United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 155 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 16, 2009 No. 90

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 16, 2009.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ED PERLMUTTER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

WHERE ARE THE FISCAL CONSERVATIVES?

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, we have now spent approximately $200 billion, $200 billion, on the war in Afghanistan against a foe that has almost no money and equipment, especially in comparison to ours. Now we are about to take up a supplemental appropriations bill later today to provide many billions more, all this in a place where even General Petraeus said we should remember has been known as the ''graveyard of empires.'' This comes on top of approximately $800 billion on the war in Iraq and hundreds of billions more in indirect costs for these two wars.

Then, in the supplemental bill that we'll take up later today, we have $5 billion for the International Monetary Fund, and in this bill, there is a guarantee for $100 billion in loans made by the IMF, loans being made to other countries. All this money will have to be borrowed because we are so many trillions in debt already that it is not even humanly comprehensible.

The bill also contains $7.7 billion for swine flu vaccines. I heard a reporting of a speech of our colleague, the gentleman from Texas, Dr. PAUL, made recently, in which he said during his first stay in the House, in I think it was 1976, that there was another swine flu scare, and that only he and one other person, probably the only other medical doctor in the House at that time, voted against the money for the swine flu scare. And one person died from swine flu that year, and many more died from taking the vaccine than died from the flu. This is a great overreaction in this area as well. Many thousands are dying from other diseases that we're not paying attention to.

This supplemental appropriations bill started out at $85 billion, then it went to $91 billion, then $95 billion, and now, today, $106 billion. And I ask you, are there no fiscal conservatives around here?

We read last year that the Pentagon had $295 billion in cost overruns on just their 72 largest weapons systems. Now, that didn't count all the cost overruns that they might have had in all their thousands of other large-, medium-, and small-sized contracts, and we're having a hearing right today—in fact, it's going on right now, I was there earlier—in the Oversight and Government Reform Committee in which they said 74 percent of the private contracts that the Federal Government gives out are given out by the Pentagon. Are there no fiscal conservatives at the Pentagon?

I know everybody is trying to prove how patriotic they are today, and everybody feels that we shouldn't question anything the Defense Department wants. But to allow $295 billion in cost overruns on just these 72 largest weapons systems, in my opinion, it's unpatriotic not to question that. And I ask again, are there no fiscal conservatives at the Pentagon?

The fact is, we've turned the Defense Department primarily into the ''Department of Foreign Aid'' now, and I believe very strongly in national defense. But we cannot afford to run the whole world, and we cannot afford to have the Department of Defense be the ''Department of Foreign Aid.''

All of this comes not long after we have raised our national debt limit to over $13 trillion. Nobody can comprehend a figure like that, no one. That is an astounding figure. And yet on top of this debt that we already have, the President's budget in this year and the next 2 years will add over $4 trillion of debt to that debt, $4 trillion in this year and the next two; three years' time, $4 trillion added to our national debt.

And then this year, if I had told people 2 or 3 years ago that we would have a budget this year of $3.6 trillion and that half of that, $1.87 trillion, would be deficit, nobody would have believed that. They would have thought that I was ridiculous or that I was crazy in saying that.

I used to say to my colleagues that it was terrible what we were doing to our children and grandchildren. Now, I'm saying it's terrible what we're doing to ourselves because it's not going to be 5 or 10 years, if that long, before we're not able to pay all of our Social Security and veterans' pensions and all of the things that we have promised our own people.

Printed on recycled paper.

We've got to stop trying to run the whole world. It's not isolationist to say that because I believe in trade and tourism, and cultural and educational exchanges, and I believe we should help during humanitarian crises. But we can't keep spending hundreds of billions of dollars in other countries, whether it's done by the Defense Department—and of course, it's also being done by every other department and agency in the entire Federal Government.

INTRODUCTION OF H.R. 1177, THE FIVE FIVE-STAR GENERAL COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOSWELL. Madam Speaker, before I get my chart and bring it up, if they'd bring it up for this situation, I just might respond to the previous speaker. He forgot to mention that they handed this mess to this new administration just a matter of a few months ago and went through 8 years of borrow and spend. So I hope the people take that with a grain of salt.

What I, Madam Speaker, would like to speak to you a few moments about today is to highlight an institution of great importance to our national security and to myself, the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College located at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas.

Most Americans are probably unaware of the role that this fine institution plays in keeping our Nation safe by training future generations of military leaders. The Command General Staff College plays a vital role, giving our Nation's Army commanders the advanced technical and tactical education they need in order to effectively lead soldiers in battle. They have been doing so since its founding in 1881, and during the past 128 years, it has provided a first-rate military education to thousands of accomplished men and women who have defended our freedom. I'd like to commend the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College on its commitment to excellence, throughout history, in support of our military.

I'd like now to draw your attention, if I may, to a particularly distinguished group of alumni. The five war heroes you see beside me, Generals George Marshall, Douglas MacArthur, Dwight Eisenhower, Henry Arnold, and Omar Bradley, served our country with valor and distinction during the Second World War and became household names through their renowned accomplishments.

It is a little-known fact, of which we are all proud, that these great men all were graduates of the Command General Staff College where they received their unique training and education needed to excel in leading our brave servicemembers into battle.

Since then, the college has continued to improve and adapt its training in response to the ever-evolving challenges of war. Though the specifics of the instruction may have changed, the honorable mission has not. I, too, am a graduate of, and a former instructor, at the U.S. Army Command General Staff College. Madam Speaker, I speak from personal experience of the pride and the satisfaction that comes from knowing that I received the best military leadership education our Nation has to offer and stood in the footsteps of these great men.

General George Marshall was the Army Chief of Staff under President Roosevelt and one of the chief architects of victory for our Greatest Generation and later served as the third Secretary of Defense.

General Douglas MacArthur bravely led our forces to victory in the Pacific theater.

General Dwight Eisenhower, our past President, was the Supreme Allied Commander in Europe and directed the D-day operation, whose anniversary was just celebrated, before going on to lead our Nation through some of the most trying times during the Cold War.

General Henry Arnold commanded the Army Air Corps in Europe and remains the only person ever to hold the title of General of the Air Force.

Last, but certainly not least, General Omar Bradley commanded the Allied forces on their march to victory in North Africa and became the first to hold the position of Chairman of the Joint Chiefs.

At this point, I'd like to make mention of an organization that provides invaluable support to the U.S. Army Command General Staff College, which is the U.S. Army Command General Staff College Foundation. This organization is funded by private donations, and its mission is to enrich the academic experience of the college by providing resources in areas not covered by appropriations.

Since its inception, this foundation has established a number of awards for academic excellence for students of the college in recognition of their achievements in the fields of tactics, logistics, and military arts. It has supported professional development at the Harvard Business School for college faculty members. The Foundation has also sponsored the Colin Powell Academic Lecture Series, which began in April of 2008. General Powell is also an alumni of the college. Indeed, it is hard to overstate the degree to which the Foundation has enriched the experience of both students and staff at the college.

Its board of directors comprises retired officers, business and community leaders, all of whom have a keen interest in improving the quality of the education provided by the college. I would like to commend the Foundation's board and, in particular, its CEO, Colonel Robert Ulin—who is in the gallery I do believe—U.S. Army-Retired, for the invaluable work that he does to enhance the college and its future military leaders. Colonel Ulin is also a graduate and instructor of the college.

It is with this Foundation and the Command and General Staff College in mind today that I would like to mention H.R. 1177, the Five Five-Star General Commemorative Coin Act. This bill would authorize the U.S. Treasury to mint a series of commemorative $5, $1 and half-dollar coins bearing the likeness of these distinguished five generals. These coins would honor the historic contributions these men have made in defense of justice and freedom. Americans young and old could admire and collect them, and the stories of these great men might be reinforced in the popular imagination, perhaps even inspiring some to follow their lead.

This bill will honor the great soldiers of the past. Please sponsor H.R. 1177.

CAP-AND-TAX IS GOING TO BE NOTHING MORE THAN A NATIONAL ENERGY TAX

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

Mr. LATTA. Madam Speaker, one of the issues that we've been talking a lot about on this floor and across this country has been about cap-and-tax, and cap-and-tax is nothing more than it is going to be a national energy tax.

Now, I have a very unique district in the Fifth Congressional District of Ohio. It's interesting in that I represent not only the largest manufacturing district in the State of Ohio, but I also represent the largest agricultural district in the State of Ohio.

I know we've been talking about this and there's been a lot of information that's being put out there by a lot of different groups. But I think it's interesting to point out that the Heritage Foundation and just last week the Brookings Institution has also put out how many jobs are going to be lost by this. The Heritage Foundation is estimating that you're looking at anywhere from over 1.5 million jobs being lost; carry out to the end date with the Brookings Institution, about 2.5 percent. We can't afford to have this happening in the United States.

When you look at what the Heritage Foundation did, they did a very interesting study. They did what they call a manufacturing vulnerability index. They took all 435 districts across the Congress. They said, What was the amount of energy that you use and what type of energy it was? In my case in the State of Ohio, 87 percent of our energy is coal-generated. Next door to my west is Indiana. They get 94 percent.

So they ranked all these districts together. The question was, Okay, where did you stand? And this is one of those times where you don't want to be at the top of the list. Of the top 20 districts in the United States, according to this manufacturing vulnerability index, 16 of the top 20 were from Ohio and Indiana. Unfortunately, in my case, I came in number three.

Number three, What's that going to mean? It means it's going to be tough to get jobs in northwest Ohio, north-central Ohio, and people are having a tough time right now because we have a manufacturing district. If we don't have those jobs and we don't have that electricity that we can turn on in the morning, make sure that those plants can run, we're not going to have people working.

It's not like it's just going to affect the folks on the industrial side and the manufacturing side. As I said, I also have the largest agricultural district in the State of Ohio. And one of the things that's tough out there is there are a lot of farmers in my district that not only farm full time, but they have a job also full time off the farm, and they have to balance the two together. They're working long, long hours, especially if they're on the livestock side. So these folks are worried about not only having to turn on the energy at the workplace but also the workplace on the farm.

And as we've seen some of these numbers being calculated as to what it might cost for a family of four with cap-and-tax, you're talking about in some cases right off the bat, $1,500 additional for a family of four and all the way up in the out-years being calculated at up to $4,800.

Let's also put this in context of what it's going to do on the farm income side. It's estimated by the Heritage Foundation that by the year 2012 you're going to see a drop of about $8 billion in farm income; in 2024, $25 billion; and in 2025, $50 billion. So you're seeing decreases in farm income of 28, 60, and 94 percent respectively. You're going to see a total decrease from 2010 to 2035 of 57 percent and a total decrease in the baseline for farm income out there.

The question is, How is a farm going to survive in this country? It's going to be tough. Ag construction costs are estimated, because of cap-and-tax, they're going to go up 10 percent by the year 2034. By 2035—and here's a real tough one for farmers because of course, everything you're doing is out there in the field—gas and diesel prices are going to go up 58 percent; electricity costs on the farm, 90 percent. So when you're already out there struggling right there to make a living on the farm, it's going to be very difficult with these numbers to do it.

Then we have to think about this. Where are these young farmers going to go? We're going to try to get more younger people out on these farms, but we all know right now equipment costs are high. We all know that land prices are high. But then when you add all these costs up and you put these electricity costs and you put the energy costs and you put the fertilizer costs in, all these are all driven by energy costs. It's going to hit home real quick. We're going to have fewer and fewer people out on the farm. It's estimated we have less than 2 percent of Americans farming today, less than 2 percent. In Ohio, it's under 1 percent, but they're feeding us all, and we should be thankful for them.

The co-ops in my district and across not only my district but the State and the country are very fearful about this. These electric co-ops out there are worried because if they have to buy more green energy, those costs would have to be passed on to the end user. That's the farmer, the manufacturer, the senior, the family, and they are all worried about it.

But who's our competition? You know, last week, we had the Ag Secretary before us in the Agriculture Committee, and we asked questions about China. And China is not going to abide by cap-and-tax, and in fact, the day that we had that hearing, they said that they were not going to abide by cap-and-tax. I would ask that this legislation be defeated.

THE NEED FOR HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of long overdue health care reform. We've been talking about health care reform since the administration of Harry Truman. It's time for action.

Among the Jeffersonian rights enumerated in the Declaration of Independence, the first was the right to life. And yet, today, with health costs spiraling out of control for millions of Americans, that right to life becomes more and more difficult to manage.

While the need for some level of reform is clear, whatever reform the Nation agrees upon must respect the right of the individual to continue to select their own physician. Assisting some Americans in accessing health care must not come at the expense of restricting health care access to others. We cannot have a government-imposed regime. We must respect people's right to maintain control over their current health care access and health care insurance.

Having said that, America currently has the most expensive health care system in the world. In 2006, we ranked first at 15.3 percent of our gross domestic product in expenditures for health care. Runner-up was Sweden with a socialized health care system. It was at 11.3 percent.

On a per capita basis, we spend the most in the world, $5,267 for every man, woman, and child in America; and yet, if you look at our outcomes, we are in the middling ranks of industrialized countries in terms of outcomes. We rank 50th out of 224 Nations in the world in terms of life expectancy. As a Nation, we are spending more on health care than everybody else, but we're not necessarily getting the outcomes we need.

Our challenge is to make health care costs obviously more affordable. A recent USA Today poll showed 21 percent of Americans struggling with health care costs, being able to manage it, significantly up from what it would have been a decade or 2 decades ago.

Those who currently have, and like their existing health care coverage, still nonetheless often lament the rapidly increasing costs of premiums and recognize that we all pay a cost for emergency room treatment for those without health care coverage. In fact, it is estimated that that costs everybody $1,000 per capita per year because of our fellow 46 million Americans who lack health care coverage.

As we debate the various proposals, Madam Speaker, for reforming health care, I would like to propose five principles that certainly will guide me and I think many others as we move forward various proposals.

The first is, every child in America should have access to health care. No child should go in this country without having access to health care. We know that, for example, a child without health care who develops appendicitis has five times a negative outcome in terms of losing his or her life than a child with health insurance. That's unacceptable, it seems to me, as Americans.

Secondly, nobody should be financially destroyed due to a catastrophic illness. It's challenging enough to combat a deadly medical condition, but tremendous expenses incurred can wipe out a family's savings and, indeed, cost them their livelihood and their home.

Third, insurance companies should not be allowed to cherry pick, and I'm a proud cosponsor of a bill that would prescribe that. The whole point of having health care insurance is to share the risk. Previous existing conditions affect 45 percent of all Americans today, and indeed, if we all live long enough, every one of us is going to end up with a previous existing medical condition. The health insurance companies shouldn't be allow to disqualify people in that case.

Fourth, we must respect the right of our fellow citizens to choose the health care insurance and provider they want.

Fifth, we must move toward universality of health care coverage. Everyone in America should have access to health care in this wonderful country of ours.

Ultimately, we must address health care reform for a number of reasons: to provide broader coverage for those currently uninsured; to bring down the increasingly difficult costs to businesses, especially small businesses, families, and sole proprietors; to reduce the growing strain of health care costs on our Nation's deficit; and to improve the overall health of our Nation.

Fiftieth place is nothing to be proud of, Madam Speaker, and I hope all of my colleagues will join me in supporting a health care reform program that will reposition America as a competitive, successful, and healthy society.

WINE TO WATER CHANGES LIVES AROUND THE WORLD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, this recession has been tough on my State of North Carolina. With high unemployment haunting our State, it is easy to lose sight of the inspiring stories of many who continue to work hard at doing good. One of those who committed to doing just that is Doc Hendley, the founder of a North Carolina nonprofit called Wine to Water based in Boone in the heart of the High Country.

Doc's vision for this organization is nothing short of inspiring. As a person who grew up carrying water, I am particularly sensitive to this issue. Doc started Wine to Water after doing some water sanitation work in Darfur, Sudan, with Samaritan's Purse, another exceptional relief organization located in Boone, North Carolina. Wine to Water was founded on the premise of giving the more fortunate members of our society an opportunity to bring life-giving water to people without access to clean drinking water around the world.

Wine to Water, which takes its name from the first miracle performed by Jesus during his Earthly ministry, took an otherwise everyday event like a wine tasting and turned it on its head. By using wine events to raise money and awareness about the lack of clean drinking water in the developing world, Doc Hendley has harnessed a powerful social force and multiplied the generosity of many, including a corps of dedicated ASU students who volunteer with Wine to Water. Doc is, in essence, turning wine to water for some of the neediest people on the planet.

The work of Wine to Water in places like Sudan and Cambodia has already brought clean water to more than 25,000 people. Today, Doc's entrepreneurial spirit and dedication are helping to tap sustainable sources of clean water for communities beyond the reach of many traditional aid organizations.

Doc Hendley is setting a compelling example of the value of hard work and a vision to help others. He's taken a commonplace object and used it to mobilize communities in America to help suffering communities around the world.

He is truly an exceptional North Carolinian, and I want to praise him for his dedication to serving needy and suffering people. He has taken personal risks to do the hard work of providing water and clean water education in far-flung locations around the globe.

Thank you, Doc and all those who work with Wine to Water, for your inspiring example during these difficult times.

THE UPCOMING ENERGY LEGISLATION

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

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Madam Speaker, by the end of this year, we hope to pass a comprehensive energy bill which will help this country move forward on clean, renewable, American energy, and certainly, will help fuel our economic recovery.

As co-Chair of the New Democratic Coalition on Energy, I believe now is the time for a robust, market-based approach to approach our Nation's energy needs. We have to pass legislation that will make smart investments in alternative energy, and I think every American understands the common sense behind that. These are the kinds of things that will make us more viable and competitive, not only here in the United States but abroad, for our American companies.

It's also clear, as we know as we get into this energy debate, this is about our national security; the fact that we continue to import 60-plus percent of our oil from countries outside the United States, many of which, particularly in the Middle East, are not our friends and are funding our enemies.

We also know it's about, as I said, job creation, and it's also about good environmental policy.

Now, you've heard a lot about this energy bill so far. You may continue to hear a lot about it, and you hear studies on one side that say we're going to lose jobs; the other side saying we're going to create jobs. But I think there's quite a remarkable thing that's going on right now as I've worked on this with many other Members, on both the Democrat and Republican side.

There's a coalition of people out there, interested groups, that have come together and said we support the energy bill that is currently being presented by Congress. And I just want to name some of the companies and some of the groups because it just doesn't sound like the normal groups that would come together: BP, big oil company; Dow Chemical; ConocoPhillips, General Electric. You've got the entire labor union movement supporting this. You've got the League of Conservation Voters and the Sierra Club.

Now, I know not everyone's familiar with every one of these organizations, but suffice it to say, you have got some very large corporate businesses that have their view of the world and certainly the necessity to having an efficient energy policy. You've got some environmental groups that have come together and said, you know, we like this, this makes some sense to us. And you've got labor which doesn't always necessarily but sometimes agrees with the other two groups.

So what I like to think when I hear a study from this organization, sometimes I've heard of that organization, sometimes I haven't, and you have got another group that comes and says the opposite, I like to think of common sense when it comes to coming together and putting together logical and efficient legislation.

The fact that these three sort of disparate groups have come together and said, yeah, we support this, I think something is going on here that we should take a close look at and certainly consider in supporting.

I want to talk specifically about the jobs that will be created by this because I had a very unique conversation with the president of the largest utility company from Florida where I'm from. He was telling me they're building the largest solar plant in the world in Florida. Now, we like to call ourselves The Sunshine State, so we think that's a good place for it, but there are already a lot of solar plants in other parts of the world.

But they're building this in Florida, and what he told me was they were very unhappy about the fact that when they're building this huge plant, hundreds of millions of dollars, they're going to have to import the mirrors—that's the components to build the solar plant—from Germany. I said, Why is that? And he said, Well, we don't build them in the United States. There aren't the kind of incentives for businesses to do that here; but if you did build them in Florida or Georgia or California or Ohio, we would buy them here because they would be far less expensive. Just the shipping costs overseas of this very fragile equipment adds such an expensive piece to the equation.

That, to me, strikes at the heart of this whole point. Why aren't we doing everything we can to create these kinds of jobs in the United States and creating the incentives? Well, the good news is the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, which we passed—that's the recovery bill—a few months ago has the kind of tax incentives and many of the components to begin to encourage this type of industry for creating jobs in the United States. I want these jobs to be in Florida or other parts of the United States because they're good quality jobs and will support a good industry.

Another area which I think we talked about, you know, nationally is wind power. A big part of what's going on around the world right now, a lot of that is built overseas, but here's another good example. A typical wind turbine has 8,000 parts and is made of 250 tons of steel. Americans make steel. We fabricate. We assemble. We can deliver that to a wind farm in the United States at far less of a cost than if it was done overseas. And guess what, you can't outsource the labor or the people that put these things together and install them. You can't do it from overseas. So, again, an idea whose time has come.

The great thing about this energy bill is this is the kind of forward-thinking that will create the next generation of jobs, whether it's wind or wave

or solar or any combination of things that will make this country more energy secure, smarter, more efficient, and will advance us into the next generation of not only energy but make this country very strong from a national security point of view and a jobs point of view.

So I look forward to working with my colleagues to pass this bill, move this country forward, and make us more secure.

THE CAP-AND-TRADE BILL WILL DEFINITELY COST JOBS

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, it's interesting to follow my colleague from Florida because this cap-and-trade bill that's going to the floor will definitely cost jobs, and I have a lot of examples to promote that and prove that.

The Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission said in a memo to members of his delegation that: However, if the Waxman-Markey bill were to pass, Pennsylvania is looking at a bleak scenario by 2020: a net loss of as many as 66,000 jobs, a sizeable hike in electricity bills of residential customers, an increase in natural grass prices.

You don't want to believe the public utility commission, just take JOHN DINGELL who is the chairman emeritus, having served here over 50 years. He's quoted as saying, Nobody in this country realizes that cap-and-trade is a tax and it's a big one.

And if you don't believe that, just listen to the comments made by now-President Barack Obama in January 2008: Under my plan, a cap-and-trade system, electricity costs would necessarily skyrocket.

Now, in economies like we have today, the last thing you want to do is affect jobs and cause the loss of jobs, either by moving away from the fossil fuel infrastructure that makes our country great or by raising electricity rates.

I always bring this poster to the floor. These are miners that lost their jobs in the last iteration of the Clean Air Act. This one mine had 1,200 miners. After the passage of the Clean Air Act they lost their jobs. This is Monterey 10 in Kincaid, Illinois.

Here's a report from the Illinois Department of Natural Resources. Listen to what happened after the Clean Air Act of 1990's amendment: Exxon Coal, Monterey 2, closed by market conditions brought about by the Clean Air Act; the next one, Ziegler Coal, Old Bin No. 24, market conditions by the Clean Air Act Amendments. We also have this one, Monterey 10, market conditions brought about by the Clean Air Act Amendments, and many more on this report.

What a cap-and-trade bill does is cap fossil fuel use. It says you cannot use this anymore. What is a fossil fuel? It's coal, it's natural gas, it's crude oil. It's what we use to create the strongest economy in this world, and if you cap it and we have electricity demands go up, only one thing can happen, higher electricity rates.

Now, if my friends on the other side were serious about carbon dioxide, in their bill they would forcefully push for the expansion and use of nuclear power. But is it there in their bill? No. Nuclear power emits no carbon dioxide into the atmosphere. That's why many of us on our side really question the sincerity of our friends on the other side because there's no major promotion of nuclear power.

Republicans have an alternative. It's the All-American Energy Security Act. It's very simple. It says we like energy, we like to use it, and we want all comers to come into the market of ideas to compete for use by consumers, driving down prices.

