

This legislation is not about changing the responsibilities of the Secretary of the Navy Department, reallocating resources, or altering missions. This change is all about respect and gratitude to the Marine Corps. As symbolic as this change might be, the Marine Corps has earned the right to be recognized in the Department's name. Over the past several years, this change has received support from three former Navy Secretaries, the Marine Corps League, Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Fleet Reserve Association, and many other individuals and groups.

In 2004, at a hearing before the House Armed Services Committee, Navy Admiral Stansfield Turner described his support for this change, and he said, ''I think this change in title enhances the prestige and pride of the people in the Marine Corps, and it does not necessarily take anything away from the Navy in that process. I am particularly impressed today . . . [by] the degree of cooperation between the armed services of our country.''

And Admiral Turner further stated, ''Emphasizing that this is a Navy-Marine Corps team is a very important part of keeping that kind of sight on the objective of teamwork in combat.''

Madam Speaker, the marines who are fighting today deserve this recognition.

In closing, I would like to show the change.

Madam Speaker, on this first poster was actually a letter that was sent by the Secretary of the Navy to a Marine wife who was killed. I certainly have taken out the name of the Marine Corps's wife's name, and I want to read this part to you and to those on the floor: On behalf of the Department of the Navy, please accept my very sincere condolences in the loss of your husband, Captain so-and-so, Marine.

Madam Speaker, the important part of reading this is this. If this bill becomes law, this fighting team will recognize this Marine family in this way: The Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps. Dear Marine Corps family, On behalf of the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps. Madam Speaker, that's all that it does, but it's very important that the Marine Corps receive this recognition.

And before closing, Madam Speaker, as I do frequently, I ask God to please bless our many men and women in uniform, I ask God to bless the families of our men and women in uniform, and I ask God in his loving arms to hold the families who have given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq. And, Madam Speaker, I ask three times, God, please, God, please, God, please continue to bless America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

## UNFAIR TREATMENT OF CAR DEALERSHIPS

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. Madam Speaker, this last weekend, I met with several auto dealers in my district, and it was very interesting to find out really what all of them are going through right now.

The Chrysler and General Motors companies are closing hundreds and hundreds of automobile dealerships across the country, and after talking to these dealers, I can't figure out why. It isn't costing the automobile companies anything. They sell the cars to the dealers and the dealers sell those to the consumer. And the dealers pay for those cars.

In addition, the dealers pay for the advertising, the dealers pay for the plant and equipment, their dealerships, the buildings. They pay the mechanics. They pay the sales people. So the car company, all they do is make the car and sell it to the dealer. And so why are they closing all of these dealerships? It seems to me, as you reduce your sales force across the country, you're going to reduce the amount of cars that are sold to the consumer. It just doesn't make any sense to me.

But let me tell you some of the things that these dealers are going through right now. One dealer told me that—it's a Chrysler dealer—he had a Dodge dealership. And Chrysler asked him a couple of years ago to buy another dealership that wasn't doing as well, and they asked him to not only buy the property but to upgrade the equipment and upgrade the property and upgrade the showroom.

So he put $3 million into buying a property and upgrading the showroom in the mechanics area, the garage area. And after he did it, just recently, right after he got it done, had invested $3 million, they closed him down. They closed him down. He lost $3 million after they asked him, the company asked him, to invest that money in purchasing and upgrading this other store.

Now, that's terrible. He put $3 million in it as the company requested, and then they cut the legs off from under him and he loses $3 million.

I talked to a Chevrolet dealer who was negotiating with a GMC dealer across the street. The GMC dealer and the Chevrolet dealer were right across the street from one other, and General Motors said, Why don't the two of you combine? And so the two companies were negotiating with one another on who would buy the other out, and it was a $3 million to $5 million purchase. Well, they couldn't reach agreement before the deal with General Motors took place, and they were going to close a whole bunch of dealerships. So what they did is they decided to close the dealership of the Chevrolet dealership down even though he was very profitable.

□ 1945

And what that means, simply, is the GMC dealer across the street is going to get this Chevrolet dealership that would have sold for $3 million to $5 million to him for nothing. And so this dealer is going out of business, and it's going to cost him $3 million to $5 million because they closed his dealership. He sold as many cars as they asked him to sell, he was up to snuff on his payments and everything else that was requested by the company, and they knocked the legs out from under him as well, and it cost him $3 million to $5 million.

There was a GM dealer that came to me at this meeting the other day, and he had eight dealerships, and they closed one of them down. It's going to cost him several million dollars. But he can't complain publicly because GM is going to be closing other dealerships down in the future, and he's afraid if he says anything they will close some of his other dealerships down and cost him more money.