These areas, the Outer Continental Shelf, are all natural gas. We would exploit natural gas and crude oil reserves. We would take the revenues to go to renewables, wind and solar power which is being exploited around the country right now. We would make fuel from coal. We would take coal, 250 years' worth of recoverable coal, turn it into liquid fuels, decreasing our reliance on imported crude oil. We would continue to move and exploit biofuels, which is soy diesel, corn, cellulosic, and the like.

And the great ''add'' in the All-American Energy Security Act from the Republicans is, we need to build 100 new nuclear power plants in the next 20 years. That is a commitment on lower electricity prices for the consumer, and that is a down payment on energy security. We have 31 permits now in the process of going through. We only have credits for three nuclear power plants to be built. That doesn't touch the increased demand that we're going to have.

So either you have job loss, higher prices, and a cap-and-tax demand-control economy energy future, or you have an all-of-the-above strategy which sets standards and says we want all comers to come and provide the energy that Americans need, bringing more supply and lower prices, and creating jobs.

WE ARE WITNESSING TIANANMEN IN TEHRAN

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

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, I come to this floor at a time of extraordinary moment on the global stage. According to the Islamic Republic News Agency, the official news agency of Iran, President Mahmud Ahmadinejad, supposedly won the election over his primary opponent on 12 June 2009.

But from the very moment that that election result was announced, the international community and the international press called it into question, and the bases for that, even before the extraordinary demonstrations had begun to take place, is the fact that these were paper ballots, but the official government results of the election were announced literally within hours of the polls being closed.

Various media outlets around the world have questioned the authenticity of the results. Mr. Mousavi, the defeated candidate, has launched a legal appeal against the election results. On the day of the election, mobile phone communications were interrupted. Western media has reported ''heavy electronic jamming'' disturbing broadcasts. News Web sites were reportedly blocked by Iranian authorities, and the Iranian Government has allegedly arrested opposition political figures and journalists.

The Iranian Government has outlawed any protests following 2 days of extraordinary unrest. The BBC recently reported that recent rallies in the streets of Tehran were the biggest demonstrations in the Islamic Republic's 30-year history. The protests, according to news reports, became violent, and according to media reports, pro-government forces attacked demonstrators in the last 24 hours, causing at least one fatality.

We are witnessing a Tiananmen in Tehran, and the United States of America must stand in the gap on behalf of those brave Iranian citizens who are standing for free and fair elections, democracy, and basic rights. Freedom, in fact, may be flowering in Iran, as hundreds of thousands rally for democracy and free elections.

And while I appreciate President Obama's comments yesterday at the White House that he was ''troubled by the violence,'' and his belief that the voices of the Iranian people should be ''heard and respected,'' it seems by my likes that this administration has yet to express the unqualified support of the American people for those who are courageously taking to the streets for free elections and for democracy in Iran.

Let me say from my heart, the American cause is freedom, and in this cause, the American people will not be silent, here or abroad. If the President of the United States won't express the unqualified support of our Nation for the dissidents in the streets of Tehran, this Congress must.

Today, I am introducing a resolution that will do just that. It will express its concern regarding the reported irregularities of the presidential elections of 12 June 2009; condemn the violence against demonstrators by pro-government militias in Tehran in the wake of the election; it will affirm our belief in the universality of individual rights and the importance of democratic and fair elections; and lastly and most importantly, Madam Speaker, it will express the support of the American people for all Iranian citizens who struggle for freedom, civil liberties, and the protection of the rule of law.

Believe it or not, in my small town of Columbus, Indiana, I grew up next door to a Hungarian immigrant who fled Hungary in the wake of the Soviet repression of the Hungarian Revolution in 1956. I sat often with Julius Perr, now passed away, and heard of the way the Hungarian people, inspired by our calls for freedom, stood up for their own freedom. And as Bret Stephens recounts in today's Wall Street Journal, We stood by idly, we didn't want to interfere, and the Soviet tanks rolled.

We cannot stand idly by, speak of Iran sovereignty, speak of their own right to choose their own leadership at a time when hundreds of thousands of Iranians are risking their liberty, and even their lives, to stand for free elections and democracy.

Ronald Reagan said, There is no arsenal or no weapon in the arsenals of the world so formidable as the will and moral courage of free men and women. All of us desire a fresh start with Iran, and it seems from news reports and the extraordinary images coming from the streets of Iran that millions of Iranians long for a new start in their government. There is a reformist movement afoot in Iran.

Today, I will introduce a resolution. I urge all of my colleagues in both parties to join me in expressing support for these brave and courageous men and women.

WHERE'S THE TRANSPARENCY?

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I do appreciate this opportunity.

You know, there's so many people out of work around this country. We know since President Obama took office 2 million more people have lost jobs. It's staggering and quite sobering.

I recently met with many people who are unemployed in a north Lufkin church, and I guess virtually all were African Americans. These were people that were ready to go to work, willing to go to work, good, strong work ethic, have families, deeply caring about their community and their families. And so it got me to looking and thinking what can I do to use my position to try to help people get jobs.

There's the Texas Workforce Commission that does a good job trying to have job fairs. It turned out by using my position, partnering with other groups, the Chamber, different groups, we were able to have 50 employers with over 1,000 jobs to offer, but even that doesn't satisfy all of the need for all of the jobs people are needing that are out of work.

But it did sensitize me to the fact, look around for job opportunities. Where is this Nation spending money that might go to help people who are unemployed? Where could they get jobs? We've got another job fair coming up in Longview in a couple of weeks, and we're hoping it will be as successful.

But as I look around and I see the millions of dollars being spent and I hear from constituents, and having a heart, wanting to help them, I'm brought to the question after we hear about the Uyghurs, four of them going to Bermuda—although we were promised great transparency—and that was one of the things that appealed to the voters of the United States, that if we elect this administration we will have complete transparency, everything will be transparent, we'll know what they're spending money on, we will know what they're doing. Well, we don't know. They won't tell us what money has been sent to Bermuda to take four Uyghurs, but some are estimating $12 million apiece. They don't think it's very much, maybe $12 million apiece or so. We know that supposedly other Uyghurs are going from Guantanamo to Palau.

One report I read estimated that over the last 14 years, going back to the middle of the Clinton administration, we paid Palau about $852 million just for aid. And so there's some question that we're going to pay them more millions to take these, or since their 15-year agreement is up, are they willing to take these?

The bottom line is millions and millions of dollars are being paid to take 17 Uyghurs, and for those that don't know, those are people in China who, because of their religious belief, are adverse to China. And we know that these 17 were captured in terrorist camps in Afghanistan. Some say, well, they weren't being trained to terrorize us, but they were in terrorist camps in Afghanistan.

So the question many are asking now is, for those 2 million of us who have lost our jobs since January of this year, what terrorist camp can we go to to train so that maybe we could spend the rest of our lives at U.S. expense on the beaches of Bermuda? We saw the people, the pictures of the four Uyghurs in Bermuda. They really seemed to be enjoying themselves, laughing, cutting up, out there on the beach, the waves crashing. Those Uyghurs who have gone to Palau, how many millions have been paid we don't know. But I have got a bunch of constituents who are willing to go train in terrorist camps, in Afghanistan if necessary, if our government will pay millions of dollars to send them to the beaches.

Also, one other point, we know there's been no transparency with the auto task force. We don't know what they're being paid. We just know that this group that has never run anything in the car business is running the car businesses and dictating what will happen. Well, I've got lots of people that are every bit as unqualified to run the car business in my district who are unemployed. They want that job. Where do they apply to run the car businesses of America and get on the auto task force? We want to know because they'd like that job.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 19 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

UNITED STATES ASSOCIATION OF FORMER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS 2009 ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS

Mr. HERTEL. It is an honor for me to introduce the gentleman from Maryland, who for over three decades has provided leadership in this House on behalf of the Democratic Party, on behalf of the State of Maryland but on behalf of our Nation, most importantly.

This session of Congress that we are in today has been the most productive in my lifetime. We see the many challenges that face us—on the economy, the war, on health care, on all the different issues that have faced the American public, and the majority leader, who has been forging ahead and working in a bipartisan way on these very important challenges, has had the time not only to play golf with us yesterday at our Wounded Warriors tournament but to come again this morning and take some time to welcome us.

Thank you very much, Majority Leader.

Mr. HOYER. Thank you very much, Mr. Vice President, Mr. Speaker. You know Bob Michel was my Speaker. You've heard my story on going up to Ray LaHood and saying, Ray—this is 1995, John—and I said to Ray, who was presiding—you know, Ray presided a lot and was an excellent presiding officer. I went up to him and told him—we had about 197 votes at that point in time. I said, you know, I'll get you 197, you get 21 and we'll elect Bob Michel the Speaker. He smiled. It probably crossed his mind that that was a worthwhile endeavor but maybe he couldn't get there.

But in any event, it's always a pleasure to be with Bob Michel and all of you; my former colleague in the Maryland delegation, Connie Morella, who is one of your officers in this organization; John Rhodes, with whom I served. John, thank you very much for the great service you gave to this country and that your father gave to this country and that you continue to give to this country. We're blessed by that. And all of you with whom I have served over the years. As a matter of fact, most of the people as I look around here, it was a great pleasure to serve with you. Marty Russo, of course, I served with him as well and that was a little more of a trial.

Marty played golf yesterday. Dennis, he's really feeling badly. He shot six under par and he didn't win. He thinks it was fixed that the former Members were not allowed to win the tournament. He said, you know, what was the worth of playing in it.

I'm very pleased to be here with you. I try to join you every year. Your ranks seem a little smaller this year than they have in years past. Maybe some folks will be coming in.

I rose on the floor about 3 or 4 weeks ago just before the Memorial break and said, Look, when we come back, we're going to be more timely in the counting of the votes. We're going to try to keep the votes down to somewhere in the neighborhood of 20 minutes as opposed to, they were getting to average 25 minutes, which was, you do that over 10, 15, 20 votes over the course of a day, it really extends the day. The chairmen were having people waiting in their committees. We're struggling to get there. If I close it out—Alexis Covey-Brandt—Alexis, wave—she is now our floor director. And then sitting next to Alexis is someone I think probably all of you know, she is the granddaughter of a great American, a great Representative in this House, the former Speaker of the House, Tip O'Neill, Catlin O'Neill, who represents the Speaker on the floor and helps manage the floor. We're pleased to be here with you.

Dennis, you were very kind about reaching out in a bipartisan way. I lament the fact that when Bob Michel was here, we had reaching out more in a bipartisan fashion because both sides I think were inclined to do so. We had more golf tournaments, Bob, and we played more and spent more time with one another. I played golf yesterday with JOHN BOEHNER. I drove the cart. He rode along. He scored well. I tried to stay in the hunt. JOHN and I talked about trying to work things in a more bipartisan fashion, but very frankly as all of you have observed, the confrontation continues in a somewhat strident tone too often in this House. That was not so early on when I came here but frankly almost every decade it has escalated and that's unfortunate.

But, on the other hand, I think Dennis is right. This may be the most productive 5 months that I've spent in the House. I don't mean that we haven't had other productive times—we have—but the agenda that we confronted as we took over at a time of crisis, with a brand new President, an historic President. 2008, an historic year. I think all of us are pleased that we were alive to watch what America did in 2008. I thought JOHN MCCAIN's best speech of the campaign was the night he lost. It was not only a gracious speech but it was a speech that tried to bring the country together in support of our newly elected President, and I thought it showed JOHN MCCAIN at his very best. Obama gave a speech that showed him at his very best. And frankly I think George Bush the next day, on Wednesday, gave a brief speech which showed him at his very best. And the three of them together showed America at its very best.

I tell people that one of the proudest days of my service in the House of Representatives and of my country was on the day that was one of my most disappointing. And that, of course, was January 20, 2001, when my side clearly thought it had won the election, had received a half a million more American votes than our opponent, George Bush, but notwithstanding that, by a 5–4 vote, the Supreme Court of the United States had brought the election to a close. And so as we sat there on the podium, I was about 10 feet from Bill Clinton, about 15 feet from George Bush, and within minutes—and it happened in seconds as you know—within minutes, the most power in one person that exists on the face of the Earth was passed peacefully, notwithstanding the extraordinary concerns that the then-incumbent President of the United States, who had that power in his grasp—it was in his grasp—notwithstanding that, he released it peacefully, without a shot being fired, without demonstrations in the streets on that day, and America showed the world once again that it was a nation of laws.

That was a proud day, I think, for all of us, a wrenching day for those of us who were on the losing side on that day but a proud day for our country. All of us in this Chamber have had the opportunity to serve in the people's House, the repository of that power to make the laws that govern, not of men but of laws.

And so I always take the opportunity to thank all of you. And we lament the fact that we've lost—I'm not sure how many people we've lost. John, I am sure there will be a recitation of that and a remembrance of those we've lost. But one person with whom I had the opportunity and I think most of you had the opportunity to serve, we lost. In doing so, we lost a great spirit, not just a great former Member of the Congress. I'm not going to read all of it but I remember him quoting Teddy Roosevelt on a relatively regular basis. I've got the whole quote, but I'm just going to read you a few lines of it:

''It is not the critic who counts;
not the man who points out
how the strong man stumbles,
or where the doer of deeds
could have done them better.
The credit belongs to the man
who is actually in the arena.''

I choose like I choose ''all men are created equal'' to consider ''man'' in that sense generic—for human beings.

It goes on to say:

''The credit belongs to the man
who is actually in the arena.''

And then it concludes:

''Who at the best knows in the end
the triumph of high achievement,
and who at the worst, if he fails,
at least fails while daring greatly,
so that his place shall never be
with those cold and timid souls
who neither know victory nor defeat.''

All of us got in the arena. We put our egos on the line. Sometimes those egos can be severely bruised in this business internally and certainly externally. But we got in the arena because we knew that that is where you could make a difference, for the people that were your neighbors, for your family and for your country. And for that, I think Americans honor each and every one of you, and I thank you for having learned from you, been impressed by you, using in many cases you as an example of how we ought to work together.

It's easier when you get out of Congress, I think, to adopt that premise, because you then look not so much on the differences but on the similarities. Far too often as human beings we look at the differences, that which divides us, as opposed to that which brings us together, the values that we have in common.

JOHN, before you came in, I mentioned the fact that you and I played golf together. We had a great time. We spent 4 or 5 hours riding around the course together, enjoying one another, learning from one another. JOHN's really a student of golf. He was helping me be a little better than normally I am. But we need to learn from those experiences and learn from people like Bob Michel, who lived life in Congress teaching all of us that.

So I thank you for staying active, keeping the faith, providing ongoing examples that simply being elected is not the only way to serve. You continue to serve in so many positive roles. I know on behalf of the Speaker, I know JOHN will speak for himself, we welcome you back to this Chamber which meant so much in your lives and to which you meant so much in your service.

Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Mr. Vice President.

You know, I read that and of course I hope all of you know the person I was referring to was Jack Kemp—who reflected, I think, JOHN—I served with Jack on the Appropriations Committee for a significant period of time, and Jack always had that positive spirit, that hand reached out to include rather than to exclude. We miss Jack Kemp. He was a great servant in this House and a great servant of his party and a great servant of his country.

Mr. HERTEL. I want to thank the majority leader for taking the time with us. For someone of his stature and experience it means a great deal for those of us gone but not forgotten as he comes to see us and take the time out of his schedule. Today at noon, Majority Leader HOYER and Jack Kemp will be honored by the Victims of Communism Memorial program which is going to take place in the Visitors Center for all of their work in triumphing over communism. Leader HOYER was chairman of the Helsinki Commission which did so much to make a difference in this world that we have today because they brought down the Soviet Union and assisted all those people seeking freedom in Eastern Europe and around the globe. The Helsinki Commission's work is one of the most outstanding things this Congress has ever

done and it was led by Majority Leader HOYER.

And now it is my great honor to recognize the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Ohio, our Republican leader, a great friend of ours who also took the time to spend with us yesterday at the Wounded Warriors golf match, Mr. JOHN BOEHNER.

Mr. BOEHNER. As I look around, most of you I know, not all of you but most of you, and on behalf of my colleagues and I, I just want to say welcome back. Your service here clearly was an honor or you probably wouldn't have come back, and clearly all of us have had an opportunity to work with you. But we do appreciate your service, we appreciate your coming back and appreciate what you do to help this institution that we have all had an opportunity to serve in. I think a special congratulations is in order for Lou today, having celebrated some 50 years in public service and will be receiving an award from all of you today.

STENY and I did play golf yesterday. We did have a wonderful time. And it really reminded me of kind of a motto that I learned from Bob Michel, and that is that you can disagree without being disagreeable. I think all of you know that there are some major things happening here and clearly there's not quite a consensus on those things moving ahead. And so part of my mantra to my colleagues on our side is that to stand up and fight the fight but, you know, you don't have to be disagreeable in the process. There are plenty of facts to lay on the table.

I really do appreciate all of you being here and appreciate the work you do for our institution and glad to welcome all back.

Thank you.

Mr. HERTEL. I want to thank the Republican leader for taking the time but also the interest and the leadership in helping us with the Wounded Warriors project that was so very important. He's been there the last 2 years to lead the way and we've been able to raise over $200,000 now for the Disabled Sports and Wounded Warriors project. We just can't thank our two leaders enough for participating because that will make the difference in getting more participation of sponsors and Members to come out to that tournament so it can be ongoing and benefit these veterans that have done so much for our country.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. HERTEL. And now it is my privilege to ask our Republican leader, Bob Michel, to lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. Michel 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.

Mr. HERTEL. The Clerk will now call the roll of former Members of Congress.

The Clerk called the roll of the former Members of Congress, and the following former Members answered to their names:

Hon. Bill Alexander, AR
Hon. Clarence Brown, OH
Hon. Nancy Boyda, KS
Hon. Jack Buechner, MO
Hon. Bill Burlison, MO
Hon. Joe DioGuardi, NY
Hon. Ed Foreman, TX, NM
Hon. Lou Frey, FL
Hon. Ben Gilman, NY
Hon. Dennis Hertel, MI
Hon. William Hughes, NJ
Hon. Barbara Kennelly, CT
Hon. Ron Klink, PA
Hon. Ernie Konnyu, CA
Hon. Ken Kramer, CO
Hon. Martin Lancaster, NC
Hon. Ron Mazzoli, KY
Hon. Matt McHugh, NY
Hon. Bob Michel, IL
Hon. Connie Morella, MD
Hon. Jay Rhodes, AZ
Hon. Phil Ruppe, MI
Hon. Marty Russo, IL
Hon. Jim Symington, MO
Hon. Lindsey Thomas, GA

Mr. HERTEL. The Chair announces that 26 former Members of Congress have responded to their names.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Arizona, the Honorable Jay Rhodes, the President of our Association.

Mr. RHODES. Dennis, thank you. Thank you very much for hobbling in. We appreciate the fact that it's not altogether easy for you at this particular point in your recovery. We very much appreciate all of your service to all of us. You are now in the category of wounded warrior. We're happy to see that you are at least making a slow but steady recovery.

I appreciate very much the fact that Mr. HOYER and Mr. BOEHNER took the time to come and be with us this morning. I think their comments were very, very pertinent and to the point. I especially would like to associate myself with Mr. HOYER's comments about the regrettable deterioration in relationships between the parties on the floor. It does call to mind the days when Bob Michel was our leader and when Tip O'Neill was the leader and the Speaker, and also the days frankly when my dad had preceded Bob. Mr. O'Neill, Mr. Rhodes, and Mr. Michel, some of their favorite stories deal with their relationships off the floor. I think it's a shame that the relationships off the floor here don't reflect the kind of camaraderie that even was in existence still in 1986 when Ernie Konnyu and Connie Morella and Jack Buechner and NANCY PELOSI and I came into this Chamber. I think that each of us could say that things were a lot better in 1986 and we can each say we saw them start to deteriorate from that point on. And it's sad. It's not good for the institution and it's not good for the country.

It is a pleasure to be back here and we appreciate the opportunity to present the annual report of the U.S. Association. I and some of my colleagues will report on our activities and projects that we have undertaken over the course of the past year and we will present our Distinguished Service Award.

As you all know, the Association is fiercely nonpartisan, or fiercely bipartisan. It was chartered by Congress but you know that we receive no public funding, no appropriations, no earmarks, nothing from the United States Congress in terms of funding the operations of this association. Our purpose is to promote public service and strengthen democracy, both abroad and at home. And when I say we promote public service, I want to emphasize that when we utilize one of our flagship programs, which is the Congress to Campus Program, that our purpose is not to go to college campuses and encourage young people to become politicians. Our purpose is to go to college campuses and encourage young people to consider public service as an honorable profession for their lives. And I think that we make a contribution in that regard. There are approximately 600 former Senators and Representatives who belong to this association. We reckon that there are probably about a thousand living persons who have served in the past in either the House or the Senate and roughly 600 of them belong to our association. We are united to teach about Congress and the importance of representative democracy. All the activities which we are about to describe are financed either through dues, program-specific grants and sponsors, or our fundraising dinner. Our finances are sound, our projects are fully funded, and our 2008 audit, which was completed fairly recently by our outside accounting firm, comes back to us with a completely clean bill of health. We have had a very successful, active, and rewarding year. We have continued our work serving as a liaison between the current Congress and legislatures abroad; we have created partnerships with highly respected institutions in the area of democracy building and election monitoring; we have developed new projects which we are in the process of expanding, including our webcasting civics education program; and we again sent dozens of bipartisan teams of former Members to university campuses here in the United States and abroad as part of the Congress to Campus Program. I am sure that those of you who have participated in that program know that in the majority of the cases our members who come back from having participated say almost universally that they benefited more, the former Members benefited more than they think they brought benefit to the young people that we talked to. That is a reflection of the fact that our young population is much more sophisticated, much more educated and much more enthusiastic about their futures than they generally get credit for.

I am very pleased now to report on the program work as we've gone through this year. Our first report will

be delivered by the gentlelady from Connecticut, Ms. Kennelly. Over the past 4 years, we have made it a priority to put unique capabilities inherent in our membership to productive use in the area of democracy building overseas and legislative strengthening overseas. I am pleased to announce today that we have a major new program to support these efforts. We have been awarded a grant by the U.S. Agency for International Development so that bipartisan teams of former Members can travel to emerging democracies and interact with their legislative branches on a peer-to-peer basis. Our teams will work with the bipartisan House Democracy Assistance Commission to conduct workshops, panels and presentations for the legislative branches of numerous countries around the globe. We not only talk to the elected legislative representatives but also to their staffs and silently we say to them, Do as we say, don't do as we do. But I think that we have lessons to impart to legislative branches, both Members and staff overseas, and I am very happy to yield to the gentlelady from Connecticut to report on this.

BENEDICTION

Mr. HERTEL. Mr. President, we have been joined by the House Chaplain, Father Coughlin, and at this moment I would just ask before we go further with our report that we ask Father Coughlin, the House Chaplain, to give us a benediction.

Mr. RHODES. I would yield to the House Chaplain, Father Coughlin.

Rev. COUGHLIN. I am honored to be here with you.

Let us pray.

Almighty God, we praise You and bless You as the Lord of our lives. Each of us has a story to tell. For each of us this has been a journey, a journey with many ups, many downs, many prizes, many rewards, and at the same time many sacrifices.

Bless our constituents who brought us here. Bless all our family members who have stood by us at all times. Bless us now. Help us, Lord, to meet You at the present moment, for that's where You are always to be found. We thank You for all You have given us in the past, we praise You now and ask for health and happiness in the present that we may be your instruments of bringing good news, power, integrity, justice and goodness to this country.

Bless us that we may serve always, upholding the Constitution that holds us all together. Confirm us in liberty and in justice, now and forever. Amen.

Mr. HERTEL. Thank you, Father. Now I do recognize the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES. I yield to the gentlelady from Connecticut.

Ms. KENNELLY. Thank you, Mr. President.

May I take this opportunity to thank you and our Executive Director, Pete Weichlein. These two gentlemen have worked so hard this year and as Dennis said, we've had really a very successful year and I think we're going into a whole new dimension and my report will show that.