You know, I just don't understand this. We have the government, the car czars, if you will, now taking control of the entire auto industry. They're forcing the executives of the companies out of office and replacing them with handpicked people by our government through the car czar and the Auto Task Force. So the government is taking over the auto industry and closing these dealerships, putting hundreds of thousands of people out of work, closing thousands of dealerships across the country, and actually hurting the American auto industry's ability to sell cars when they're in competition with car companies around the world. It just doesn't make any sense to me.

So, once again, here we have the government taking over an industry, socializing the auto industry, and really killing an awful lot of the people who work in it—not to mention the restaurants and the stores that surround these car dealerships who have been in business as well, and it's going to cost them jobs.

Government control of the private sector just destroys the private sector. And they want to now take over our health care industry. They're taking over the banks. They want to take over the energy industry with cap-and-trade, which is going to cost every family in this country $3,000 to $4,000 more per year for energy.

We don't need socialism in this country. We certainly don't need it. And here's an example, the car industry, of what happens when government takes over.

## CAP-AND-TRADE ALTERNATIVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. INGLIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. INGLIS. Madam Speaker, today I had interesting discussions in Greenville and Spartanburg, South Carolina. They were entitled, ''What's wrong with cap-and-trade and what's right with using free enterprise to solve the challenge that we have?''

So what's wrong with cap-and-trade? We came to pretty solid agreement on that, Madam Speaker. It's a massive tax increase in the midst of a recession; it's a Wall Street trading scheme that really would make any trader on Wall Street that led us into this recent debacle blush; and it's really a proposal that's going to end up decimating American manufacturing because the tax on energy would be applied just domestically, it wouldn't be applied to imported goods. And the result is that we would export productive capacity from the United States to other countries that don't have a price on carbon. So it's a real problem, and it is something that we have got to stop in order to get to the better.

The better that we discussed is a proposal—actually, a bipartisan proposal at this point—that JEFF FLAKE and DAN LIPINSKI and I are supporting, which is a plan to basically do a revenue-neutral tax swap. It involves changing what we tax and causing free enterprise to fix the problem that some are trying to fix with cap-and-trade; but as I just pointed out, there are real problems with cap-and-trade.

So the way this revenue-neutral tax swap would work is we would reduce taxes on something we want more of, which is payroll, by reducing the payroll tax. That's 6.2 percent from the employer and 6.2 percent from the employee on the first $106,800 worth of income. We would reduce that, and in an equal amount swap the tax, if you will, in an equal amount put a tax on carbon dioxide emissions. The result would be no additional take to the government, so it's revenue neutral. It would just free of from taxation something you want more of, which is income and labor and industry, and impose a tax on something you want less of, which is carbon dioxide.

The point that I was making in Greenville and Spartanburg today is, even if you think climate change is a bunch of hooey and there is no need to reduce carbon dioxide, I think conservatives can jump at the opportunity to reduce taxes on income. Because if you reduce set payroll tax, you free up employers to employ more people and you free up the employee to have more of their own money. This is something conservatives should be very excited about. Even if we were switching to, say, a tax on sweet gumballs or sycamore balls, or acorns, it would be better than taxing payroll.

The problem with taxing payroll is you're punishing work. So what we do is free up from taxation payroll, impose a tax on carbon dioxide, and watch the free enterprise system, with that price signal, change where we are such that we would fix the national security problem we have—which is great exposure to OPEC and its control of our oil markets—and we would also create jobs by creating new industries in new kinds of technologies, and we would clean up the air.

The point that I was making in these meetings in Greenville and Spartanburg is, even if you think climate change is hooey, still the small particulates in coal would cause you to want to take action. The cleaner alternative of nuclear power will come to the market when the market says, oh, coal is now paying the full freight of its cost. If it is, nuclear becomes possible and we start building nuclear power plants.

Madam Speaker, the key to this is getting the economics right. If we do that, we can fix this problem. But it starts with stopping this cap-and-trade because cap-and-trade isn't the way to fix this problem. The free enterprise system is the way to fix it. And to win the triple play of this American century we can improve the national security of the United States, we can create jobs, and we can clean up the air. Madam Speaker, I say we come together and get that done after we stop cap-and-trade.

## CONGRATULATING HUGH GRANT FOR WINNING 2009 KEYSTONE CENTER LEADERSHIP AWARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. AKIN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the winner of the 2009 Keystone Center Leadership Award for Leadership in Industry, Mr. Hugh Grant, chairman, president, and CEO of Monsanto Corporation.

Keystone Awardees have contributed to society in ways that reflect the spirit and mission of the Keystone Center and have demonstrated a history of achievement with a strong sense of vision, a proven ability to motivate others, dedication to team work and consensus, and the drive and ability to initiate fundamental and long-term positive change.

I commend Mr. Grant's exemplary leadership and the 20,000-strong Monsanto team for their extraordinary efforts and positive influence on American agriculture, technological innovation, and generous contributions to