Thank you, Jay, for your introduction and thank you for your leadership in securing the AID grant you just announced. The House Democracy Assistance Commission is an undertaking of the House of Representatives to strengthen democracy in those institutions by assisting parliaments in emerging democracies. One of the objectives of HDAC is to provide expert advice to members and staff of the parliaments of partner countries. HDAC is chaired by Congressmen DAVID PRICE of North Carolina and DAVID DREIER of California. It is an extension of the great work begun by former Congressmen Martin Frost and Gerry Solomon as past of the Frost-Solomon Task Force. We are pleased to be able to play an important part in this outstanding project.

Via the AID grant, bipartisan teams of former Members will travel to six countries in 2009 and 2010. These countries probably will be Georgia, Kenya, Kosovo, Liberia, Peru and Ukraine. We will focus our projects on areas including legislative strengthening, legal reform, constituent representation, oversight and budget capacity. We will spend about one week in each country. In addition to meeting with legislators, we hope that each visit can include some time spent at local universities. It is one of the core beliefs of this organization that we need to reach out to the next generation of leaders, whether in the United States or abroad, and share some of our experiences and visions. This grant is a very exciting development for our organization and we look forward to reporting on these missions when we return to this great hall next year.

In addition to the HDAC project, we continue the good work commenced by Jack Buechner, former president of this organization. I am referring to the International Election Monitors Institute which we created in conjunction with our Canadian and European Union sister organizations. IEMI takes former legislators from the United States, Canada and Europe and trains them in proper election monitoring techniques and a code of conduct. To this end, we have been able to put together a 2-day training course which we have now administered six times in Ottawa. The course, as well as a host of other achievements for the Institute, was made possible via a 3-year grant from the Canadian International Development Agency. Dozens of United States, Canadian and European former legislators have gone through the training and are now well versed in the actual set of responsibilities and challenges that come with election observation. For the near future, we have identified two crucial elections, and these certainly are crucial elections, where we hope to have some of our observers present: August of this year in Afghanistan and January 2010 in Iraq. Our model is to partner with reputable like-minded organizations in the United States, Europe or Canada and funnel our trained former Members into their delegations. In the past we have used this model quite successfully, for example, by working with the National Democratic Institute during their observer missions to Morocco and Ukraine. Our colleague Dennis Hertel of Michigan is the current president of IEMI and we thank him for his leadership.

In addition to partnering with organizations such as NDI, IRI and IFES on election monitoring missions, we have just entered a new partnership with the State University of New York. SUNY Albany houses one of the leading democracy building NGOs in the country—the Center for International Development. Our association has entered into a partnership agreement with SUNY to compete for a USAID contract which we expect will be announced in early 2010. This contract will focus on democracy and governance projects from 2010 through 2015 and only organizations which have been invited to compete are eligible to submit proposals. SUNY has an outstanding track record for these types of AID contracts and we are confident that via this new partnership our members will be able to engage in an even greater number of democracy building projects worldwide.

Mr. Speaker, we have made it our mission to create these important opportunities for our membership. Former Members of Congress can play a crucial role in these types of programs and it is quite rewarding that we are seeing the beginning of the fruits of our labor. I thank you for letting me give this report, Jay, and I say this looks very exciting and this organization is really moving.

Mr. RHODES. Barbara, thank you very much. And you're right—we are moving. And it's positive movement.

I am now pleased to recognize our colleague from Maryland, Ms. Morella, in her capacity as representative of the executive committee overseeing many of our international programs. We achieve our objectives through congressional study groups involving Germany, Turkey and Japan. We have arranged multiple special events in the Capitol for representatives of the parliaments of those countries, and we continue to plan for trips overseas for our congressional staff and for sitting Members to welcome sitting parliamentarians and staff people here to the United States.

I am pleased to yield to the gentlelady from Maryland, Connie Morella, my classmate, for her report on our study group events.

Ms. MORELLA. Thank you, Jay.

Yes, we were members of the 100th Congress and it's a privilege to be here with former Members and with good friends who are here. And thanks for your leadership, Jay.

The United States Association of Former Members of Congress has created invaluable opportunities for current Members of Congress to engage with their counterparts around the world through programming hundreds of special events in the U.S. Capitol for international delegations. The Association is pleased to oversee the congressional study groups on Germany, Turkey and Japan as well as to initiate the first trilateral renewable energy roundtable for lawmakers from India, Germany and the United States. The Association's flagship international program is the Congressional Study Group on Germany, which has been conducted by the Association for over 25 years. The first trip I ever took was with that particular study group to Germany in 1987. The Study Group on Germany is one of the largest and the most active exchange programs involving the U.S. Congress and the parliament of another country. It is a bipartisan organization, with approximately one-third of the Members of the U.S. Congress participating. The House Chairs are Congressman RUSS CARNAHAN of Missouri and Congressman ROB BISHOP of Utah. The Senate Chairs are Senator EVAN BAYH of Indiana and Senator JEFF SESSIONS of Alabama.

The Congressional Study Group on Germany serves as a model for all other study groups under the umbrella of the FMC. The Study Group on Germany has three programming pillars: the Distinguished Visitors Program, which hosts guests from Germany at the U.S. Capitol; annual seminars allowing for in-depth discussions for the lawmakers of both countries; and a senior congressional staff study tour in Germany. In addition, the Congressional Study Group on Germany is a resource for Members of Congress to receive objective information on current U.S.-German relations. The study group also supports the Congress-Bundestag Youth Exchange Program. Nearly every month, the study group brings high-ranking German elected officials to Capitol Hill to meet with Members of Congress as part of its Distinguished Visitors Program. Recently honored guests include: the German Federal Minister for Labor, Olaf Scholz; the Chairman of the Bundestag's Foreign Affairs Committee, Ruprecht Polenz; and the German Federal Minister for Economics and Technology, Karl-Theodor zu Guttenberg.

The highlight of each programming year is the annual Congress-Bundestag seminar. Each year, the study group brings approximately eight Members of Congress together with German legislators for several days to reinforce friendships and examine pertinent topics in transatlantic relations, such as NATO, climate change, or trade. The parliamentarians are joined by former Members of the Congress and the Bundestag, officials of the two federal governments, think tank and foundation representatives and members of the German-American corporate community. The 26th annual seminar took place at the end of May in Berlin and Cologne. Highlights included meetings with Chancellor Angela Merkel and Foreign Minister Frank-Walter Steinmeier. A study tour for senior congressional staff is planned for the fall in conjunction with the 20th anniversary of the fall of the Berlin Wall.

The Congressional Study Group on Germany has received generous grants from the German Marshall Fund of the United States which has supported it for 25 years. The Association would like to thank Craig Kennedy, GMF's President, for his support of the Congressional Study Group on Germany. Additional funding to assist with administrative expenses is received from a group of organizations whose representatives serve on a Business Advisory Council to the study group. The Business Advisory Council is chaired by former Member Tom Coleman of Missouri, who served as the chairman of the Congressional Study Group on Germany in the House in 1989. Current Business Advisory Council members are Airbus, Allianz, BASF, Daimler, Deutsche Telekom, Deutsche Post DHL, Eli Lilly, Fresenius, Lufthansa, RGIT, SAP, and Volkswagen. It's a large group.

Now there is a Congressional Study Group on Turkey, also. The Association established that congressional study group in 2005 and it has quickly become a major program for the Association. The Study Group on Turkey educates U.S. Members of Congress about the strategic relationship between the United States and Turkey and promotes increased cooperation between the two countries. Using the successful, long-running Congressional Study Group on Germany as a model, the Study Group on Turkey has become a highly relevant and unique forum for dialogue between U.S. and Turkish legislators and government officials. The Study Group on Turkey's House Chairs are Representative WEXLER of Florida and Representative WHITFIELD of Kentucky. Congressman COHEN of Tennessee and Congresswoman FOXX of North Carolina are the Vice Chairs.

Turkey is one of our strategic allies and is uniquely positioned to work with the United States on many important challenges such as peace in the greater Middle East and energy security. The Study Group on Turkey brings current Members of Congress together with their legislative peers, government officials and business representatives in Turkey and serves as a platform for all participants to learn about U.S.-Turkish relations firsthand.

Thanks to funding from the Economic Policy Research Foundation of Turkey, a nonpartisan foundation established by the Turkish business association TOBB, the German Marshall Fund of the United States and a group of corporate sponsors making up the Business Advisory Council, the Study Group on Turkey can carry out its mandate to strengthen cooperation between the United States and Turkey. The Business Advisory Council members are Coca-Cola, Eli Lilly, Philip Morris and the Turkish-American Business Council.

The Congressional Study Group on Turkey runs a Distinguished Visitors Program for Members of Congress featuring visiting dignitaries from Turkey. Recent guests for roundtable discussions include Turkish Foreign Minister Ahmet Davutoglu and Chairman Mercan of the Turkish Grand National Assembly's Foreign Affairs Committee. The Congressional Study Group on Turkey also conduct an annual U.S.-Turkey seminar. In 2008, Representative STEVE COHEN from Tennessee hosted the annual seminar in Memphis. United States Members of Congress and Turkish parliamentarians participated in the seminar and discussed topics that included U.S.-Turkish trade relations, the integration of immigrants and energy security. The seminar is a conference for U.S. members of Congress to discuss areas of mutual concern with their legislative counterparts in Turkey. This year's U.S.-Turkey seminar is scheduled to take place during the first week of September in Ankara and in Istanbul. Members of Congress and their counterparts in the Turkish Grand National Assembly will discuss such issues as stability in the Middle East and prospects for Turkey's accession into the European Union.

There are other study groups. I would like to mention that the Association serves as the secretariat for the Congressional Study Group on Japan. Founded in 1993 in cooperation with the East-West Center in Hawaii, the Congressional Study Group on Japan is a bipartisan group of Members from the House and the Senate. The Congressional Study Group on Japan arranges opportunities for Members of Congress to meet with their counterparts in the Japanese Diet in addition to organizing discussions for Members to hear from American and Japanese experts on U.S.-Japanese relations. The House Chairs for the Congressional Study Group on Japan are Congressman JIM MCDERMOTT of Washington and Congresswoman SHELLY MOORE CAPITO of West Virginia. In the Senate, Senators JIM WEBB of Virginia and LISA MURKOWSKI of Alaska take an active role in study group programming. The Congressional Study Group on Japan is funded by the Japan-U.S. Friendship Commission.

Finally, the Association is excited about the launch of a new program. Together with the Alliance for U.S. India Business, the Bertelsmann Foundation, the Robert Bosch Foundation, and TERI North America, we will hold the first Trilateral Renewable Energy Roundtable for lawmakers from Germany, India and the United States at the beginning of July. All three countries are major democratic economies from crucial regions of the globe that have a stake in world GDP as well as

environmental sustainability. Lawmakers from each country will have the opportunity to exchange their policy views to find common approaches for promoting renewable energy. The House leadership for this new project is Congressman JAY INSLEE of Washington and Congressman MICHAEL BURGESS of Texas.

The Congressional Study Groups on Germany, Turkey and Japan as well as the Trilateral Roundtable demonstrate the important role that the Former Members Association plays in assisting current Members in their foreign relations portfolio. I think the former Members can be very proud of the work they do to make these study groups possible and the opportunities they are in, and I consider it a privilege to participate in many of those activities.

I thank you for listening to this lengthy report that indicates some of the very important work being done by the Former Members Association. Thank you.

Mr. RHODES. Thank you, Connie. I think we can be proud of our excellent programming offered by our Congressional Study Groups.

Another program which our association and its members hold in very high esteem is the Congress to Campus Program. This wonderful program has been administered for the past 2 years internally by our staff. We have made the program grow and we have expanded it internationally. We've also reached out to community colleges and high schools. This growth was due to a large extent to a grant we received from the Joyce and Donald Rumsfeld Foundation. Let me take this opportunity to thank Secretary Rumsfeld for his invaluable support, which we really appreciate. We continue to work with the Stennis Center for Public Service, but all administration of this program is now done in-house by our staff.

I am very pleased to yield to a former president of our association, the Honorable MATT MCHUGH of New York, who chairs the Congress to Campus Program.

MATT, thanks for all your work.

Mr. MCHUGH. Thank you very much, JAY. It is always a pleasure to be here with our friends and colleagues.

Before giving my report on the program, I want to say it's a special pleasure to be here this year because we're giving our annual award to Lou Frey. I had the privilege of serving as vice president during Lou's tenure as president and he was a tremendously strong leader for us in those days and has since then been a leader of our association. I think no one really deserves the honor more than Lou and I note that he has Marcia his wife with him and many of his beautiful family members. And so we're delighted to be with you today, Lou, and to give you this long-deserved honor.

As JAY said, the Congress to Campus Program has been administered by the Association in cooperation with the Stennis Center for 2 years now. During that time, the program has experienced a marked growth and has expanded for the first time to include community colleges across the country. As most of you know, this program is the flagship program for our Members. It sends bipartisan teams of former Members to colleges, universities and high schools across the country to educate the next generation of leaders on the importance of civic engagement. The participating students benefit, we think, from the interaction with our association members, whose knowledge and experience are truly a unique resource. Our members, as JAY said, benefit through their continued involvement in public service and the ability to engage young people on issues of importance to them.

During each visit, our bipartisan team conducts classes, meets individually with students and faculty, speaks to campus media, participates in both campus and community forums, and meets with local citizens. Institutions that we visit are encouraged to market the visit to the entire campus community, not just simply to students who major in political science, history or government. Over the course of 2½ days, hundreds of students are exposed to the former Members' message regarding the significance of public service.

The program has made both domestic and international visits this academic year, including two separate visits to campuses in the United Kingdom and one in Canada. Over the 2008–2009 academic year, the program has made 20 campus visits, including visits to institutions we had not previously visited, such as the U.S. Air Force Academy, the University of Montana, and a number of community colleges as I have mentioned. More than 30 former Members participated this year, and I want to thank all of you who took the time from your schedules to do so. I would also like to encourage those of you who have not had the opportunity to seriously consider participating. It's truly a great way to continue our public service after Congress.

I also want to extend our thanks to the faculty, the staff members and students who worked so diligently on each of these visits. Without their hard work, these visits would simply not have been possible. We rely heavily on the universities to take the lead in coordinating logistics related to each visit and appreciate the time they devote to ensuring that their students receive the full benefit of the program.

We have continued our relationship with the Stennis Center for Public Service, as JAY mentioned earlier, in the administration of this program and I think we owe a special debt of gratitude to Tracy Fine of our staff and to Brother Rogers of the Stennis Center for their fine work on this program. Our two staffs work very closely together to make the program such a success and we appreciate the continuing financial support we also receive from the Stennis Center. We look forward to working with the Center in the years ahead.

I would also like to take this opportunity to second JAY's note of thanks to the Joyce and Donald Rumsfeld Foundation for its generous financial support for the program during this past year. The Foundation's generous grant enabled the program to reach an even wider array of students, including those at the community colleges that participated for the first time this year.

In addition to the expansion of the program to community colleges, the program has also commenced a concerted effort in partnership with the University of Central Florida and the Lou Frey Institute of Politics and Government to reach out to high school students via a series of webcasts, another example of the kind of work that Lou does consistently with younger people. These programs focus on specific issues and are designed as a tool for teachers to showcase the legislative process and encourage involvement in government. During the fall, the first in the series was piloted to high schools in Florida, and in 2009 and 2010 it will expand its reach to high schools in other States. Using this technology, the Association can reach a much larger audience and can make an even greater contribution to civics education. While these ''virtual'' visits cannot replace the person-to-person experience of a traditional Congress to campus visit, they can play an important supplemental role in teaching about representative democracy at the high school level.

We have also continued our working relationship with the People to People Ambassador Program which brings young people to our Nation's capital for a week of events centered on the concepts of character and leadership. These students are younger than those who participate in the Congress to Campus activities but they have already demonstrated a commitment to the ideals that Congress to Campus seeks to promote. The Association's involvement in this program allows our members living in this area, the Washington area, to speak to these younger students on the importance of public service and to answer their many questions about our government and our country. A number of our members continue to work full time, but this program permits them to continue their public service in this way. The events are typically held in the early morning at suburban locations, and I want to thank my colleagues who have participated in this program.

As some of you may know, the Association also partners with the Washington Center for Internships and Academic Seminars to organize panels of former Members of Congress to meet with students who are interning in the area, and to participate in seminars that address current issues and the relationship between the administration and the Congress. During the past academic year, the Washington Center and

the Association convened six separate panels of former Members to speak with the students. Since last year was an election year, the Washington Center held seminars at each of the party conventions at which former Members of Congress spoke to the students about the party platforms, the nomination process and other issues that the students were interested in. I also want to thank my colleagues who participated in these panels throughout the year.

Finally, I want to say again how really grateful we are to those who have made the Congress to Campus Program such a success and to strongly encourage all of my friends and colleagues to participate in the program either by making a visit to a school or by recommending a school to host the program. As all of us know, a democracy can prosper only if its citizens are both informed and engaged, and as former legislators we have a particular opportunity and responsibility to encourage such involvement. This program gives us a good chance to do so, particularly with our young people. Again, I thank those who have been part of it and encourage all of us to continue to participate.

Thank you very much.

Mr. RHODES. Thank you, MATT. I appreciate the time that you spend for the Association and for our projects and especially Congress to Campus which is one of our finest undertakings and at this point in time at least is the face of this organization publicly. That's where we are seen the most. I hope you will have a chance to read the article that was in Roll Call yesterday which should give you an indication in conjunction with the earlier reports about some of our international programs that we are going to try to expand the face so that it is recognized in areas other than the College to Campus Program. But College to Campus is clearly our flagship at this point and we really appreciate all the help we get, especially from MATT.

Now I need to talk to you a bit about the Statesmanship Dinner. Incidentally, in the Roll Call article, the only slight error that the reporter made in that the article was the implication that this is my swan song as president and that Dennis is taking over immediately after this meeting. I'm sorry to report to you, that's not true. You're stuck with me for another year. And Dennis is stuck up in that chair for another year. But next year he'll be up here lecturing you on how great we all are. We are chartered by Congress and receive no funding. The Association is responsible for finding our money to conduct our programs and one of the ways we do this is through our annual fundraising dinner. As part of this dinner, we recognize former and current Members of Congress for a particular achievement through our Statesmanship Award. In March of this year, we honored former and current Members who preceded their service in Congress with their service in the military. The very first Congress included veterans of our revolutionary war and veterans have played a key role in the Congress ever since. This Congress in particular includes veterans from the Iraq war, and there are probably going to be some after the next election from the Afghan war. These are fine men and women who deserve our recognition. During the course of this dinner, four individuals, Representative BUYER, Senator JOHN MCCAIN, Congressman JOHN CONYERS and Senator DANIEL INOUYE represented the different generations of Members who went from service in uniform to service in Congress. It was a very, very successful evening. It was very well received. And it was a successful fundraiser. This was our 13th fundraising dinner and the 13th time Lou Frey has chaired the undertaking. He deserves a special thanks for his tireless efforts on our behalf for this dinner. Lou is responsible for more ulcers amongst his dinner committee than he probably cares to acknowledge. A hard taskmaster he is, but he's a tremendous leader. He is outgrowing his own ulcers while he's making ours prosper as well. And he has promised me that he will not resign as dinner chairman while I am on the bridge. He is very disappointed to realize that there is another year, that he's got to do it another year. It's a solemn pledge.

Proceeds of the dinner help us with many of our projects. One of them is to collect the wisdom and experience of our members in book form. We have published one book called Inside the House, Former Members Reveal How Congress Really Works. It was heavily censored, but it has been widely received by political science departments in colleges and universities across the country. In a few weeks, we will be publishing volume 2 which is called Political Rules of the Road. This book collects various and sundry experiences and words of advice from people such as every single one of us in this room who has been through the caldron and have special stories to tell either because they are interesting or amusing, entertaining or enlightening. I am looking forward to seeing this book. We understand that 200 former and current Members participated and there are some 500 anecdotes contained in the volume. Another effort that we have undertaken is our annual golf tournament. Now we have had the annual golf tournament for 35 some years and it always involved sitting and former Members of Congress. Last year we expanded it to have a charitable role and we partnered with the Wounded Warriors Disabled Sports Foundation. Yesterday was the second tournament which involved the wounded warriors. As Dennis Hertel mentioned, we have been very successful in raising money for the Wounded Warriors Disabled Sports Foundation. We receive no proceeds from this tournament. And we have raised approximately $175,000 over the 2 years for the Wounded Warriors Disabled Sports Foundation.

There are many other things that we have been doing. We are running short on time. We need to move to one of the major reasons for being here, which is to honor Mr. Frey. We have continued the Life after Congress Seminar and we have sent a former Members delegation to Canada and our members had a chance to interact with colleagues in Ottawa, to strengthen that bond and that bond is very strong. We are organizing a similar mission to travel to Eastern Europe later this year. We will have a continuing relationship with the Web site project and next month, July, and I believe July 15 is the drop dead date, and I do mean drop dead date, for launching our new Web site. After July 15, I invite you to log on to www.usafmc.org and learn more than you probably want to know about all of us and all of you.

It is now my very distinct pleasure to present our 2009 Distinguished Service Award to our colleague from Florida, Mr. Frey.

For those of us who have known Lou for quite a few years, we can say without reservation, few people have the energy and the dedication that Lou commits to everything that he does. Few people have the boundless enthusiasm and his devotion to the task at hand and to the people he works with. He loves his country. He loves this institution. From the day he walked onto the House floor until this minute, he has always looked for ways to teach about Congress, to encourage the next generation of leaders, to help citizens become involved in their communities and in public service and in government. His work before, during and after his service has been distinguished and has made us a better and stronger institution and a better and stronger country. In addition, he has taken on a number of leadership positions within this organization, most of which have been alluded to. He has been our president, he has been our board member, he has been our taskmaster. We most of the time really, really appreciate him and when we don't, we are really, really not appreciating him. But most of the time we—I would not say, Lou, that you are the indispensable man, because we both know there is no such thing, but you are fairly close. Would you join me.

On behalf of the U.S. Association, it is my pleasure to present to you the 2009 Distinguished Service Award with plaque which is inscribed to Lou Frey. It says Congressman Lou Frey but ''Congressman'' is superfluous—it's just good old Lou—for his lifetime of exceptional public service. Both in and out of Congress, Lou Frey has demonstrated his great love of country and the democratic process. Renting the State of Florida, he served in the leadership of his party in the House of Representatives. He dedicated his congressional career to the youth of America, for example, by sponsoring legislation

that made higher education more financially attainable. After his tenure in Congress, he continued reaching out to America's high school and college students by establishing multiple programs that teach civic education. Thanks to Lou Frey, a new generation of leaders has become a better educated and engaged citizenry. Washington, D.C., June 16, 2009.

And it's got a gavel in it. I hope you don't think you're going to use that.

It is also my pleasure to give you a scrapbook of mementos from your friends and colleagues. I am happy to yield such time as he may consume, so long as it's not more than 10 minutes, to the Honorable Lou Frey.

Mr. FREY. Thank you, Mr. President, and thank you, all my friends. It's so great to see all of you and so many in the 91st Club back. I am so proud of my family who have helped so much. I guess there's 15 of them here. I hope you've had a chance to see them before. If not, they're up in the gallery and my bride is here which I'm not allowed to introduce but I will, anyway.

I went back before I looked at these remarks and read the speeches of Bob Michel and so many great people and what they felt about the House. I just can't match it. No way that I can match the eloquence of the words, Bob, that you and the other people did. So I thought what I would do is sort of talk about what I really care about and what I've been working on. I think we as former Members have a unique opportunity to do something that no one else can do because we're better at it where we sit in life right now than anybody, and that's the dream I had of young people and young people understanding what we've been given. It's amazing what our country has been given and it's amazing what we don't know about it. I guess I first ran into that when I started an intern program where young people come up and live with me or stay with Marcia and I, eight at a time. We would have them chaperoned. We'd go back and talk about it. And most of them were like me. I never went to my first political meeting until I was 25 years old. In school I had one course in civics. I never met a Member of Congress or a member of a State legislature basically until I started to run for office. I ran for office because I didn't want to be a State legislator and that's about all I knew. I got going on that path, I'm in Congress, and gee whiz, now what do you do, Coach? My leader wants me to play shortstop. What else can I do? I found as I got into it and spent more and more time that really our country is civically illiterate. Just plain and simple, we don't know what the devil we have. So what we tried to do in Florida as a pilot program is figure out what we could do about it rather than just saying it really doesn't work.

If you go back and you look at Jefferson, we were at the monument the other night and the quotes. I went back and I found a letter he wrote in 1816. He said, ''If a nation expects to be ignorant and free, in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be.'' This is going back pretty far, to 1816. When we look at our national landscape, there's a lot of studies that have been done, polls that have been out. A guy in Texas at the LBJ School looked at young people, and he said that the ''lack of civic engagement and civic literacy among American youth is widespread. They know very little about even the basic of the American constitutional system and have no historical perspective on the development of the nation and its relations with the rest of the world.'' I'll use my State as an example but, let me tell you, your States aren't much better and some may even be worse. But I'll pick on Florida a little bit. Senator GRAHAM and I started a joint center of civics. We had some surveys done. Florida, of the 50 States, is 47th in the average rate of volunteerism, 49th in the percentage of people who attend public meetings, and 40th in the percentage of citizens who work with others to solve a problem. And overall of the 50 States, Florida is 47th from the top in terms of civic literacy. But, let me just add to that, we've had some national tests done, surveys done. These statistics really blow you away. Seventy-three percent of the students in fourth grade could not identify the Constitution from among four choices as the instrument that contains the basic rules. That's 73 percent of the students in fourth grade. Seventy-five percent of the students in fourth grade can't identify the three parts of the Federal Government out of four possible choices. Ninety-four percent of students in grade eight couldn't give two reasons why it would be useful for a country to have a Constitution. And on and on.

The studies that really make you cry are, for instance, the studies that were done by the University of Connecticut who tested 14,000 freshmen and seniors. The average grade of the senior in civics was 53 percent. Fifty-three percent. These are seniors in school. A Florida bar survey found out that 41 percent of adults in Florida couldn't identify the three branches of American government; 54 percent couldn't correctly describe the meaning of separation of powers; 39 percent couldn't describe the meaning of checks and balances. We have two U.S. Senators living in my hometown. Ninety percent of the kids couldn't name one of them. But they haven't been indicted, so that sort of takes away from it, I guess, a little bit.

In the Florida primary in '06 which nominated a Governor and a Senator, the effective winning vote was 5.1 percent of the total Florida population. Really not a great turnout. Now there has obviously been a better turnout in the Presidential race. It was a nice spike. But when we surveyed the people there, they said, Well, we're not going to really do much after it. We don't intend to really do much. Over half the people said, yeah, they were going to vote and everything but they weren't going to do anything after it because politics just stunk.

So what you're looking at is a situation where really as a country we've been given this incredible gift and we don't know what we have and it's getting worse each year. It isn't getting better. We've been privileged to be here. There's been about 11,000 people who have ever served in the House. That's about half as many as you get at a national ball game these days. Not really very many people have ever had the privilege that we have here. We have an opportunity that is unique. Because as a Member of Congress you don't have any credibility. Right now there's a lot of fussing going on and so forth and so on and when you go out and teach in that, it's tough because as a Member of Congress you're rightly caring about your party and, you know, are you going to get reelected, are you going to get your party to stay in power. You have all these other things going. We've been in the big leagues. We've made it. All of us have been a product of the toughest system going and we've served in the greatest legislative body in the world. But our goal is different now. If our party's in, okay, fine. If it isn't, okay, we're going to survive it. We're not running for election. We are running, though, to change the young people and change what they believe and what they can do. Let me tell you, young people care. We've got a symposium. We've had 13 of them. We get about a thousand kids that come every 6 months to it. We put it on the Internet. Kids care if you give them a chance. We have a civics academy for high schools, for colleges and for elected officials, for local officials we have. We've created a civics academy in Leon County where for 3 years we're going to teach civics. We're trying to change the law in Florida so civics will be taught not just once but three or four times as we go along. People will come. Young people will come. And as former Members with what we're doing with the programs we have, University Press is here today with a new book coming out, with the program we're starting on the Internet which is going to reach across the country, there are a lot of things that we can do. We don't have to take second place to anybody. Because we are on the frontlines and we can do it better, we have more knowledge, we've been through it, but we don't have a dog in the fight in terms of where it comes out. We just want young people, young Americans, to be exposed to what it is. We're not telling them to vote Republican, vote Democrat but we are telling them, look at what we have, look at the Constitution, look at what we've been given. It would be a shame to let this go away. And if we don't reach out to the young people, the young people coming along, it is going to continue to go away. And I think that's the challenge.

Tom Brokaw, when he gave Ford's eulogy, talked about the Greatest Generation who enlisted in the war and they went and they fought and they came back and they reenlisted. They reenlisted in this country. That's what I'm asking us to do, all of us. Let us reenlist like they did and make a difference and we can do it.

Thank you so much. I'm obviously humbled by the award. Everyone here could get, I recognize that. I thank you for it. I want to thank especially my family whom I dearly love and who has been with me all the way.

Thank you very much.

Mr. RHODES. Lou, thank you. It's leadership that our young people are looking for. With the efforts of people such as you and the people that you work with and the people you work with here, hopefully we are positioning ourselves to be able to assist in providing that leadership. A lot of the programs that you have instituted which we have been privileged to participate in, and I am particularly speaking of the civics education program and the webcasts, I think we have a very, very unique opportunity to reach young men and women who really are hungry to be told, not what to do but why they are free and why they have the opportunities that they have. And it is because of you and efforts of people like you that we are going to make that effort.

We thank you very much.

I now have a portion of the program that we will go through. It's not a happy one, but I will read to you the names of our former colleagues who have passed away during the course of the past year. Each of us probably knows at least some of these names, and some may know all of them. During the past year, the following individuals have gone to a greater reward:

Glenn Andrews of Alabama
Robert Cornell of Wisconsin
Tim Hall of Illinois
Frank Harrison of Pennsylvania
Jesse Helms of North Carolina
Jack Kemp of New York
David King of Utah
Horace Kornegay of North Carolina
Dan Kuykendall of Tennessee
Raymond Lederer of Pennsylvania
Clem McSpadden of Oklahoma
Bill Orton of Utah
William Patman of Texas
James Pearson of Kansas
Claiborne Pell of Rhode Island
Carl Pursell of Michigan
Matthew Rinaldo of New Jersey
Paul Rogers of Florida
John Seiberling of Ohio
Paul Todd of Michigan
Stephanie Tubbs-Jones of Ohio
Lionel Van Deerlin of California
Jerome Waldie of California
Lyle Williams of Ohio
Wendell Wyatt of Oregon.

I ask all of you, including those in the gallery, if you would rise for just a moment of silence to pay respect to their memories.

Thank you.

A new addition to our annual meeting is a memorial breakfast where we will further celebrate the lives and contributions of our past former colleagues. The breakfast is tomorrow morning at 9 a.m. at the Capitol Hill Club. Chaplain Coughlin will join us and it would be very nice to see as many of you there as possible. We are going to give opportunities for us to share memories, if we will, of some of those with whom we were particularly acquainted who have gone on.

Before I conclude, I need to make mention of the fact that we have two former parliamentarians from Canada who have joined us. Lou Duguay is my counterpart in the Canadian Association of Former Parliamentarians and Murad Velshi is a former member of the Ontario legislature. We are honored that you have joined us and hope that you will participate in the rest of our programs.

I want to thank other members of our executive committee: Vice President Hertel; Treasurer Morella; Secretary Kennelly; and our immediate Past President, Jim Slattery. I also want to pay special recognition to our special immediate Past President, Jack Buechner. When Mr. Slattery left Washington to go back to Kansas to run for the Senate, we were lacking an immediate Past President who is a valuable member of the executive committee, and we were able to prevail upon Jack to fill in, which he did, he did very ably and contributed very much to the Association's efforts during the course of time that Jim was not here. As we know, Mr. Slattery fell short in his campaign for the Senate and has returned to Washington and has resumed his duties as immediate Past President. But, Jack, thank you for your help. We needed it and we appreciate it.

I think that it would be appropriate for me to take a moment to recognize our staff. These are very, very talented professional, hardworking, dedicated people, and they work for us and they work very, very well for us. A lot of the things that we get accomplished we couldn't do without the assistance of our five staff personnel. They are:

Esra Alemdar, Jr., Program Officer
Whitney Novak, Member Services Manager
Tracy Fine, Democracy Officer
Sudha David-Wilp, International Programs Director
Pete Weichlein, Executive Director.

Our thanks to all of you for everything you do for us.

That is the end of my report. I want to thank Leader HOYER and Leader BOEHNER for giving us the opportunity to be here on the floor today and Speaker PELOSI for making the Chamber available to us.

Mr. HERTEL. The Chair wants to thank the president of our association, the gentleman from Arizona, for all his hard work and leadership, especially in these difficult times. He does have this extra burden to carry since the gentleman from Kansas ran for the Senate and it's been in difficult times, especially in this economy. It's much harder to get the people to volunteer to contribute money. As we thank Lou Frey for his leadership all these years, it goes to such wonderful programs as our Congress to Campus Program but to Jay Rhodes for carrying this heavy load.

I also wanted to recognize Mr. Buechner who has done such a wonderful job as President and Past President in leading our group and with advice. And also Matt McHugh, our former President of the Association who is here; and Phil Ruppe from my State of Michigan. Because of all these gentlemen, we've had such a great opportunity. We have also had women before as Lindy Boggs, one of our outstanding Presidents before of our association. What a difference they have made in getting people to participate and bringing these programs to fruition. I have to also thank Barbara Kennelly, our treasurer, and Connie Morella for all their hard work and all the time they devoted, especially in this last year.

The Chair again wishes to thank all the former Members of the House for their presence here today. Before terminating these proceedings, the Chair would like to invite those former Members who did not respond when the roll was called to give their name to the Clerk for inclusion on the roll. The Chair wishes to thank the other former Members of the House for their presence here today and all of their work in contributing to all the programs that we have been talking about for the last hour and a half. As Lou Frey said, it's only with the former Members that we can continue to participate and have these programs work internationally and in over 40 campuses around our country. And now with the Wounded Warriors addition to make that disabled sports program so successful. Thank you again. We appreciate all the work that you have done.

The meeting is adjourned.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

Lord God, Who knows the truth when it is still hidden from our mind's eye, and Who reads our hearts, filled with hidden desires, we bring our needs to You in prayer.

Sometimes we are simply elated by hope. Often we are overwhelmed by the reality of daily concerns. Occasionally we are totally blinded by the emotional force field around us. Yet, we try to clear the air with our prayer.

Help us, Lord, to humbly admit that at times we are not fully conscious of what is our greatest need.

Dealing with issues that are beyond psychological admission or sociological determination or political timing, Lord, we are led to a deeper confidence that You know us better than we know ourselves.

You will help us if we simply call upon Your Holy Name, and will answer our deepest needs, even if we cannot name them ourselves, for You are the Creative One and Savior of Your people, now and forever.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HERGER 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.

WAR SUPPLEMENTAL

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

Mr. KUCINICH. We're destroying our Nation's moral and fiscal integrity with the war supplemental. Instead of ending wars in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Pakistan now, by appropriating only enough money to bring our troops home, Congress abdicates its constitutional authority, defers to the President and asks for a report. That's right. All we're asking for is a report on when the President will end the war.

There's money, too, for the IMF, presumably to bail out private European banks, billions for the IMF so they can force low- and middle-income nations to cut jobs, wages, health care and retirement security, just like corporate America does to our constituents.

And there's money to incentivize the purchase of more cars, but not necessarily from the U.S. because a ''Buy America'' mandate was not allowed. Another $106 billion, and all we get is a lousy war. Pretty soon, that's going to be about the only thing made in America: war.

ELECTING CERTAIN MINORITY MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Republican Conference, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 548

Resolved, That the following Members are, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committee:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES—Mr. McKeon, to rank before Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Platts.

Mr. PENCE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BREAKING DOWN THE UNINSURED

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, and in the many days before, we heard our colleagues talk over and over and over again about how we have so many people in this country who do not have access to health care. That's not accurate. They have access to health care. What they're talking about is people who are uninsured.

But let me talk about the numbers that make up what they're talking about as 45.7 million Americans who are uninsured. That's not true either; 9.5 million of those are noncitizens; 12 million of them are eligible for public programs such as Medicaid and Medicare; 7.3 million have incomes over $84,000 and choose not to purchase health insurance; and 9.1 million are only temporarily uninsured. That brings us down to 7.8 million American citizens, lower income, long-term uninsured, a much different figure from the 45 million they tout all the time. And a preliminary report by CBO says that they want to spend $1 trillion on this.

HONORING THE LIFE OF SENIOR AIRMAN ASHTON GOODMAN

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

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a fallen hero who was laid to rest in my district earlier this month.

Senior Airman Ashton Goodman was killed by a roadside bomb in Afghanistan on May 26. Her ultimate sacrifice is a stark reminder of the human cost of war. However, it is Ashton's life that should serve as a shining example of American achievement in Afghanistan.

While tasked with protecting vital reconstruction teams, Ashton worked to win over the hearts and minds of the Afghan people. She regularly mentored Afghan women, providing them with the guidance and skills needed to stand up against oppression and violence. Because of Ashton, many women are now combating the economic and social conditions that breed extremism.

Through her exceptional support of Afghan women and her sacrifice on behalf of her country, she has set a lasting example for our military and for all Americans.

THE CALIFORNIA CATASTROPHIC WILDFIRE PREVENTION AND COMMUNITY PROTECTION ACT OF 2009

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

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, today, I'm introducing legislation to address the dire situation facing my district and the State of California with respect to accumulation of forest fuels and the threat of catastrophic wildfires.

The California Catastrophic Wildfire Prevention and Community Protection Act of 2009 seeks to implement hazardous fuels reduction and other forest-thinning projects on Federal land that have been collaboratively developed and identified within a community's wildfire protection plan or county fire plan.

Since 2003, California has witnessed three of its worst fire seasons ever. This legislation would help address the only aspect of wildfire we can control: accumulation of forest fuels. Without action, our communities remain at risk to catastrophic wildfire.

I urge my fellow Members to support this commonsense solution.

AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE FOR EVERYONE

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

Mr. KAGEN. Mr. Speaker, we've come to a point in time in American history when it's past time for us to guarantee access to affordable health care for everyone.

Last week, Thursday, President Obama came to Green Bay, Wisconsin, and he didn't have to travel very far to find a health care story. At the airport restaurant there's Jeff. And Jeff is working 65 hours a week, two different jobs, and he doesn't have the health care coverage that he needs. He can't get health care coverage because he has a preexisting medical condition.

It's time for this House, on both sides of the aisle, to understand that Jeff isn't the only one who needs our help.

We need to have choices. We need to have the care that we require just to get through the day, and we have to have health care at a price we can all afford to pay. And we must guarantee that no citizen shall suffer any discrimination due to any preexisting medical conditions.

And I'll ask you this question: Isn't it time that we have a Federal standard, a standard health benefit plan, that's available to each and every American citizen and legal resident?

I think it's time, and so do the people of northeast Wisconsin.

A PEACEFUL FUTURE FOR IRAN

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

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, halfway across the world today people are rioting in the streets. Violence, gunshots and even death have overtaken Iran's streets as its citizens protest the results of their recent election.

Iran's security affects the entire Middle East, and the riots there show how fragile their government really is. Recently, Iran successfully tested a long-range missile, and their intentions with their nuclear program are still unknown.

The United States must utilize every diplomatic, economic, and political tool at our disposal, including the further use of sanctions. Ultimately, our goal is peace for Iran, peace now and in the future. That's why I encourage Members of this body to join me in the support of the Iran Petroleum Sanctions Act. This legislation would use sanctions on refined petroleum to Iran in order to convince the government to give up its nuclear ambitions.

Our desire, all of us across the world, is to see a secure and peaceful future for the people of Iran, the greater Middle East and the world, but this cannot happen without some changes in Iran's policies, regardless of the outcome of their election.

COMBATING A NATIONAL PROBLEM

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

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I'm glad to report to the House about another blow made against the drug cartels who smuggle narcotics into the United States from Mexico.

Recently, two women from Michigan were arrested for driving a van filled with $1 million dollars worth of marijuana down I–40 near Holbrook in my district. The Major Crimes Apprehension Team K–9 Unit pulled over the van for a traffic violation and discovered two occupants from Michigan carrying $1 million worth of marijuana.

This case further demonstrates the important role that local law enforcement in Arizona and throughout the Southwest are playing in combating a national problem.

I commend Navajo County Sheriff K.C. Clark and his department for yet another successful operation.

COMMENTS MADE BY LEON PANETTA

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, like many Americans, I cheered when CIA Director Leon Panetta recently defended the honor of his agency against unsubstantiated charges by the Speaker of the House that the CIA routinely lied to Americans and to the Congress of the United States.

Given those remarks, I was surprised to see his recent remarks about Vice President Cheney when he said, It's almost as if he wishes that this country would be attacked again in order to make his point.

Just as Mr. Panetta deserves an apology from the Speaker, Mr. Panetta owes one to the Vice President of the United States.

The Vice President was Vice President when this country was attacked. He and the President spent the next 7½ years making sure it didn't happen again. They deserve our thanks and our appreciation, not cheap shots and not questions about their motives when they address the critical issues before our country.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to stress the importance of reforming our health care system this year. Every day Americans with health concerns worry, not just about getting well, but whether they can afford to get well.

Statistics show that the average American family already pays an extra $1,100 in premiums every year for a broken system that leaves 46 million uninsured Americans, and millions more who are insured without the care they need when they need it.

Americans spend more than any other population on health care; yet we are no healthier for the investment. President Obama and this Congress want to change this dynamic.

We must make quality health care more affordable and accessible to every American: man, woman and child. We must enact a health care system, promote a health care system, ensure a health care system that will work for our constituents and be worthy of this great Nation.

□ 1215

TALKING ON THE PHONE TAX

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, ''can you hear me now?''

That phrase repeated by cell phone users across the vast prairies and wide-open spaces of America soon may be taxed by the Feds.

That's right. The taxacrats want to tax citizens for their private cell phone use and for the use of mobile phones at work. It's a benefit, the taxacrats saith. So they want to tax it.

Don't think this new ''talking on the phone tax'' will ever leave. In 1898, Congress passed temporary phone taxes to fund the Spanish-American War, but Teddy Roosevelt and the Rough Riders had the 4-month war won even before the tax took effect. Guess what? Americans are still paying that temporary phone tax for that war 111 years ago.

Phone taxes never die. They don't even fade away. Americans are taxed enough already. Government addiction to spending should be cured cold turkey style. Citizens don't need more silly taxes to fund pet projects. Mr. Speaker, the people are weary of taxes.

''Can you hear them now?'' No more taxes. No ''talking on the phone tax.''

And that's just the way it is.

HONORING THE LIFE OF COACH JIM OWENS

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, today in Seattle, a memorial service is taking place for the University of Washington's legendary football coach, Jim Owens, who passed away on June 6, leaving a legacy that extends far beyond Husky Stadium where he coached for 18 years. In fact, that legacy extends here to the Nation's Capital because I was one of the many individuals he recruited, coached and counseled on and off the field, and we remained friends for nearly 50 years.

He was a remarkable leader, assuming the job of head coach at the university at the age of 29. It was said that he brought a work ethic and a coaching style that would have intimidated a Marine Corps drill instructor. That was accurate. I can say that from personal experience. He had high expectations, and he could be tough. He once told me I was fine on defense as a linebacker, but I was the weakest weak guard on the team.

Most of all, he was a real leader, and he was successful. Three years after arriving at the University of Washington, he produced a Rose Bowl championship team, defeating Wisconsin, 44–8, in the 1960 Rose Bowl. I was proud to play for him the next year when we repeated a Rose Bowl victory over Minnesota, 17–7.

He was a great coach. Though he will be missed, his lessons will endure long beyond his death. Our prayers go out to the entire Owens family. They have lost a wonderful husband and father. His players will never forget him.

PEACEFUL DISSENT IN THE STREETS OF IRAN

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

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with President Obama, with Vice President BIDEN and with all of those around the world who have been

expressing their most profound concern about the events in Iran and, in particular, about the violence being used against those people who have been peacefully dissenting in the streets of Iran.

There are news reports that at least seven have been killed. Others have been beaten and have been badly injured. Both the protests and the violent suppression have been spreading. It has been reported that there are instances of live fire being used by police in the cities. The Iranian authorities have now indicated that they will do a limited recount of the election results. I hope they are sincere and earnest in this offer.

As President Obama has said to those who have used their right to dissent: The world is watching and the world is inspired.

RECOGNIZING VIETNAM VETERANS FROM NEW MEXICO

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

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, during the Memorial Day weekend, there was a solemn moment for one family of New Mexico. Enrique Valdez, who served as a gunnery sergeant in the United States Marine Corps, was the 400th New Mexican to have his name added to the Vietnam Memorial here in Washington. Valdez was injured during his second tour of duty in South Vietnam.

Today, I would like to say that I am thankful for the service that Sergeant Valdez gave to his country. New Mexico has always had a proud military history from the Civil War to the Operations of Enduring and Iraqi Freedom.

New Mexico's sons and daughters have always answered their Nation's call. For those who served during the Vietnam war, we as a Nation have been lax in our gratitude and appreciation. As we remember Sergeant Enrique Valdez, let us not only honor his memory and sacrifice but also honor the price that was paid by all who served in Vietnam.

FISCAL CRISES

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

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. is facing a fiscal crisis which we must soon begin to address. This will not be easy, but there are two clear things that we know we must do.

First, we know we must fix the spiraling cost of our health care system, and those who would point to our Federal deficits ignore the much larger numbers associated with the promises that we have made through Medicare and Social Security that we are going to have trouble keeping if we don't take a hard look at those things.

Secondly, as the economy recovers, this House must put the brakes on government spending. That's why I am delighted that, tomorrow, this House will take up pay-as-you-go legislation that would simply say: You pay for what you spend. You either have the guts to ask the citizenry to pay for it via taxation or you choose other things that you don't want to spend it on. We've seen PAYGO rules in place before, in the 1990s, when the government ran surpluses and when we saw unrivaled prosperity.

So we need to look back at that and have the discipline to pass that legislation so that we restore confidence in our fiscal probity and in the prosperity to our economy.

HEALTH CARE CRISIS

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

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, it is time to stop playing politics and solve the health care crisis. Americans deserve a choice in quality health care that is affordable.

Health care reform will make sure that we have the option to keep the health care insurance we have, if we like it, or to choose a quality public health care option.

Health care reform will stop the insurance companies from denying coverage to those with preexisting conditions. You will also no longer be denied care because of your age. Health care reform will make sure that you will have coverage that can never be denied or taken away. Our families need this peace of mind. We spend almost 50 percent more per person on health care than does the next most costly nation, but we are no healthier for it.

We cannot wait any longer to make health care reform a reality. Quality, affordable health care for all is long overdue.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, the American people don't need to be told there is a health care crisis in America. They're the ones living it every day. They're the ones who, for decades, have seen the price they pay out of every paycheck for health insurance skyrocket while their coverage has shrunk or has been denied altogether. They've seen the increasing copays and premiums.

We can give every American a choice. We can offer an alternative to the mountains of medical debt that so often lead to bankruptcy. We can offer an alternative to the fear that they or their children might be denied a doctor visit simply because it is more profitable to deny them coverage than to see them get well.

I want to encourage all Americans to stand up to the same fear-mongering attacks that have prevented them for decades from getting the health care they deserve. We can offer a public option that helps all Americans. I implore the American people to remember that we are not the country of ''no, we can't.'' We are America, the country of ''yes, we can.''

IRAN

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, while we are often focused on the things that make us different from other cultures, the recent news in Iran illustrates that there are far more things that bind us than that divide us. Freedom of speech, democracy and respect for basic fairness are not uniquely American or Western values. They are hardwired into all of us and are as elemental to the human experience as is the need for food, water or love.

We will likely have political differences with the Government of Iran for years to come. Despite this, let us all remember that the Iranian people want many of the same things that Americans do. They want their voices to be heard just like us. They want their government to be just, open and accessible just like us. They want their economy to be strong and for their country to work towards greater peace and understanding around the world just like us.

HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, the health care crisis in our Nation is real. We need to step forward and take action to provide quality and affordable care for those who need it. With 46 million Americans uninsured in this country, there is no time to waste in offering hardworking families the option of health insurance while infusing competition into the health care market, which desperately needs it.

Our broken health care system also happens to be the most expensive health care system in the world. If we don't act now, the cost of health care in this country in 10, 20 or 30 years will bog down our economy. Reforming our health care system now makes economic sense.

Proposed health care reform is all about options. If you are happy with your current plans and with your current providers, keep them. The choice to have health insurance and the choice to get the best medical care you can possibly get is up to you. Health care should be a right for every American, and our current health care system in this country is broken. It is time for Congress to take the lead and to make the tough choices that we were sent to Washington to make.

DAY OF THE AFRICAN CHILD

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to recognize the Day of the African Child, which has been celebrated on June 16 each year since 1991 when it was first initiated by the Organization of African Unity, the predecessor to the African Union.

This year, the African Union has designated child survival as the theme of this year's Day of the African Child.

According to the United Nations Children's Fund, sub-Saharan Africa remains the most difficult place in the world for a child to survive. Each year in sub-Saharan Africa, 1.2 million babies die in their first month of life. Roughly, one in every six children fails to reach his 5th birthday. In response to these shocking statistics, the African Union made child survival a theme for their 15th meeting coming up in 2010.

The top five killers of children under age 5 include neonatal causes such as respiratory infections, pneumonia, malaria, diarrhea, and HIV/AIDS.

So, Mr. Speaker, we encourage the legislators to support this, and I join in solidarity with UNICEF for the African child.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, America cannot afford to wait for health care reform. Right now, more than three out of four Americans are dissatisfied with the total cost of health care. That is why Congress is working hard to craft legislation to fix the health care system for American families, for American businesses, for future generations, and of course, for our own fiscal survival.

Since 2000, wages have only increased 3 percent while health insurance has increased more than 50 percent. This has caused many families to delay visits to the doctor, to skip treatments and to allow their health coverage to lapse. Despite having the most expensive health care system in the world, Americans are no healthier than many of our global partners.

President Obama and this Congress are working together to provide adequate, accessible and affordable health care now.

GOVERNMENT HASTE MAKES TAXPAYER WASTE

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

Mr. McCOTTER. We are going to soon be facing a question of health care for Americans. We've heard about how important it is for fellow Americans to have access to quality, affordable health care, and we hear that government is the answer. We hear that, if we spend $1 trillion, we may be able to insure one-third of our fellow citizens. Extrapolating from that, that means, to insure all of the uninsured, it will cost us $3 trillion. We hear this must be done by August.

Government haste makes taxpayer waste. We must do this properly. We must do this correctly. We cannot do it properly or correctly with an arbitrary deadline set by people who have, to date, passed bills they have not read and that have yet to work for the American people, whose number one concern right now is keeping a job or finding one.

□ 1230

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS OF FORMER MEMBERS CEREMONY

Mrs. MALONEY. I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings during the former Members ceremony be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and that all Members and former Members who spoke have the privilege of revising and extending their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

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.

NATIONAL CONSUMER COOPERATIVE BANK ACT AMENDMENTS OF 2009

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1674) to amend the National Consumer Cooperative Bank Act to allow for the treatment of the nonprofit corporation affiliate of the Bank as a community development financial institution for purposes of the Community Development Banking and Financial Institutions Act of 1994.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1674

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 ''National Consumer Cooperative Bank Act Amendments of 2009''.

SEC. 2. TREATMENT OF NATIONAL COOPERATIVE BANK AFFILIATE AS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.

Section 211 of the National Consumer Cooperative Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 3051) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (d) the following:

''(e) TREATMENT AS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the nonprofit corporation established under this section shall be deemed to be a community development financial institution for purposes of the Community Development Banking and Financial Institutions Act of 1994, unless, after the date of the enactment of the National Consumer Cooperative Bank Act Amendments of 2009, the Bank, or any affiliate (as defined in section 103(3) of the Community Development Banking and Financial Institutions Act of 1994) of the Bank, participates in depository institution incentives under section 114 of the Community Development Banking and Financial Institutions Act of 1994.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) and the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this particular legislation and to insert additional information.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1674, the National Consumer Cooperative Bank Act Amendments of 2009. This legislation is necessary to make a technical correction to the statute of the National Consumer Cooperative Bank Act.

The National Consumer Cooperative Bank was created by Congress in 1978 and is dedicated to strengthening communities nationwide through the delivery of banking and financial services, complemented by a special focus on cooperative expansion and economic development.

The National Consumer Cooperative Bank Act of 1978 established a nonprofit corporation to reach further into low-income communities and to serve disadvantaged populations. NCB Capital Impact is that nonprofit, mission-driven subsidiary of NCB that works to provide housing, education, health care, cultural centers, small businesses, and social services in economically distressed communities.

In the last 10 years alone, NCB Capital Impact has invested more than $600 million in assistance to low- and moderate-income communities. These funds helped finance more than 33,000 affordable housing units; 8,000 affordable assisted living units for seniors and persons with disabilities; 137,000

school seats; 2.9 million square feet of community health center space serving 350,000 patients; and helped create 25,000 jobs for low-income individuals.

In my home State of New York, NCB Capital Impact has played a significant role in providing housing finance. In fact, NCB has participated in more than 600 loans in my district alone. Most of these loans are for housing, including affordable housing, as well as loans for community facilities and loans to nonprofit organizations like the Council of New York Cooperatives and Condominiums. Together, these groups are able to provide assisted living, affordable housing and services to the frail and elderly.

Presently, NCB Capital Impact is working with five community-based organizations to help finance 17 projects that will create 558 housing units. Despite their good work in serving low-income communities and disadvantaged populations, NCB Capital Impact is not eligible for assistance authorized under the Community Development Banking and Financial Institutions Act of 1994, which is administered by the CDFI Fund. The fund has ruled it cannot certify NCB Capital Impact as a CDFI because of the corporate structure of its parent, NCB. In short, NCB Capital Impact is shut off from critical sources of financial awards that are needed to maintain their housing and community development efforts.

The interest of NCB Capital Impact in gaining CDFI certification is twofold. First, it has a track record that is comparable to other organizations that receive CDFI status; its mission is dedicated to working with low-income populations and communities. Second, increasingly in the community development finance field, CDFI certification is viewed as a Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval in working with other Federal agencies and other public and private institutions.

I think that it is important to note that this legislation does not guarantee the NCB any assistance, nor does it authorize additional amounts for the CDFI program. All it does is allow NCB to better fulfill its mission by allowing them to compete for these funds. As such, the Congressional Budget Office has determined that this legislation will have no significant impact on the Federal budget.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this technical amendment to the NCB statute so that the nonprofit, mission-driven NCB Capital Impact may continue to provide services to distressed and underserved communities throughout New York and throughout the entire country.

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

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

H.R. 1674 makes a small but significant fix to the National Consumer Cooperative Bank that will have the effect of expanding financial services options to low-income communities.

The bill would give NCB Capital Impact, the nonprofit subsidiary of NCB, the opportunity to compete with hundreds of other institutions for grants from the Community Development Financial Institutions Fund administered by the Treasury Department. Today, NCB Capital Impact is not eligible for the CDFI grants even though it provides housing, education, health care, cultural centers, small businesses, and social services in distressed areas. The mission of the CDFI Fund is to expand the capacity of financial institutions to provide credit, capital and financial services to underserved populations.

So long as the activities of the NCB Capital Impact meet the letter and the spirit of the CDFI's eligibility requirements, their organizational structure should not preclude them from receiving those dollars. This bill would allow NCB Capital Impact to compete for grants and continue providing economic development support to low- and moderate-income communities.

In closing, I would like to commend the sponsor of this legislation, Mrs. MALONEY, for her work on this bill. I am in support of her statement and would urge my colleagues also to support that.

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

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1674.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOMES FOR HEROES ACT OF 2009

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 403) to provide housing assistance for very low-income veterans.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 403

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 ''Homes for Heroes Act of 2009''.

SEC. 2. SPECIAL ASSISTANT FOR VETERANS AFFAIRS IN OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT.

Section 4 of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Act (42 U.S.C. 3533) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(g) SPECIAL ASSISTANT FOR VETERANS AFFAIRS.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There shall be in the Department a Special Assistant for Veterans Affairs, who shall be in the Office of the Secretary.

''(2) APPOINTMENT.—The Special Assistant for Veterans Affairs shall be appointed based solely on merit and shall be covered under the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service.

''(3) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Special Assistant for Veterans Affairs shall be responsible for—

''(A) ensuring veterans have access to housing and homeless assistance under each program of the Department providing either such assistance;

''(B) coordinating all programs and activities of the Department relating to veterans;

''(C) serving as a liaison for the Department with the Department of Veterans Affairs, including establishing and maintaining relationships with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs;

''(D) serving as a liaison for the Department, and establishing and maintaining relationships with officials of State, local, regional, and nongovernmental organizations concerned with veterans;

''(E) providing information and advice regarding—

''(i) sponsoring housing projects for veterans assisted under programs administered by the Department; or

''(ii) assisting veterans in obtaining housing or homeless assistance under programs administered by the Department;

''(F) preparing the annual report under section 8 of Homes for Heroes Act of 2009; and

''(G) carrying out such other duties as may be assigned to the Special Assistant by the Secretary or by law.''.

SEC. 3. SUPPORTIVE HOUSING FOR VERY LOW-INCOME VETERAN FAMILIES.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purposes of this section are—

(1) to expand the supply of permanent housing for very low-income veteran families; and

(2) to provide supportive services through such housing to support the needs of such veteran families.

(b) AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall, to the extent amounts are made available for assistance under this section and the Secretary receives approvable applications for such assistance, provide assistance to private nonprofit organizations and consumer cooperatives to expand the supply of supportive housing for very low-income veteran families.

(2) NATURE OF ASSISTANCE.—The assistance provided under paragraph (1)—

(A) shall be available for use to plan for and finance the acquisition, construction, reconstruction, or moderate or substantial rehabilitation of a structure or a portion of a structure to be used as supportive housing for very low-income veteran families in accordance with this section; and

(B) may also cover the cost of real property acquisition, site improvement, conversion, demolition, relocation, and other expenses that the Secretary determines are necessary to expand the supply of supportive housing for very low-income veteran families.

(3) CONSULTATION.—In meeting the requirement of paragraph (1), the Secretary shall consult with—

(A) the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; and

(B) the Special Assistant for Veterans Affairs, as such Special Assistant was established under section 4(g) of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Act.

(c) FORMS OF ASSISTANCE.—Assistance under this section shall be made available in the following forms:

(1) PLANNING GRANTS.—Assistance may be provided as a grant for costs of planning a project to be used as supportive housing for very low-income veteran families.

(2) CAPITAL ADVANCES.—Assistance may be provided as a capital advance under this paragraph for a project, such advance shall—

(A) bear no interest;

(B) not be required to be repaid so long as the housing remains available for occupancy by very low-income veteran families in accordance with this section; and

(C) be in an amount calculated in accordance with the development cost limitation established pursuant to subsection (i).

(3) PROJECT RENTAL ASSISTANCE.—Assistance may be provided as project rental assistance, under an annual contract that—

(A) obligates the Secretary to make monthly payments to cover any part of the costs attributed to units occupied (or, as approved by the Secretary, held for occupancy) by very low-income veteran families that is not met from project income;

(B) provides for the project not more than the sum of the initial annual project rentals for all units so occupied and any initial utility allowances for such units, as approved by the Secretary;

(C) provides that any contract amounts not used by a project in any year shall remain available to the project until the expiration of the contract;

(D) provides that upon the expiration of each contract term, the Secretary shall adjust the annual contract amount to provide for reasonable project costs, and any increases, including adequate reserves, supportive services, and service coordinators, except that any contract amounts not used by a project during a contract term shall not be available for such adjustments upon renewal; and

(E) provides that in the event of emergency situations that are outside the control of the owner, the Secretary shall increase the annual contract amount, subject to reasonable review and limitations as the Secretary shall provide.

(d) TENANT RENT CONTRIBUTION.—A very low-income veteran family shall pay as rent for a dwelling unit assisted under this section the highest of the following amounts, rounded to the nearest dollar:

(1) 30 percent of the veteran family's adjusted monthly income.

(2) 10 percent of the veteran family's monthly income.

(3) If the veteran family is receiving payments for welfare assistance from a public agency and a part of such payments, adjusted in accordance with the veteran family's actual housing costs, is specifically designated by such agency to meet the veteran family's housing costs, the portion of such payments which is so designated.

(e) TERM OF COMMITMENT.—

(1) USE LIMITATIONS.—All units in housing assisted under this section shall be made available for occupancy by very low-income veteran families for not less than 15 years.

(2) CONTRACT TERMS FOR PROJECT RENTAL ASSISTANCE.—

(A) INITIAL TERM.—The initial term of a contract entered into under subsection (c)(3) shall be 60 months.

(B) EXTENSION.—The Secretary shall, subject only to the availability of amounts provided in appropriation Acts, renew the contract entered into under subsection (c)(3) for 10 consecutive one-year terms, the first such term beginning upon the expiration of such 60-month period.

(C) AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY TO MAKE EARLY COMMITMENTS.—In order to facilitate the orderly extension of expiring contracts, the Secretary may make commitments to extend expiring contracts during the year prior to the date of expiration.

(f) APPLICATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Amounts made available under this section shall be allocated by the Secretary among approvable applications submitted by private nonprofit organizations and consumer cooperatives.

(2) CONTENT OF APPLICATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Applications for assistance under this section shall be submitted by an applicant in such form and in accordance with such procedures as the Secretary shall establish.

(B) REQUIRED CONTENT.—Applications for assistance under this section shall contain—

(i) a description of the proposed housing;

(ii) a description of the assistance the applicant seeks under this section;

(iii) a description of—

(I) the supportive services to be provided to the persons occupying such housing;

(II) the manner in which such services will be provided to such persons, including, in the case of frail elderly persons (as such term is defined in section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 (12 U.S.C. 1701q)), evidence of such residential supervision as the Secretary determines is necessary to facilitate the adequate provision of such services; and

(III) the public or private sources of assistance that can reasonably be expected to fund or provide such services;

(iv) a certification from the public official responsible for submitting a housing strategy for the jurisdiction to be served in accordance with section 105 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 12705) that the proposed project is consistent with the approved housing strategy; and

(v) such other information or certifications that the Secretary determines to be necessary or appropriate to achieve the purposes of this section.

(3) REJECTION.—The Secretary shall not reject any application for assistance under this section on technical grounds without giving notice of that rejection and the basis therefore to the applicant.

(g) INITIAL SELECTION CRITERIA AND PROCESSING.—

(1) SELECTION CRITERIA.—The Secretary shall establish selection criteria for assistance under this section, which shall include—

(A) criteria based upon—

(i) the ability of the applicant to develop and operate the proposed housing;

(ii) the need for supportive housing for very low-income veteran families in the area to be served;

(iii) the extent to which the proposed size and unit mix of the housing will enable the applicant to manage and operate the housing efficiently and ensure that the provision of supportive services will be accomplished in an economical fashion;

(iv) the extent to which the proposed design of the housing will meet the service-connected disability needs of very low-income veteran families;

(v) the extent to which the applicant has demonstrated that the supportive services identified pursuant to subsection (f)(2)(B)(iii) will be provided on a consistent, long-term basis;

(vi) the extent to which the proposed design of the housing will accommodate the provision of supportive services that are expected to be needed, either initially or over the useful life of the housing, by the very low-income veterans the housing is intended to serve;

(vii) the extent to which the applicant has ensured that a service coordinator will be employed or otherwise retained for the housing, who has the managerial capacity and responsibility for carrying out the actions described in clauses (i) and (ii) of subsection (h)(2)(A); and

(viii) such other factors as the Secretary determines to be appropriate to ensure that funds made available under this section are used effectively;

(B) a preference in such selection for applications proposing housing to be reserved for occupancy by very low-income veteran families who are homeless (as such term is defined in section 103 of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11302)); and

(C) criteria appropriate to consider the need for supportive housing for very low-income veteran families in nonmetropolitan areas and by Indian tribes.

(2) DELEGATED PROCESSING.—

(A) DELEGATION TO STATE OR LOCAL HOUSING AUTHORITY.—In issuing a capital advance under this subsection for any project for which financing for the purposes described in subsection (b)(2) is provided by a combination of a capital advance under subsection (c)(2) and sources other than this section, within 30 days of award of the capital advance, the Secretary shall delegate review and processing of such projects to a State or local housing agency that—

(i) is in geographic proximity to the property;

(ii) has demonstrated experience in and capacity for underwriting multifamily housing loans that provide housing and supportive services;

(iii) may or may not be providing low-income housing tax credits in combination with the capital advance under this section; and

(iv) agrees to issue a firm commitment within 12 months of delegation.

(B) PROCESSING BY SECRETARY.—The Secretary shall retain the authority to process capital advances in cases in which no State or local housing agency has applied to provide delegated processing pursuant to this paragraph or no such agency has entered into an agreement with the Secretary to serve as a delegated processing agency.

(C) PROCESSING FEES.—An agency to which review and processing is delegated pursuant to subparagraph (A) may assess a reasonable fee which shall be included in the capital advance amounts and may recommend project rental assistance amounts in excess of those initially awarded by the Secretary. The Secretary shall develop a schedule for reasonable fees under this subparagraph to be paid to delegated processing agencies, which shall take into consideration any other fees to be paid to the agency for other funding provided to the project by the agency, including bonds, tax credits, and other gap funding.

(D) AUTHORITY RETAINED BY SECRETARY.—Under such delegated system, the Secretary shall retain the authority to approve rents and development costs and to execute a capital advance within 60 days of receipt of the commitment from the State or local agency. The Secretary shall provide to such agency and the project sponsor, in writing, the reasons for any reduction in capital advance amounts or project rental assistance and such reductions shall be subject to appeal.

(h) PROVISION OF SUPPORTIVE SERVICES TO VETERAN FAMILIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall coordinate with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to ensure that any housing assistance provided to veterans or veteran families includes a range of services tailored to the needs of the very low-income veteran families occupying such housing, which may include services for—

(A) outreach;

(B) health (including counseling, mental health, substance abuse, post-traumatic stress disorder, and traumatic brain injury) diagnosis and treatment;

(C) habilitation and rehabilitation;

(D) case management;

(E) daily living;

(F) personal financial planning;
(G) transportation;
(H) vocation;
(I) employment and training;
(J) education;
(K) assistance in obtaining veterans benefits and public benefits;
(L) assistance in obtaining income support;
(M) assistance in obtaining health insurance;
(N) fiduciary and representative payee;
(O) legal aid;
(P) child care;
(Q) housing counseling;
(R) service coordination; and
(S) other services necessary for maintaining independent living.

(2) LOCAL COORDINATION OF SERVICES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall coordinate with the Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs to ensure that owners of housing assisted under this section have the managerial capacity to—

(i) assess on an ongoing basis the service needs of residents;

(ii) coordinate the provision of supportive services and tailor such services to the individual needs of residents; and

(iii) seek on a continuous basis new sources of assistance to ensure the long-term provision of supportive services.

(B) CLASSIFICATION OF COSTS.—Any cost associated with this subsection relating to the coordination of services shall be an eligible cost under subsections (c)(3).

(i) DEVELOPMENT COST LIMITATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall periodically establish reasonable development cost limitations by market area for various types and sizes of supportive housing for very low-income veteran families by publishing a notice of the cost limitations in the Federal Register.

(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—The cost limitations established under paragraph (1) shall reflect—

(A) the cost of construction, reconstruction, or moderate or substantial rehabilitation of supportive housing for very low-income veteran families that meets applicable State and local housing and building codes;

(B) the cost of movables necessary to the basic operation of the housing, as determined by the Secretary;

(C) the cost of special design features necessary to make the housing accessible to very low-income veteran families;

(D) the cost of community space necessary to accommodate the provision of supportive services to veteran families;

(E) if the housing is newly constructed, the cost of meeting the energy efficiency standards promulgated by the Secretary in accordance with section 109 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 12709); and

(F) the cost of land, including necessary site improvement.

(3) USE OF DATA.—In establishing development cost limitations for a given market area under this subsection, the Secretary shall use data that reflect currently prevailing costs of construction, reconstruction, or moderate or substantial rehabilitation, and land acquisition in the area.

(4) COMMUNITY SPACE.—For purposes of paragraph (2), a community space shall include space for cafeterias or dining halls, community rooms or buildings, workshops, child care, adult day health facilities or other outpatient health facilities, or other essential service facilities.

(5) COMMERCIAL FACILITIES.—Neither this section nor any other provision of law may be construed as prohibiting or preventing the location and operation, in a project assisted under this section, of commercial facilities for the benefit of residents of the project and the community in which the project is located, except that assistance made available under this section may not be used to subsidize any such commercial facility.

(6) ACQUISITION.—In the case of existing housing and related facilities to be acquired, the cost limitations shall include—

(A) the cost of acquiring such housing;

(B) the cost of rehabilitation, alteration, conversion, or improvement, including the moderate or substantial rehabilitation thereof; and

(C) the cost of the land on which the housing and related facilities are located.

(7) ANNUAL ADJUSTMENTS.—The Secretary shall adjust the cost limitation not less than annually to reflect changes in the general level of construction, reconstruction, and moderate and substantial rehabilitation costs.

(8) INCENTIVES FOR SAVINGS.—

(A) SPECIAL HOUSING ACCOUNT.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall use the development cost limitations established under paragraph (1) or (6) to calculate the amount of financing to be made available to individual owners.

(ii) ACTUAL DEVELOPMENTAL COSTS LESS THAN FINANCING.—Owners which incur actual development costs that are less than the amount of financing shall be entitled to retain 50 percent of the savings in a special housing account.

(iii) BONUS FOR ENERGY EFFICIENCY.—The percentage established under clause (ii) shall be increased to 75 percent for owners which add energy efficiency features which—

(I) exceed the energy efficiency standards promulgated by the Secretary in accordance with section 109 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 12709);

(II) substantially reduce the life-cycle cost of the housing; and

(III) reduce gross rent requirements.

(B) USES.—The special housing account established under subparagraph (A) may be used—

(i) to provide services to residents of the housing or funds set aside for replacement reserves; or

(ii) for such other purposes as determined by the Secretary.

(9) DESIGN FLEXIBILITY.—The Secretary shall, to the extent practicable, give owners the flexibility to design housing appropriate to their location and proposed resident population within broadly defined parameters.

(10) USE OF FUNDS FROM OTHER SOURCES.—An owner shall be permitted voluntarily to provide funds from sources other than this section for amenities and other features of appropriate design and construction suitable for supportive housing under this section if the cost of such amenities is—

(A) not financed with the advance; and

(B) is not taken into account in determining the amount of Federal assistance or of the rent contribution of tenants.

(j) TENANT SELECTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An owner shall adopt written tenant selection procedures that are—

(A) satisfactory to the Secretary and which are—

(i) consistent with the purpose of improving housing opportunities for very low-income veteran families; and

(ii) reasonably related to program eligibility and an applicant's ability to perform the obligations of the lease; and

(B) compliant with subtitle C of title VI of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13601 et seq.) and any regulations issued under such subtitle.

(2) NOTIFICATION OF REJECTION.—Owners shall promptly notify in writing any rejected applicant of the grounds for any rejection.

(3) INFORMATION REGARDING HOUSING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide, to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Labor, information regarding the availability of the housing assisted under this section.

(B) SHARING OF INFORMATION WITH ADDITIONAL AGENCIES.—Within 30 days of receipt of the information, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of Labor shall provide such information to agencies in the area of the housing that receive assistance from the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Labor for providing medical care, housing, supportive services or employment and training services to homeless veterans.

(k) MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS.—

(1) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall make available appropriate technical assistance to ensure that prospective applicants are able to participate more fully in the program carried out under this section.

(2) CIVIL RIGHTS COMPLIANCE.—Each owner shall certify, to the satisfaction of the Secretary, that assistance made available under this section will be conducted and administered in conformity with title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000a et seq.), the Fair Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 3601 et seq.), and other Federal, State, and local laws prohibiting discrimination and promoting equal opportunity.

(3) OWNER DEPOSIT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall require an owner of housing, assisted under this section, to deposit an amount not to exceed $15,000 in a special escrow account to ensure the owner's commitment to the housing. Such amount shall be used only to cover operating deficits during the first three years of operations and shall not be used to cover construction shortfalls or inadequate initial project rental assistance amounts.

(B) REDUCTION OF REQUIREMENT.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may reduce or waive the owner deposit specified under subparagraph (A) for individual applicants if the Secretary finds that such waiver or reduction is necessary to achieve the purposes of this section and the applicant demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Secretary that it has the capacity to manage and maintain the housing in accordance with this section.

(ii) NONPROFITS.—The Secretary may reduce or waive the requirement of the owner deposit under subparagraph (A) in the case of a nonprofit applicant that is not affiliated with a national sponsor, as determined by the Secretary.

(4) NOTICE OF APPEAL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall notify an owner not less than 30 days prior to canceling any reservation of assistance provided under this section.

(B) APPEAL.—

(i) FILING DEADLINE.—During the 30-day period following the receipt of any notice required under subparagraph (A), an owner may appeal the proposed cancellation.

(ii) TIMING OF DECISION.—Any appeal undertaken under clause (i), including review by the Secretary, shall be completed not later than 45 days after the appeal is filed.

(5) LABOR.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall take such action as may be necessary to ensure that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors and subcontractors in the construction of housing with 12 or more units assisted under this section shall be paid wages at rates not less than the rates prevailing in the locality involved for the corresponding classes of laborers and mechanics

employed on construction of a similar character, as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with subchapter IV of chapter 31 of title 40, United States Code.

(B) EXEMPTION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to any individual who—

(i) performs services for which the individual volunteered;

(ii) does not receive compensation for such services or is paid expenses, reasonable benefits, or a nominal fee for such services; and

(iii) is not otherwise employed at any time in the construction work.

(6) ACCESS TO RESIDUAL RECEIPTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall authorize the owner of a housing project assisted under this section to use any residual receipts held for the project in excess of $500 per unit (or in excess of such other amount prescribed by the Secretary based on the needs of the project) for activities to retrofit and renovate the project as described under section 802(d)(3) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 8011(d)(3)) or to provide supportive services to residents of the project.

(B) REPORT.—Any owner that uses residual receipts under this paragraph shall submit to the Secretary a report, not less than annually, describing the uses of the residual receipts.

(C) DETERMINATION OF AMOUNT.—In determining the amount of project rental assistance to be provided to a project under subsection (c)(3) of this section, the Secretary may take into consideration the residual receipts held for the project only if, and to the extent that, excess residual receipts are not used under this paragraph.

(7) OCCUPANCY STANDARDS AND OBLIGATIONS.—Each owner shall operate housing assisted under this section in compliance with subtitle C of title VI of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13601 et seq.) and any regulations issued under such subtitle.

(8) USE OF PROJECT RESERVES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Amounts for project reserves for a project assisted under this section may be used for costs, subject to reasonable limitations as the Secretary determines appropriate, for reducing the number of dwelling units in the project.

(B) APPROVAL OF SECRETARY REQUIRED.—Any use described in subparagraph (A) of amounts for project reserves for a project assisted under this section shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary to ensure that such use is designed to retrofit units that are currently obsolete or unmarketable.

(9) REPAYMENT OF ASSISTANCE AND PREVENTION OF UNDUE BENEFITS.—

(A) REPAYMENT.—If a recipient, or a project sponsor receiving funds from the recipient, receives assistance under subsection (b) for use pursuant to paragraph (2) of such subsection for the construction, acquisition, or rehabilitation of supportive housing for very low-income veteran families and the project ceases to provide permanent housing, the Secretary shall require the recipient, or such project sponsor, to repay the following percentage of such assistance:

(i) In the case of a project that ceases to be used for such supportive housing before the expiration of the 10-year period beginning upon commencement of the operation of the project, 100 percent.

(ii) In the case of a project that ceases to be used for such supportive housing on or after the expiration of the 10-year period beginning upon commencement of the operation of the project, but before the expiration of the 15-year period beginning upon such commencement, 20 percent of the assistance for each of the years during such 15-year period for which the project fails to provide permanent housing.

(B) PREVENTION OF UNDUE BENEFITS.—Except as provided in paragraph (C), if any property is used for a project that receives assistance under subsection (b) for use pursuant to paragraph (2) of such subsection for the construction, acquisition or rehabilitation of supportive housing for very low-income veteran families, and the sale or other disposition of the property occurs before the expiration of the 15-year period beginning upon commencement of the operation of the project, the recipient (or the project sponsor receiving funds from the recipient) shall comply with such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe to prevent the recipient (or such project sponsor) from unduly benefitting from such sale or disposition.

(C) EXCEPTION.—A recipient, or a project sponsor receiving funds from the recipient, shall not be required to make repayments, and comply with the terms and conditions, required under subparagraph (A) or (B) if—

(i) the sale or disposition of the property used for the project results in the use of the property for the direct benefit of very-low income persons;

(ii) all of the proceeds of the sale or disposition are used to provide permanent housing for very-low income veteran families meeting the requirements of this section;

(iii) project-based rental assistance or operating cost assistance from any Federal program or an equivalent State or local program is no longer made available and the project is meeting applicable performance standards, provided that the portion of the project that had benefitted from such assistance continues to meet the tenant income and rent restrictions for low-income units under section 42(g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; or

(iv) there are no low-income veteran families in the geographic area of the property who meet the program criteria, in which case the project may serve non-veteran individuals and families having incomes described in subsection (l)(2) of this section.

(10) CONTINUED ELIGIBILITY OF VERY LOW-INCOME VETERAN FAMILIES.—A veteran family residing in supportive housing assisted under this section may not be considered to lose its status as such a family for purposes of eligibility for continued occupancy in such housing due to the death of any veteran member of the family, including the sole veteran member of the family.

(l) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions shall apply:

(1) CONSUMER COOPERATIVE.—The term ''consumer cooperative'' has the same meaning given such term for purposes of the supportive housing for the elderly program under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 (12 U.S.C. 1701q).

(2) VERY LOW-INCOME VETERAN FAMILY.—The term ''very low-income veteran family'' means a veteran family whose income does not exceed 50 percent of the median income for the area, as determined by the Secretary with adjustments for smaller and larger families, except that the Secretary may establish an income ceiling higher or lower than 50 percent of the median for the area on the basis of the Secretary's findings that such variations are necessary because of prevailing levels of construction costs or fair market rents (as determined under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f)), or unusually high or low family incomes.

(3) OWNER.—The term ''owner'' means a private nonprofit organization or consumer cooperative that receives assistance under this section to develop and operate supportive housing for very low-income veteran families.

(4) PRIVATE NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION.—The term ''private nonprofit organization'' means—

(A) any incorporated private institution or foundation—

(i) no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any member, founder, contributor, or individual;

(ii) which has a governing board that is responsible for the operation of the housing assisted under this section; and

(iii) which is approved by the Secretary as to financial responsibility;

(B) a for-profit limited partnership the sole or managing general partner of which is an organization meeting the requirements under clauses (i), (ii), and (iii) of subparagraph (A) or a corporation meeting the requirements of subparagraph (C);

(C) a corporation wholly owned and controlled by an organization meeting the requirements under clauses (i), (ii), and (iii) of subparagraph (A); and

(D) a tribally designated housing entity, as such term is defined in section 4 of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (25 U.S.C. 4103).

(5) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, except where specifically provided otherwise.

(6) STATE.—The term ''State'' includes the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the possessions of the United States.

(7) SUPPORTIVE HOUSING FOR VERY LOW-INCOME VETERAN FAMILIES.—The term ''supportive housing for very low-income veteran families'' means housing that is designed to accommodate the provision of supportive services that are expected to be needed, either initially or over the useful life of the housing, by the veteran families that the housing is intended to serve.

(8) VETERAN.—The term ''veteran'' has the meaning given the term in section 101 of title 38, United States Code.

(9) VETERAN FAMILY.—The term ''veteran family'' includes a veteran who is a single person, a family (including families with children) whose head of household (or whose spouse) is a veteran, and one or more veterans living together with 1 or more persons.

(m) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—Of any amounts made available for assistance under this section:

(1) PLANNING GRANTS.—Not more than 2.5 percent shall be available for planning grants in accordance with subsection (c)(1).

(2) CAPITAL ADVANCES.—Such sums as may be necessary shall be available for capital advances in accordance with subsection (c)(2).

(3) PROJECT RENTAL ASSISTANCE.—Such sums as may be necessary shall be available for project rental assistance in accordance with subsection (c)(3).

(4) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—Not more than 1 percent shall be available for technical assistance in accordance with subsection (k)(1).

(n) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR HOUSING ASSISTANCE.—There is authorized to be appropriated for assistance under this section $200,000,000 for fiscal year 2009 and such sums as may be necessary for each fiscal year thereafter.

SEC. 4. HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHERS FOR HOMELESS VETERANS.

Section 8(o)(19) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)) is amended to read as follows:

''(19) RENTAL VOUCHERS FOR HOMELESS VETERANS.—

''(A) ADDITIONAL VOUCHERS.—In addition to any amount made available for rental assistance under this subsection, the Secretary shall make available the amount specified in

subparagraph (B), for use only for providing rental assistance for homeless veterans in conjunction with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

''(B) AMOUNT.—The amount specified in this subparagraph is, for each fiscal year, the amount necessary to provide not fewer than 20,000 vouchers for rental assistance under this subsection.

''(C) CONTINUED ELIGIBILITY OF HOMELESS VETERAN FAMILIES.—If any veteran member of a household for which rental assistance is being provided under this paragraph, including the sole veteran member of the household, dies, such household may not be considered, due to such death, to lose its status as the household of a homeless veteran for purposes of—

''(i) eligibility for continued assistance under this paragraph; or

''(ii) continued occupancy in the dwelling unit in which such family is residing using such assistance at the time of such death.

''(D) FUNDING.—The budget authority made available under any other provisions of law for rental assistance under this subsection for fiscal year 2009 and each fiscal year thereafter is authorized to be increased in each such fiscal year by such sums as may be necessary to provide the number of vouchers specified in subparagraph (B) for such fiscal year.''.

SEC. 5. INCLUSION OF VETERANS IN HOUSING PLANNING.

(a) PUBLIC HOUSING AGENCY PLANS.—Section 5A(d)(1) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437c–1(d)(1)) is amended by striking ''and disabled families'' and inserting '', disabled families, and veterans (as such term is defined in section 101 of title 38, United States Code)''.

(b) COMPREHENSIVE HOUSING AFFORDABILITY STRATEGIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 105 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 12705) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)(1), by inserting ''veterans (as such term is defined in section 101 of title 38, United States Code),'' after ''acquired immunodeficiency syndrome,'';

(B) in subsection (b)(20), by striking ''and service'' and inserting ''veterans service, and other service''; and

(C) in subsection (e)(1), by inserting ''veterans (as such term is defined in section 101 of title 38, United States Code),'' after ''homeless persons,''.

(2) CONSOLIDATED PLANS.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall revise the regulations relating to submission of consolidated plans (part 91 of title 24, Code of Federal Regulations) in accordance with the amendments made by paragraph (1) of this subsection to require inclusion of appropriate information relating to veterans and veterans service agencies in all such plans.

SEC. 6. EXCLUSION OF VETERANS BENEFITS FROM ASSISTED HOUSING RENT CONSIDERATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for purposes of determining the amount of rent paid by a family for occupancy of a dwelling unit assisted under a federally assisted housing program under subsection (b) or in housing assisted under any other federally assisted housing program, the income and the adjusted income of the family shall not be considered to include any amounts received by any member of the family from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs as—

(1) compensation, as such term is defined in section 101(13) of title 38, United States Code; and

(2) dependency and indemnity compensation, as such term is defined in section 101(14) of such title.

(b) FEDERALLY ASSISTED HOUSING PROGRAM.—The federally assisted housing programs under this subsection are—

(1) the public housing program under the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437 et seq.);

(2) the tenant-based rental assistance program under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f), including the program under subsection (o)(19) of such section for housing rental vouchers for low-income veteran families;

(3) the project-based rental assistance program under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f);

(4) the program for housing opportunities for persons with AIDS under subtitle D of title VIII of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 12901 et seq.);

(5) the supportive housing for the elderly program under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 (12 U.S.C. 1701q);

(6) the supportive housing for persons with disabilities program under section 811 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 8013);

(7) the supportive housing for the homeless program under subtitle C of title IV of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11381 et seq.);

(8) the program for moderate rehabilitation of single room occupancy dwellings for occupancy by the homeless under section 441 of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11401);

(9) the shelter plus care for the homeless program under subtitle F of title IV of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11403 et seq.);

(10) the supportive housing for very low-income veteran families program under section 3 of this Act;

(11) the rental assistance payments program under section 521(a)(2)(A) of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1490a(a)(2)(A);

(12) the rental assistance program under section 236 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z–1);

(13) the rural housing programs under section 515 and 538 of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1485, 1490p–2);

(14) the HOME investment partnerships program under title II of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 12721 et seq.);

(15) the block grant programs for affordable housing for Native Americans and Native Hawaiians under titles I through IV and VIII of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (25 U.S.C. 4111 et seq., 4221 et seq.);

(16) any other program for housing assistance administered by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development or the Secretary of Agriculture under which eligibility for occupancy in the housing assisted or for housing assistance is based upon income;

(17) low-income housing credits allocated pursuant to section 42 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; and

(18) tax-exempt bonds issued for qualified residential rental projects pursuant to section 142(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

SEC. 7. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS FOR HOUSING ASSISTANCE FOR VETERANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall, to the extent amounts are made available in appropriation Acts for grants under this section, make grants to eligible entities under subsection (b) to provide to nonprofit organizations technical assistance appropriate to assist such organizations in—

(1) sponsoring housing projects for veterans assisted under programs administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development;

(2) fulfilling the planning and application processes and requirements necessary under such programs administered by the Department; and

(3) assisting veterans in obtaining housing or homeless assistance under programs administered by the Department.

(b) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—An eligible entity under this subsection is a nonprofit entity or organization having such expertise as the Secretary shall require in providing technical assistance to providers of services for veterans.

(c) SELECTION OF GRANT RECIPIENTS.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall establish criteria for selecting applicants for grants under this section to receive such grants and shall select applicants based upon such criteria.

(d) FUNDING.—Of any amounts made available in fiscal year 2009 or any fiscal year thereafter to the Department of Housing and Urban Development for salaries and expenses, $1,000,000 shall be available, and shall remain available until expended, for grants under this section.

SEC. 8. ANNUAL REPORT ON HOUSING ASSISTANCE TO VETERANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than December 31 each year, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall submit a report on the activities of the Department of Housing and Urban Development relating to veterans during such year to the following:

(1) The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

(2) The Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate.

(3) The Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

(4) The Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives.

(5) The Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(6) The Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(7) The Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

(b) CONTENTS.—Each report required under subsection (a) shall include the following information with respect to the year for which the report is submitted:

(1) The number of very low-income veteran families provided assistance under the program of supportive housing for very low-income veteran families under section 3, the socioeconomic characteristics of such families, the types of assistance provided such families, and the number, types, and locations of owners of housing assisted under such section.

(2) The number of homeless veterans provided assistance under the program of housing choice vouchers for homeless veterans under section 8(o)(19) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)(19)) (as amended by section 4), the socioeconomic characteristics of such homeless veterans, and the number, types, and locations of entities contracted under such section to administer the vouchers.

(3) A summary description of the special considerations made for veterans under public housing agency plans submitted pursuant to section 5A of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437c–1) and under comprehensive housing affordability strategies submitted pursuant to section 105 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 12705).

(4) A description of the technical assistance provided to organizations pursuant to grants under section 7.

(5) A description of the activities of the Special Assistant for Veterans Affairs.

(6) A description of the efforts of the Department of Housing and Urban Development

to coordinate the delivery of housing and services to veterans with other Federal departments and agencies, including the Department of Defense, Department of Justice, Department of Labor, Department of Health and Human Services, Department of Veterans Affairs, Interagency Council on Homelessness, and the Social Security Administration.

(7) The cost to the Department of Housing and Urban Development of administering the programs and activities relating to veterans.

(8) Any other information that the Secretary considers relevant in assessing the programs and activities of the Department of Housing and Urban Development relating to veterans.

(c) ASSESSMENT OF HOUSING NEEDS OF VERY LOW-INCOME VETERAN FAMILIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For the first report submitted pursuant to subsection (a) and every fifth report thereafter, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall—

(A) conduct an assessment of the housing needs of very low-income veteran families (as such term is defined in section 3); and

(B) shall include in each such report findings regarding such assessment.

(2) CONTENT.—Each assessment under this subsection shall include—

(A) conducting a survey of, and direct interviews with, a representative sample of very low-income veteran families (as such term is defined in section 3) to determine past and current—

(i) socioeconomic characteristics of such veteran families;

(ii) barriers to such veteran families obtaining safe, quality, and affordable housing;

(iii) levels of homelessness among such veteran families; and

(iv) levels and circumstances of, and barriers to, receipt by such veteran families of rental housing and homeownership assistance; and

(B) such other information that the Secretary determines, in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and national nongovernmental organizations concerned with veterans, homelessness, and very low-income housing, may be useful to the assessment.

(3) CONDUCT.—If the Secretary contracts with an entity other than the Department of Housing and Urban Development to conduct the assessment under this subsection, such entity shall be a nongovernmental organization determined by the Secretary to have appropriate expertise in quantitative and qualitative social science research.

(4) FUNDING.—Of any amounts made available pursuant to section 501 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1701z–1) for programs of research, studies, testing, or demonstration relating to the mission or programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development for any fiscal year in which an assessment under this subsection is required pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection, $1,000,000 shall be available until expended for costs of the assessment under this subsection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) and the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 403.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Representative CAPITO. She is an active member of the Financial Services Committee, and I thank her for managing today.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to thank Representative MICHAUD—also known as MICHAUD, depending on where you're from—for his outstanding work in helping with this bill. He is a cosponsor. I thank the ranking member, SPENCER BACHUS. Of course I thank the chairman of the Financial Services Committee, Mr. BARNEY FRANK. I also would like to thank the Housing Subcommittee Chair who has worked closely with me on this project, Representative MAXINE WATERS.

Mr. Speaker, the question may be posed in the mind of someone as to why we should pass the Homes for Heroes Act. I would like to answer this question. We need to pass this bill because, while many of us are sleeping in the sweets of life, too many of our veterans are sleeping in the streets of life. We need to pass it because, while many of us have homes and good jobs, too many of our veterans are homeless, with no jobs at all. We must pass this piece of legislation because America can't continue to be the home of the free and the land of the brave if too many of our brave veterans continue to be homeless.

Mr. Speaker, the statistics are shocking; they literally shock the conscience. Veterans are 9 percent of the population and more than 25 percent of the homeless. On any given night, 131,000 veterans are homeless, and 300,000 veterans will experience homelessness at some point in the course of 1 year. One-half of the veterans who are homeless suffer from mental illness, two-thirds suffer from alcohol or substance abuse. About 47 percent of homeless veterans are Vietnam veterans.

In Texas, there are about 16,000 homeless veterans. In my city of Houston, Texas, we have about 2,500 homeless veterans. Per the National Alliance to End Homelessness, 467,000 veterans spend more than 50 percent of their income on rent; 1.5 million veterans have incomes below the poverty line; and 643,000 veterans have incomes below 50 percent of the poverty line. Mr. Speaker, America needs to pass Homes for the Heroes because our veterans need homes.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 403 would establish a Special Assistant for Veteran Affairs within HUD. It would give this person the authority to coordinate services for homeless veterans. And this would be with the States, with local authorities, and with nonprofit organizations as well.

This bill establishes a $200 million assistance program in HUD for veterans for supportive housing and services for low-income veterans. It expands the very popular and very successful HUD Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing Program, authorizing 20,000 vouchers annually when funded. It authorizes $1 million in HUD grants to assist housing providers to help them provide the supportive services and the planning necessary to fulfill the needs of our veterans.

This bill would require HUD to submit an annual comprehensive report to Congress on homelessness among the veteran population. And this bill will do what is necessary as a great first step to ending homelessness among our veterans population. This bill is supported by 12 anti-homelessness and veterans organizations.

Mr. Speaker, if America is to continue to be the land of the free, America must provide homes for the brave.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague, Mr. GREEN, for his passion and his devotion to this bill, Homes for Heroes Act, as he has been shepherding this now for several Congresses. I appreciate his support, and I want to lend my support as well.

As we know, the Iraq and Afghanistan wars have placed new pressures on veterans services and housing. The Department of Veterans Affairs estimates that it has served approximately 916 returning veterans in its homeless programs and has identified over 2,900 more as being at risk of homelessness. The Congressional Research Service, in its report entitled ''Veterans and Homelessness,'' explains why both male and female veterans are overrepresented in the homeless population.

This country simply must do a better job of providing for our veterans. For this reason, I rise in strong support of H.R. 403, the Homes for Heroes Act of 2009.

As my colleague explained, this legislation will help to expand the supply of housing for very low-income veterans and increase the number of vouchers for homeless veterans. It establishes a Special Assistant for Veteran Affairs at the Department of Housing and Urban Development to ensure veterans receive proper access to HUD's housing assistance programs, coordinate all HUD programs and activities pertaining to veterans, and would act as a liaison between HUD and the Department of Veterans Affairs.

In an effort to expand the supply of veterans housing, the bill authorizes appropriations for housing assistance for very low-income and homeless veterans. A very low-income veteran family has an income not exceeding 50 percent of an area's median income. A $200 million authorization would provide capital advances and planning grants to private nonprofits and consumer cooperatives for the construction and rehabilitation of permanent supportive

housing for very low-income veterans. The $200 million authorization may also be used for project rental assistance.

□ 1245

The bill also authorizes appropriations necessary to provide 20,000 additional housing choice vouchers for homeless veterans for fiscal year 2009 and each year thereafter.

Other provisions in the bill include the exclusion of veterans benefits amounts from rental subsidy calculations for all federally funded housing programs and an authorization of $1 million in technical assistance grants to nonprofits who provide veterans housing or provide assistance to veterans seeking housing.

All in all this bill, I believe, will help to address an area or an issue of homelessness in our veterans population, one that we must not allow to continue. H.R. 403 is similar to H.R. 3329, which passed the House in the 110th Congress by a vote of 412–9.

I urge my colleagues' support.

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentlelady for her generous comments and her appeal to colleagues to support this important piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the RECORD a letter that has been signed by 16 organizations that are supporting this piece of legislation.

JUNE 12, 2009.

Hon. AL GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE GREEN: We are writing to express our overwhelming support for H.R. 403, the Homes for Heroes Act of 2009, legislation that would provide housing assistance for very low-income veterans. We urge the House of Representatives to pass this bill on Tuesday, June 16, 2009.

The Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) officials recently reported on any given night, 131,000 veterans are homeless. Veterans are at a greater risk of becoming homeless due to health problems (post traumatic stress disorder, substance abuse issues, mental health disorders), economic issues (extremely low or no livable income), and a shortage of affordable housing.

While most currently homeless veterans served during prior conflicts or in peacetime, the newest generation of combat veterans of Operation Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom (OEF–OIF), both men and women, are returning home and suffering from war related conditions that may put them at risk for homelessness. A growing trend in homelessness among these new veterans points to a need to develop a coordinated approach to reduce and ultimately eliminate homelessness among all veterans.

Your bill, H.R. 403, the ''Homes for Heroes Act of 2009,'' will provide shelter for homeless veteran families and help prevent low-income families from falling into homelessness. The undersigned organizations are pleased the following legislative actions are contained in this bill:

1. Establish the position of Special Assistant for Veterans Affairs within the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).
2. Establish permanent supportive housing and services for very low-income veterans and their families through a $200 million assistance program.
3. Authorize HUD to provide housing assistance to private nonprofit organizations and consumer cooperatives to expand the supply of permanent affordable housing.
4. Require HUD to coordinate with the VA to provide supportive services tailored to the needs of the very low-income veteran families occupying supportive housing.
5. Expand the highly successful HUD–VA Supportive Housing (HUD–VASH) Program, authorizing 20,000 vouchers annually and making the program permanent.
6. Place additional priority on veterans and require all local public housing agencies to develop plans to address the needs of homeless veterans.
7. Authorize $1 million in HUD grants to assist housing and service providers to execute their housing projects for very low-income veteran families.
8. Require HUD to submit a comprehensive annual report to Congress on the housing needs of homeless veterans.

To meet the current and future needs of our Nation's most vulnerable veterans, we ask the House of Representatives to pass H.R. 403, the Homes for Heroes Act of 2009. Supporting this historic veteran homelessness prevention initiative will be a giant step forward towards ending veteran homelessness in America.

Corporation for Supportive Housing
Goodwill Industries International
Local Initiatives Support Corporation
Military Officers Association of America
National Alliance to End Homelessness
National Association for Black Veterans
National Coalition for Homeless Veterans
National Coalition for the Homeless
National Law Center on Homelessness & Poverty
National Leased Housing Association
National Low Income Housing Coalition
National Policy and Advocacy Council on Homelessness
Vietnam Veterans of America
American Association of Homes and Services for the Aging
Services For the Aging
National Association of Affordable Housing Lenders
National Equity Fund

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

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to now yield 2 minutes to Ms. BROWN-Waite from Florida, an advocate for veterans all across the board and certainly housing for our veterans.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 403, the Homes For Heroes Act of 2009.

For our Nation's veterans, the fight does not end when they return from battle. Readjusting to civilian life and coping with the physical and psychological effects of war can be a daunting task. Current reports estimate that about 154,000 veterans are homeless on any given night. This statistic is a tragedy. However, Congress is now taking a step in the right direction.

The Homes For Heroes Act creates a Special Assistant for Veterans Affairs within HUD, provides at least 20,000 low-income veterans with rental vouchers, and aids veterans in applying for and obtaining assistance. Additionally, I'm proud that this bill includes help for veterans with mental health disorders and assists low-income veterans and their families with personal and financial planning, obtaining veterans benefits, and vocational training.

As a former member of the Committee on Veterans Affairs, I am aware of the many unique issues that our veterans face. The Homes For Heroes Act will supply our veterans with the tools that they need to reintegrate into society, and I thank Representative Green for introducing this bill.

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I close by urging my colleagues to support this piece of legislation and to please consider the fact that our veterans have been there for us; this is an opportunity for us to be there for them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 403, which will increase support for our veterans by providing them with housing benefits. I thank my colleague Representative AL GREEN for introducing this important legislation, as well as the many cosponsors for their support. I thank Arthur D. Sidney for his assistance on this matter.

I stand in support of this legislation because it assists those men and women who have sacrificed so much for this country. This bill will establish a Special Assistant for Veterans Affairs within the Department of Housing and Urban Development. In doing so, the office will ensure that veterans and their families that are most in need will receive housing benefits and get them off the streets. The office will build upon the existing infrastructure already in place among public and private institutions by granting housing vouchers, providing public housing, and coordinating efforts across HUD programs and activities.

Nearly a quarter of the homeless population in the United States is comprised of veterans and their families. The National Survey of Homeless Assistance Providers and clients found that 18% of homeless male veterans participating in homeless assistance programs reported that their latest episode of homelessness lasted 3 months or less, compared to 28% of their male nonveteran counterparts. This disproportionate burden on the men and women that have served in the Armed Forces is a grave injustice. We must continue working to increase support for our veterans in recognition of their ultimate sacrifice—risking their lives to serve this great country. Please join me in supporting our veterans by voting for this legislation.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 403, the Homes for Heroes Act of 2009. I am proud to be a cosponsor and would like to recognize the leadership of Representative AL GREEN who introduced this very important bill last Congress, which passed the House Floor. This bill upholds the principle that those who served our Nation honorably should not have to live on the streets or in shelters.

According to the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, approximately 150,000 to 200,000 American veterans are living on the

streets or in shelters. And nearly 300,000 veterans may experience homelessness at some point during the course of a year.

The Housing and Community Opportunity Subcommittee, which I chair, held a hearing on this bill during the 110th Congress and heard from witnesses how the return of veterans from Iraq and Afghanistan would greatly increase demand for affordable housing and social services in communities across the country.

Since then, the economy has only worsened and the number of veterans returning home from Iraq and Afghanistan continues to increase. Furthermore, many veterans are at greater risk of becoming homeless because they struggle with health and economic issues, while facing a shortage of affordable housing.

That is why H.R. 403 is so important. This bill would create a new program where none existed before to develop permanent supportive housing for the homeless veterans who need it. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 403.

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

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

AWARDING A CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO THE WOMEN AIRFORCE SERVICE PILOTS

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 614) to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the Women Airforce Service Pilots (''WASP'').

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The text of the Senate bill is as follows:

S. 614

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

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) the Women Airforce Service Pilots of WWII, known as the ''WASP'', were the first women in history to fly American military aircraft;

(2) more than 60 years ago, they flew fighter, bomber, transport, and training aircraft in defense of America's freedom;

(3) they faced overwhelming cultural and gender bias against women in nontraditional roles and overcame multiple injustices and inequities in order to serve their country;

(4) through their actions, the WASP eventually were the catalyst for revolutionary reform in the integration of women pilots into the Armed Services;

(5) during the early months of World War II, there was a severe shortage of combat pilots;

(6) Jacqueline Cochran, America's leading woman pilot of the time, convinced General Hap Arnold, Chief of the Army Air Forces, that women, if given the same training as men, would be equally capable of flying military aircraft and could then take over some of the stateside military flying jobs, thereby releasing hundreds of male pilots for combat duty;

(7) the severe loss of male combat pilots made the necessity of utilizing women pilots to help in the war effort clear to General Arnold, and a women's pilot training program was soon approved;

(8) it was not until August 1943, that the women aviators would receive their official name;

(9) General Arnold ordered that all women pilots flying military aircraft, including 28 civilian women ferry pilots, would be named ''WASP'', Women Airforce Service Pilots;

(10) more than 25,000 American women applied for training, but only 1,830 were accepted and took the oath;

(11) exactly 1,074 of those trainees successfully completed the 21 to 27 weeks of Army Air Forces flight training, graduated, and received their Army Air Forces orders to report to their assigned air base;

(12) on November 16, 1942, the first class of 29 women pilots reported to the Houston, Texas Municipal Airport and began the same military flight training as the male Army Air Forces cadets were taking;

(13) due to a lack of adequate facilities at the airport, 3 months later the training program was moved to Avenger Field in Sweetwater, Texas;

(14) WASP were eventually stationed at 120 Army air bases all across America;

(15) they flew more than 60,000,000 miles for their country in every type of aircraft and on every type of assignment flown by the male Army Air Forces pilots, except combat;

(16) WASP assignments included test piloting, instructor piloting, towing targets for air-to-air gunnery practice, ground-to-air anti-aircraft practice, ferrying, transporting personnel and cargo (including parts for the atomic bomb), simulated strafing, smoke laying, night tracking, and flying drones;

(17) in October 1943, male pilots were refusing to fly the B–26 Martin Marauder (known as the ''Widowmaker'') because of its fatality records, and General Arnold ordered WASP Director, Jacqueline Cochran, to select 25 WASP to be trained to fly the B–26 to prove to the male pilots that it was safe to fly;

(18) during the existence of the WASP—

(A) 38 women lost their lives while serving their country;

(B) their bodies were sent home in poorly crafted pine boxes;

(C) their burial was at the expense of their families or classmates;

(D) there were no gold stars allowed in their parents' windows; and

(E) because they were not considered military, no American flags were allowed on their coffins;

(19) in 1944, General Arnold made a personal request to Congress to militarize the WASP, and it was denied;

(20) on December 7, 1944, in a speech to the last graduating class of WASP, General Arnold said, ''You and more than 900 of your sisters have shown you can fly wingtip to wingtip with your brothers. I salute you . . . We of the Army Air Force are proud of you. We will never forget our debt to you.'';

(21) with victory in WWII almost certain, on December 20, 1944, the WASP were quietly and unceremoniously disbanded;

(22) there were no honors, no benefits, and very few ''thank you's'';

(23) just as they had paid their own way to enter training, they had to pay their own way back home after their honorable service to the military;

(24) the WASP military records were immediately sealed, stamped ''classified'' or ''secret'', and filed away in Government archives, unavailable to the historians who wrote the history of WWII or the scholars who compiled the history text books used today, with many of the records not declassified until the 1980s;

(25) consequently, the WASP story is a missing chapter in the history of the Air Force, the history of aviation, and the history of the United States of America;

(26) in 1977, 33 years after the WASP were disbanded, the Congress finally voted to give the WASP the veteran status they had earned, but these heroic pilots were not invited to the signing ceremony at the White House, and it was not until 7 years later that their medals were delivered in the mail in plain brown envelopes;

(27) in the late 1970s, more than 30 years after the WASP flew in World War II, women were finally permitted to attend military pilot training in the United States Armed Forces;

(28) thousands of women aviators flying support aircraft have benefitted from the service of the WASP and followed in their footsteps;

(29) in 1993, the WASP were once again referenced during congressional hearings regarding the contributions that women could make to the military, which eventually led to women being able to fly military fighter, bomber, and attack aircraft in combat;

(30) hundreds of United States servicewomen combat pilots have seized the opportunity to fly fighter aircraft in recent conflicts, all thanks to the pioneering steps taken by the WASP;

(31) the WASP have maintained a tight-knit community, forged by the common experiences of serving their country during war;

(32) as part of their desire to educate America on the WASP history, WASP have assisted ''Wings Across America'', an organization dedicated to educating the American public, with much effort aimed at children, about the remarkable accomplishments of these WWII veterans; and

(33) the WASP have been honored with exhibits at numerous museums, to include—

(A) the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC;

(B) the Women in Military Service to America Memorial at Arlington National Cemetery, Arlington, Virginia;

(C) the National Museum of the United States Air Force, Wright Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio;

(D) the National WASP WWII Museum, Sweetwater, Texas;

(E) the 8th Air Force Museum, Savannah, Georgia;

(F) the Lone Star Flight Museum, Galveston, Texas;

(G) the American Airpower Museum, Farmingdale, New York;

(H) the Pima Air Museum, Tucson, Arizona;

(I) the Seattle Museum of Flight, Seattle, Washington;

(J) the March Air Museum, March Reserve Air Base, California; and

(K) the Texas State History Museum, Austin, Texas.

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL.

(a) AWARD AUTHORIZED.—The President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of

the House of Representatives shall make appropriate arrangements for the award, on behalf of the Congress, of a single gold medal of appropriate design in honor of the Women Airforce Service Pilots (WASP) collectively, in recognition of their pioneering military service and exemplary record, which forged revolutionary reform in the Armed Forces of the United States of America.

(b) DESIGN AND STRIKING.—For the purposes of the award referred to in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Treasury shall strike the gold medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions, to be determined by the Secretary.

(c) SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Following the award of the gold medal in honor of the Women Airforce Service Pilots, the gold medal shall be given to the Smithsonian Institution, where it will be displayed as appropriate and made available for research.

(2) SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that the Smithsonian Institution shall make the gold medal received under this Act available for display elsewhere, particularly at other locations associated with the WASP.

SEC. 3. DUPLICATE MEDALS.

Under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, the Secretary may strike and sell duplicates in bronze of the gold medal struck under this Act, at a price sufficient to cover the costs of the medals, including labor, materials, dyes, use of machinery, and overhead expenses.

SEC. 4. NATIONAL MEDALS.

Medals struck pursuant to this Act are national medals for purposes of chapter 51 of title 31, United States Code.

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS; PROCEEDS OF SALE.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be charged against the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund, an amount not to exceed $30,000 to pay for the cost of the medal authorized under section 2.

(b) PROCEEDS OF SALE.—Amounts received from the sale of duplicate bronze medals under section 3 shall be deposited in the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and to insert extraneous material thereon.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge and compliment the Member from Florida, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and commend her on what she has done to get this piece of legislation to the floor. She has worked with Senator KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON, who has had this piece of legislation pass the Senate. She had 75 cosponsors; hence, the legislation is now before us in the House.

Mr. Speaker, there should be a compendium of knowledge, if you will, styled ''The Greatest Stories Never Told.'' Perhaps therein would be the story of the Buffalo Soldiers, a story rarely told of how they had to fight their way into the military so they could fight for their country. Perhaps contained therein there would be the story of the Filipino soldiers who died in the struggle at the Bataan March.

Such a collection would not be complete, however, without the story of the WASP. These are the first women to fly military aircraft. They are the women in the Air Force, the Women Airforce Service Pilots known as the WASP. It's a story of gender bias, Mr. Speaker, the notion that flying is a man's work. It's a story of culture bias, the belief that a woman's place is in the home. It's a story of injustice, the notion that women could apply but never qualify. It's a story of inequalities and inequities, the notion that women could have rank but not always have their rank respected. Mr. Speaker, it's a story of never say never, a story of persistence pays off, a story of success because of some, and a story of success in spite of others.

It's a story of how a famous pilot, Jacqueline ''Jackie'' Cochran, became the first commander of the WFO in 1942. That's the Women's Flying Training Detachment. It's a story of how a test pilot, Nancy Love, became the commander of the WAF, the Women's Auxiliary Flying Ferrying Squadron in 1942. It's a story of how the WFO and the WAF merged in 1943 to become the WASP.

The WASP would go on and fly 60 million miles. They would fly every type of aircraft. They would be stationed at 120 bases across the country. And on December 20, 1944, when victory was at hand, the WASP were quietly and unceremoniously disbanded. Thirty-eight lost their lives in the course of serving their country; however, families and friends had to pay for their burial expenses. Survivors had to pay their way back home because they were not considered a part of the military in an official capacity. Many of their records were sealed and unavailable to historians until the 1980s. They didn't get veteran status until 1977, and this was done without a White House ceremony, and it was done without the kind of fanfare that we would expect them to receive in this day and time.

The story, Mr. Speaker, is one of few being honored, and their honors being accorded them too late, and not enough thank yous having been accorded them at all. The story of the WASP is one that is, in my opinion, the greatest story never told and one which we should acknowledge with this bill when it is passed today.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the House sponsor of this legislation, I rise in strong support of Senate bill 614, a bill to award the Congressional Gold Medal to the Women Airforce Service Pilots of World War II, WASP. And here is a picture, Mr. Speaker, of the WASP, one of the many pictures, but as the previous speaker pointed out, not enough recognition was paid to them.

Special thanks for this bill go to Financial Service Chairman BARNEY FRANK and Ranking Member SPENCER BACHUS and their staff as well for their assistance in bringing this legislation to the floor today.

I would also like to thank my staff, Mr. Speaker, particularly Captain Deanna Nieves, right behind me, United States Marine Corps, who's serving as a defense fellow in my office for the remainder of the year. Her efforts were instrumental in achieving the required number of cosponsors for this bill in record time. And Sarah Gamino, sitting next to her, worked so hard on all of our office projects. Thanks to all of the great staff work on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, as has been pointed out, the bill before us today honors a special sisterhood of women, most of them in their 80s, who share a unique place in American history. These women have been mothers and grandmothers, teachers and office workers, nurses, business owners, photographers, and dancers. One was even a nun. But before that they were pilots for the United States Army Corps during World War II. They are heroines.

Women Airforce Service Pilots, or WASP, were the first women in history to fly America's military aircraft. Between the years of 1942 and 1944, these courageous women volunteered to fly noncombat missions so that every available male pilot could be deployed into combat. More than 25,000 women applied for the program, but only 1,830 qualified women pilots were accepted. Unlike their male counterparts, women applicants were required to be qualified pilots before they could even apply for the Army Air Force military flight training program. Altogether, 1,102 women earned their wings and went on to fly over 60 million miles for the Army Air Forces, equal to some 2,500 times around the globe. Their performance was equal in every way to that of male pilots. With the exception of direct combat missions, the WASP flew the same aircraft and the same missions as male pilots.

Women pilots were used to tow targets for male pilots who were using live ammunition, for searchlight missions, chemical missions, engineering test flying, and countless other exercises.

In 1944 the WASP were disbanded, their service records sealed and classified. By the time the war ended, Mr. Speaker, 38 women pilots had lost their lives while flying for our country. Their families were not allowed to have an American flag placed on their coffins. And although they took the military oath and were promised military status, the WASP never were recognized as military personnel nor were

they ever recognized as veterans at the war's end.

In 1977, more than 30 years after the WASP had served, another woman pioneer, Congresswoman Lindy Boggs, introduced legislation to grant the WASP veterans status. Speaking of the day when women would be fully integrated into the military, WASP Byrd Howell Granger noted: ''If the Nation ever again needs them, American women will respond. Never again will they have to prove they can do any flying job the military has. Not as an experiment. Not to fill in for men. They will fly as commissioned officers in the future Air Force of the United States with equal pay, hospitalization, insurance, veterans' benefits. The WASP have earned it for these women of the future.''

And the WASP were indeed and continue to be true pioneers whose example paved the way for the Armed Forces to lift the ban on women attending military flight training in the 1970s. Today women in the military fly every type of aircraft, from the F–15 to the space shuttle.

My daughter-in-law, Lindsay Nelson, a Marine Corps pilot, is part of the lasting legacy of WASP. Lindsay, a graduate of the United States Naval Academy, served two combat tours in Iraq and Afghanistan, where she flew the F/A–18 fighter jet. I'm so proud of Lindsay and of all our servicewomen, past and present, who continue to inspire young women to achieve the unfathomable.

By definition, the Congressional Gold Medal is the highest expression of Congress of national appreciation for the most heroic, courageous, and outstanding individuals.

□ 1300

Given the overwhelming support for this legislation, as evidenced by the bipartisan support of 334 cosponsors in the House companion legislation, I am confident that Members of this Chamber deem the WASP as deserving of this honor. Of the 1,102 WASP, more than 300 are still alive today and are residing in almost every State of our country. Join me in paying homage to these trailblazers and these patriots who served our country without question and with no expectation of recognition or praise.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting yes on this bill, to award the WASP the Congressional Gold Medal, and request its prompt signing into law.

For history's sake, I will submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the names of the 1,102 WASP.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to thank the gentlelady for the outstanding work that she has done on this piece of legislation. She has worked tirelessly to bring it to the floor; and I compliment the gentlelady, along with Senator KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON, for the outstanding job that she has done as well. I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) whose district covers Sweetwater, Texas, which is home to the WASP. This is where they trained, and that is where their museum is.

Mr. CONAWAY. It is my great pleasure today to recognize the invaluable service rendered to our country by the Women's Air Force Service Pilots during World War II. Their history is one of many surprising and impressive stories that helped define a generation.

In the early 1940s, as it became apparent that the United States could not avoid the war that was plaguing Europe and the Far East, many accomplished pilots volunteered their services to our country. They were thanked for their offer, but were refused because they were women. Their argument, that female pilots could free up male pilots to serve in combat roles, was initially dismissed by the Army Air Force's leadership. Yet two of our Nation's most famous female pilots, Jacqueline Cochran and Nancy Harken Love, persevered and continued to lobby for the ability to use their exceptional skills in service of our country.

As the Nation mobilized, it became clear there were simply not enough male pilots in the country to fight the war and man the home front. As the iconic Rosie the Riveter began to build her tanks and her planes, the Army set up two squadrons of women pilots to assist in the war effort. In 1942 Ms. Love became the commanding officer of Women's Auxiliary Ferry Squadron in New Castle, Delaware, which ferried planes around the country from factories to air bases. Not long after that, Ms. Cochran became commanding officer of 319th Women's Flying Training Detachment in Houston, Texas, which provided basic flight instruction for the Army Air Forces. On August 5, 1943, these squadrons were combined to form the Women's Air Force Service Pilots. Over 25,000 women applied to become pilots, and only some 1,900 were selected for training. Of these, almost 1,100 eventually earned their wings, many at Avenger Field in the town of Sweetwater, Texas. That is in the district that I get to represent.

The women who volunteered to fly planes faced a world that we can scarcely imagine. While complaints of sexism in the workplace still exist today, in the 1940s, sexism was not the exception but the standard operating practice. The women of the WASP were paid less, were trained with inferior equipment, refused the status of officers, and faced an openly hostile work environment. They also had to buy their own uniforms and pay for their room and board each month at their training facilities. Yet through all of that, the WASP pilots were stationed at over 120 air bases across the United States, flying every type of aircraft and performing almost every duty of pilots in the Army Air Forces. They logged 60 million miles, ferrying planes, transporting cargo and personnel, towing targets, instructing new cadets, and acting as test pilots.

Of the almost 1,100 women who flew as the WASP, 38 gave their lives. In what remains a blot on our country, these women were returned home not with military honors but at the expense of their families because, although they flew military planes at the direction of military commanders, they were not considered to be members of the Army.

In October 1944, the program ended abruptly, and many of the records surrounding the program were filed away and classified in government archives. It was not until the Air Force announced that it would train the military's ''first'' female pilots in the 1970s that a renewed interest in the WASP allowed them to be granted veteran status and the campaign ribbons which they earned through their service.

While it might be tempting to see today's Congressional Gold Medal as a way to right the injuries done to the women of WASP, to do so would be to neglect the true significance of their contributions to winning a war and advancing women's equality. The legacy of the WASP is unmistakable. At a time when women were routinely assumed to be less capable than men, these individuals stood up and asked for the right to prove themselves. These women did not just answer the call of their country, they called themselves to service. And in doing so, forever upended the notion of what women could and should do in our Armed Forces.

I would like to commend the leadership and the board of the National WASP World War II Museum in Sweetwater, Texas, for preserving the unique history of these women and preparing educational materials to share their story with countless students throughout the country.

I would recommend to the leadership, the Speaker and to my colleagues to swing by Sweetwater, Texas—it's on I–20, an easy drive from Fort Worth or El Paso, 300 miles in either direction—to see this museum and get a flavor for what these women endured during training. It was a very austere training base in a pretty rough part of Texas, and you would be impressed with what they did and what they accomplished.

Additionally, I would like to thank Air Force Major Nicole Malachowski who worked tirelessly to secure this tribute for the service of these women. Major Malachowski was a Thunderbird pilot.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I would like to grant an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CONAWAY. The Thunderbirds, of course, are the elite performance team for the Air Force; and Nicole was a member of that team in the early nineties. As a female test pilot, no one understands WASP's legacy better than her. As she explained in her letter to me, ''I am convinced that every opportunity I've been afforded, from flying combat patrols over Iraq to representing the military as a fellow, is because of these pioneering WASP. Countless servicemen during World War II, and every airman since, have reaped the benefits of their courage, determination, and sacrifice.''

It is with great enthusiasm that I ask my colleagues for their support on Senate bill 614 and that we recognize the contribution of these women for their service with our highest congressional award.

I thank you for the time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume for a very brief closing.

Mr. Speaker, the story of the WASP is, without question, among the stories that are rarely, if ever, told. In fact, I have contended and continue to contend it's among the greatest stories never told. But for this reason, we should accord this Congressional Gold Medal. I beg all of my friends to support it if a vote is called for. I shall not call for one.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 614.

This legislation awards a Congressional Gold Medal to the Women Airforce Service Pilots (WASP) in honor of their dedicated service during World War II.

I am a cosponsor of the House version of this bill (H.R. 2014), which recognizes the first women in the history of our country to fly American military aircraft. The Women Airforce Service Pilots volunteered to fly over 60 million miles in every type of aircraft available to them, participating in all missions other than direct combat missions. They towed targets for air-to-air and ground-to-air gunnery practice, ferried planes, transported cargo and personnel, instructed, flew weather missions, and test flew repaired aircraft. They even flew aircraft that male pilots refused to fly.

In spite of their service, the Women Airforce Service Pilots were not given active duty military status and never received any kind of commissioning, rank, or military benefits. In November 1977, Congress narrowly approved legislation to give the WASP the veteran status that they had earned, but they were not invited to the bill signing and received their medals in the mail.

Today we recognize the 1,102 women who trained to serve as Women Airforce Service Pilots, 300 of whom are still living today, including three from my home State of Hawaii: Betty Joiner, Elaine Jones, and Mildred Marshall.

As a result of the heroism exemplified by the Women Airforce Service Pilots, the U.S. Armed Forces lifted the ban on women attending military flight training in the 1970s, and women now fly on every type of aircraft imaginable, from combat fighter aircraft to space shuttles. This legislation at long last commemorates their service to our country.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support S. 614, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the Women Airforce Service Pilots, and to honor all the Women Airforce Service Pilots, or WASP, especially three who live in Lancaster, California in my district. Flora Belle Reece, Irma ''Babe'' Story, and Marguerite ''Ty'' Killen are perfect examples of why this intrepid group of women deserve the honor they are receiving today.

I was privileged to join the Mojave Chamber of Commerce in honoring these three women at a special May 11th luncheon. It was a pleasure to recognize these three amazing pilots who dedicated themselves to a dangerous mission when their country needed them.

Flora Belle Reece learned to fly before she could drive so she could join the WASP. Reece primarily flew the AT–6, but also the PT–19, PT–17, BT–13, and B–26, and she often tested aircraft that had been repaired. She was assigned to Foster Field, Texas, and there she discovered an affinity for the P–38 Lightning, often visiting with the aircraft's crew chief; she was able to fly in one in 2004 during a commemorative flight.

Irma ''Babe'' Story grew up in the Antelope Valley with her brother, Tom, hanging out at the local airport running errands, and eventually learning to fly at Antelope Valley College. Story received her pilot's license at the age of 19 in June 1941, and worked at Lockheed's Vega aircraft factory in Burbank until joining the WASP program in 1943. She flew the AT–6 and Cessna UC–78, and later the B–26.

Marguerite ''Ty'' Killen learned to fly as a 15-year-old in high school and received her commercial and flight instructor ratings when she was 19. Killen was a student at the University of Arizona when she found out that the WASP age requirement was dropped to 19, and so she signed up for WASP training and graduated in August 1944. She flew a variety of aircraft, including the Stearman PT–17, AT–6 advanced trainer, Beechcraft AT–11, the Vultee BT–13, and was a copilot in a B–24.

These women, and all those who stepped up to serve when their country needed them, are deserving of our thanks and admiration. I am pleased to support this legislation to recognize their efforts with a Congressional Gold Medal.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 614, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the Women Airforce Service Pilots of World War II.

As an original cosponsor of a similar measure in the House, I would like to give special recognition to Betty Cozzens, one of my constituents from Cody—and one of the 300 remaining Women Airforce Service Pilots.

We all owe these heroic women a debt of gratitude. In the 16 months that the Women Airforce Service Pilots existed, over 1,000 of them served their country with pride.

The Congressional Gold Medal is one of the most distinguished forms of recognition that Congress can bestow. It is an expression of public gratitude on behalf of the nation—to these women, for their service in a time of need.

The Women Airforce Service Pilots forged reform in the U.S. Armed Forces in regard to women in service, flying on every type of assignment flown by the male Army Air Forces pilots, except combat. I would like to express my gratitude to Betty and her fellow pilots for their trailblazing service, being the first women in history to fly American military aircraft.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 614.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF NATIONAL EYE INSTITUTE

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 366) recognizing the 40th anniversary of the National Eye Institute (NEI) and expressing support for designation of 2010 through 2020 as the ''Decade of Vision''.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 366

Whereas vision impairment and eye disease is a major public health problem, especially due to the aging of the population, a disproportionate incidence of eye disease in minority populations, and vision loss as a result of diabetes and other chronic diseases, which costs the Nation $68,000,000,000 annually in health care costs, lost productivity, reduced independence, diminished quality of life, increased depression, and accelerated mortality;

Whereas 38,000,000 people in the United States age 40-plus currently experience blindness, low-vision, or an age-related eye disease, and this number is expected to grow to 50,000,000 by 2020, a year mid-way in the tidal wave of 78,000,000 baby boomers who will begin turning age 65 in 2010, and many of whom will continue working well beyond age 65;

Whereas, in public opinion polls over the past 40 years, people in the United States have consistently identified fear of vision loss as second only to fear of cancer and, as recently as a 2008 NEI study, 71 percent of respondents indicated that a loss of their eyesight would have the greatest impact on their life;

Whereas, with wisdom and foresight, Congress passed the National Eye Institute (NEI) Act (Public Law 90–489), which was signed into law by President Johnson on August 16, 1968, with the NEI holding the first meeting of its National Advisory Eye Council (NAEC) on April 3, 1969;

Whereas the NEI leads the Nation's Federal commitment to basic and clinical research, research training, and other programs with respect to blinding eye diseases, visual disorders, mechanisms of visual function, preservation of sight and the special health problems and needs of individuals who are visually-impaired or blind, and to disseminate information aimed at the prevention of blindness, specifically with public and professional education facilitated through its National Eye Health Education Program (NEHEP);

Whereas the NEI maximizes Federal funding by devoting 85 percent of its budget to

extramural research that addresses the breadth of eye and vision disorders, including ''back of the eye'' retinal and optic nerve disease, such as age-related macular degeneration (AMD), glaucoma, and diabetic retinopathy, and concomitant low vision, and ''front of the eye'' disease, including corneal, lens, cataract, and refractive errors;

Whereas the NEI research benefits children, including premature infants born with retinopathy and school children with amblyopia (''lazy eye'');

Whereas the NEI benefits older citizens in the United States by predicting, preventing, and preempting aging eye disease, thereby enabling more productive lives and reducing Medicare costs;

Whereas the NEI has been a leader in basic research, working with the NIH's Human Genome Project to translate discoveries of genes related to eye disease and vision impairment, which comprises one quarter of genes discovered to date, into diagnostic and treatment modalities;

Whereas the NEI has been a leader in clinical research, funding more than 60 clinical trials, including a series of Diabetic Retinopathy Clinical Trials Networks, in association with the National Institute for Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Disorders (NIDDK), which have developed treatment strategies that have been determined by the NEI to be 90 percent effective and save an estimated $1,600,000,000 per year in blindness and vision impairment disability costs;

Whereas the NEI has been a leader in prevention research, having reported from the first phase of its Age-Related Eye Disease Study (AREDS) that high levels of dietary zinc and anti-oxidant vitamins reduced vision loss in individuals at high risk for developing advanced AMD by a magnitude of 25 percent, and in its second phase, is now studying the impact of other nutritional supplements;

Whereas the NEI has been a leader in epidemiologic research, identifying the basis and progression of eye disease and its disproportionate incidence in minority populations such that informed public health policy decisions can be made regarding prevention, early diagnosis, and treatment;

Whereas the NEI has been a leader in collaborative, trans-NIH Institute research, working with the National Cancer Institute (NCI) and the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute (NHLBI) on factors that promote or inhibit new blood vessel growth that has resulted in the first generation of Food and Drug Administration (FDA)-approved ophthalmic drugs to inhibit abnormal blood vessel growth in the ''wet'' form of AMD, thereby stabilizing and often restoring vision;

Whereas the NEI has been a leader in collaborative research with other Federal entities, such that its bioengineering research partnership with the National Science Foundation and the Department of Energy has resulted in a retinal chip implant, referred to as the ''Bionic Eye'', that has enabled individuals who have been blind for decades to perceive visual images;

Whereas the NEI has been a leader in collaborative research with private funding entities, such that its human gene therapy trial with the Foundation Fighting Blindness for individuals with Leber Congenital Amaurosis (LCA), a rapid retinal degeneration that blinds infants in their first year of life, has demonstrated measurable vision improvement even within the initial safety trials;

Whereas in the decade 2010 through 2020, the Nation will face unprecedented public health challenges associated with aging, health disparities, and chronic disease; and

Whereas Federal support at the NEI and related Department of Health and Human Services agencies is essential for the prevention and early detection, access to treatment and rehabilitation, and research associated with vision impairment and eye disease: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the 40th anniversary of the National Eye Institute (NEI), commends it for its leadership, and supports its mission to prevent blindness and to save and restore vision;

(2) supports the designation of the ''Decade of Vision'' to maintain a sustained awareness in the next decade of the unprecedented public health challenges associated with vision impairment and eye disease and to emphasize the need for Federal support for prevention and early detection, access to treatment and rehabilitation, and research; and

(3) commends the National Alliance for Eye and Vision Research (NAEVR), which serves as the ''Friends of the National Eye Institute'', for its efforts to expand awareness of the incidence and economic burden of eye disease through its Decade of Vision 2010–2020 Initiative.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

This resolution recognizes the 40th anniversary of the National Eye Institute within the National Institutes of Health and designates the years 2010 through 2020 as the Decade of Vision.

Eye disease is a significant public health problem. Those disproportionately affected by eye disease are our aging population, the African American and Hispanic communities, and those who suffer from chronic diseases, especially diabetes. The National Eye Institute estimates that eye disease and vision impairment currently cost the Nation $68 billion in health care costs, lost productivity, reduced independence, diminished quality of life, and accelerated mortality.

The NEI leads our Nation's efforts to prevent blindness and to save and restore vision. The NEI has been a leader in both basic and translational research. Its researchers have been able to associate one-quarter of all genes discovered to date with eye disease and vision impairment. The NEI has conducted more than 60 clinical trials that have resulted in treatments and therapies to save sight and, in some cases, actually reverse vision loss.

The National Eye Institute estimates that over the decade of 2010 to 2020, the number of individuals over age 40 who experience blindness, low vision or age-related eye disease, such as age-related macular degeneration, glaucoma, diabetic retinopathy and cataracts, will grow from today's level of 38 million cases to 50 million cases. As a result, the National Eye Institute's leadership, in directing vital vision research over the next decade, will be more important than ever.

I have been pleased to work on this resolution with my coauthor Mr. SESSIONS of Texas. He has been a terrific coauthor and has worked very hard with me to bring this matter to the floor and to the attention of this Congress. I commend this resolution to my colleagues.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the gentlewoman's amendment. I want to thank TAMMY BALDWIN from Wisconsin for not only working with me but also other members of my conference, the Republican Conference, on important issues related to eye and retinal health. I appreciate her recognizing today as the 40th anniversary of the National Eye Institute, H. Res. 366. Also I appreciate her dedication to people that are suffering with retinal and eye diseases; and these visions issues that we speak about today, as a result of our support and the support of the National Eye Institute, make a difference to thousands of people who have these eye diseases in their families.

I am very proud of this resolution. Last Congress we, meaning Ms. BALDWIN and I, joined together in support of National Glaucoma Day, and today we're here to recognize the 40th anniversary of the National Eye Institute and to express support for the designation of 2010 through 2020 as the Decade of Vision.

The National Eye Institute, also known as NEI, was established by Congress in 1968 to protect and prolong the vision of the American people. NEI research leads to sight-saving treatments, reduces visual impairment and blindness, and improves the quality of life of people of all ages.

□ 1315

Vision research has been supported through the NEI by over 600 research grants and training awards made to scientists at more than 250 medical centers, hospitals, universities, and other institutions across the country and around the world. With congressional and public support, the national investment in vision research has yielded substantial dividends to treat many potentially blinding eye diseases and visual disorders.

Vision impairment and eye disease is a major public health problem for the world to face. As you have heard, vision-related costs here in the United States approach $68 billion annually. There are some 38 million people in the United States over the age of 40 currently experiencing blindness, low vision, or age-related eye disease. This

number is estimated to increase to 50 million people by 2020.

NEI benefits children born with eye diseases and vision loss, as well as older citizens and everyone else that fits in between. NEI actively works to predict, prevent, and preempt aging eye disease and visual impairment thereby enabling more productive lives and reducing vision costs.

The National Eye Institute is the world leader in basic research with the National Institutes of Health's Human Genome Project to translate discoveries of genes related to eye disease and vision impairment which compromises one-quarter of genes, discovered to date, into diagnostic and treatment modalities.

The NEI has been a leader in collaborative research with so many private funding entities such as the human gene therapy trial with the Foundation Fighting Blindness, or this lead organization known as FFB, for individuals with Leber congenital amaurosis, a rapid retinal degeneration that blinds infants in their first year of life. This trial has demonstrated measurable visual improvement even with initial safety trials.

I am a big supporter of the Foundation Fighting Blindness, and the work that they have done in the past continues to carry out in our daily lives. This resolution recognizes the 40 years of service from the National Eye Institute and commends them for their leadership while supporting their mission to prevent blindness and save and restore vision.

Additionally, this resolution designates 2010 through 2020 as the ''Decade of Vision'' to maintain awareness in the next decade of public health challenges associated with vision impairment and eye disease, as well as to emphasize the need for prevention and early detection, access to treatment, and rehabilitation.

Lastly, we commend the National Alliance for Eye and Vision Research for its efforts to expand awareness of the incidence and economic burden of eye diseases through this Decade of Vision initiative.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of supporting not only this 40th anniversary but also to say that the United States Congress has what I believe is a realistic opportunity to work with the National Institutes of Health to make sure that we continue to push the envelope for people who are in this country and around the world who are counting on research and development to cure blindness during this Decade of Vision. I encourage all of my colleagues to vote in favor of this resolution.

I thank the gentlewoman from Wisconsin for her concentrated and special support of blindness issues. I look forward to working with her.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I would now like to yield 3 minutes to a fellow member of the Energy and Commerce Committee and a champion of vision issues, Mr. GREEN of Texas.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I would like to thank my colleague, who is a diligent and hardworking member of our Energy and Commerce Committee, for sponsoring H.R. 366, celebrating the Decade of Vision and the National Eye Alliance's 40th anniversary.

As co-Chair of the Congressional Vision Caucus with a particular interest in vision health, I strongly support the National Eye Institute, which serves as the lead NIH institute that manages our Nation's commitment to save and restore vision.

NEI research has contributed to the development of several critical therapies and interventions that are helping to slow the progression of vision impairment. In some cases, these therapies are helping to restore sight for individuals who may otherwise have lost their vision. Treatments for diabetic retinopathy that were developed by NEI researchers save our health care system more than $1.6 billion annually. Other NEI-funded research is resulting in treatments and therapies that are slowing the progression of vision impairment; in some cases, vision loss is even restored.

Starting next year, the first wave of the 78 million baby boomers will begin turning 65 years old, an age of elevated risk for aging eye disease. Coupled with the disproportionate incidences of eye disease in the African American and Hispanic populations and the increased incidence of diabetic eye disease, the NEI will be challenged more than ever to fund basic and clinical research that results in treatment and therapies.

As demonstrated by its past history, I am confident that the NEI will rise to this challenge, and, of course, we in Congress must work to ensure that it is adequately funded so that it can continue its research that benefits the health—and vision health—of all Americans.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to close by recognizing just a few of the champions of eye health and the warriors against eye disease from the district that I have the privilege of representing. And I know, like my coauthor, Congressman SESSIONS, we were drawn to this issue because of pioneering things that are happening in each of our respective districts.

Dr. Paul Kaufman is a leading eye researcher at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, and a major partner of the National Eye Institute. And I want to commend and recognize his groundbreaking research.

Also, a technology called BrainPort is being developed in my district by a company called Wicab with the support of National Eye Institute funding, and this technology is helping the blind to find new ways to process visual information. These sort-of breakthroughs are so exciting and really go back to the importance of celebrating the accomplishments to date and the future potential through the National Eye Institute with our support.

Again, I commend my colleagues' support of this resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 366.

The question was taken.

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

Ms. BALDWIN. 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 2470, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 780, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 2247, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 403, de novo.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER ROY H. BOEHM POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2470, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2470.

This will be a 15-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 417, nays 0, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 340]

YEAS—417

Abercrombie	Bishop (GA)	Burgess
Ackerman	Bishop (NY)	Burton (IN)
Aderholt	Bishop (UT)	Butterfield
Adler (NJ)	Blackburn	Buyer
Akin	Blumenauer	Calvert
Altmire	Blunt	Camp
Andrews	Boccieri	Campbell
Arcuri	Boehner	Cantor
Austria	Bono Mack	Cao
Baca	Boozman	Capito
Bachmann	Boren	Capps
Bachus	Boswell	Capuano
Baird	Boucher	Cardoza
Baldwin	Boustany	Carnahan
Barrett (SC)	Boyd	Carney
Barrow	Brady (PA)	Carson (IN)
Bartlett	Brady (TX)	Carter
Barton (TX)	Braley (IA)	Cassidy
Bean	Bright	Castle
Becerra	Broun (GA)	Castor (FL)
Berman	Brown (SC)	Chaffetz
Berry	Brown, Corrine	Chandler
Biggert	Brown-Waite, Ginny	Childers
Bilbray	Buchanan	Clarke
Bilirakis		Clay

Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
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
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
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
Gutierrez
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
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
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
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
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)
Quigley
Radanovich
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
Rush
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)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
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
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—16

Alexander
Berkley
Bonner
Connolly (VA)
Costello
Hoyer
Kennedy
Larson (CT)
Lewis (GA)
Lummis
Putnam
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sullivan
Waters
Wilson (OH)
Young (FL)

□ 1347

Mr. FOSTER changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STUDENT INTERNET SAFETY ACT OF 2009

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 780, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 780, as amended.

This will be 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. 341]

YEAS—416

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
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
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
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
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
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
Gutierrez
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
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
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
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
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
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
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
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
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)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
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
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—17

Alexander
Baldwin
Berkley
Bonner
Connolly (VA)
Costello
Hoyer
Kennedy
Larson (CT)
Lewis (GA)
Obey
Roe (TN)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sullivan
Waters
Wilson (OH)
Young (FL)

□ 1355

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''A bill to promote the safe use of the Internet by students, and for other purposes.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of rule IX, I hereby notify the House of my intention to offer a resolution as a question of the privileges of the House. The form of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. —

Whereas the Honorable Nancy Pelosi, a Representative from California, served from 1997 to 2002 as Ranking Democratic Member of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence;

Whereas Representative Pelosi currently serves as Speaker of the House, a position of considerable power and influence within the Congress;

Whereas title 3 of the United States Code designates the Speaker of the House as third in line of succession to the Presidency;

Whereas Speaker Pelosi has publicly challenged the truthfulness of what she and other congressional leaders were told by Central Intelligence Agency officials about the agency's use of enhanced interrogation techniques on suspected terrorists;

Whereas in an MSNBC interview on February 25, 2009, Speaker Pelosi stated, ''I can say flat-out, they never told us that these enhanced interrogation techniques were being used'';

Whereas, Speaker Pelosi's public statements allege a sustained pattern of deception by government intelligence officers charged by law with informing Congress about the agency's activities;

Whereas when asked at a press conference on May 15, 2009 widely reported by the news media, ''Madam Speaker, just to be clear, you're accusing the CIA of lying to you in September?'' Speaker Pelosi stated, ''Yes'';

Whereas during the same press conference the Speaker subsequently stated, ''So yes, I'm saying they are misleading, the CIA was misleading the Congress'' and further, ''they mislead us all the time'' and ''they misrepresented every step of the way'';

Whereas in a memorandum to CIA employees released publicly on May 15, 2009, Leon Panetta, the CIA Director, stated, ''It is not our policy or practice to mislead Congress. That is against our laws and our values. As the Agency indicated previously in response to Congressional inquiries, our contemporaneous records from September 2002 indicate that CIA officers briefed truthfully on the interrogation of Abu Zubaydah, describing the enhanced interrogation techniques that had been employed'';

Whereas when asked in a press conference held June 4, 2009, ''Madam Speaker, are you still receiving intelligence briefings?'' Speaker Pelosi responded by saying, ''Yes, I am; yes, I am.'';

Whereas a June 5, 2009 article on Human Events.com entitled, ''Pelosi Still Receives CIA Briefings, But Won't Say If They're Truthful'' stated, ''She refused to answer when asked whether or not she believes intelligence professionals are still lying to her.'';

Whereas national and international media reports on this controversy have damaged the reputation of the House by raising questions about whether the effectiveness of congressional oversight may have been undermined through false or misleading statements by intelligence officials; and

Whereas in order to safeguard the reputation of the House it is imperative to reconcile as soon as possible the aforementioned contradictory statements by Speaker Pelosi and CIA Director Panetta: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) a Select Subcommittee of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence shall be established to review and verify the accuracy of the Speaker's aforementioned public statements;

(2) the Select Subcommittee shall be comprised of four members of the full committee, two appointed by the chairman of the committee and two by its ranking minority member;

(3) The subcommittee shall have the same powers to obtain testimony and documents pursuant to subpoena authorized under clause 2(m) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House; and,

(4) the Select Subcommittee report its findings and recommendations to the House not later than sixty calendar days after adoption of this resolution.

□ 1400

Mr. Speaker, that is the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair designates now as the time that the gentleman may offer his resolution.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I therefore offer the resolution. I assume it has to be read, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. —

Whereas the Honorable Nancy Pelosi, a Representative from California, served from 1997 to 2002 as Ranking Democratic Member of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence;

Whereas Representative Pelosi currently serves as Speaker of the House, a position of considerable power and influence within the Congress;

Whereas title 3 of the United States Code designates the Speaker of the House as third in line of succession to the Presidency;

Whereas Speaker Pelosi has publicly challenged the truthfulness of what she and other congressional leaders were told by Central Intelligence Agency officials about the agency's use of enhanced interrogation techniques on suspected terrorists;

Whereas in an MSNBC interview on February 25, 2009, Speaker Pelosi stated, ''I can say flat-out, they never told us that these enhanced interrogation techniques were being used'';

Whereas, Speaker Pelosi's public statements allege a sustained pattern of deception by government intelligence officers charged by law with informing Congress about the agency's activities;

Whereas when asked at a press conference on May 15, 2009 widely reported by the news media, ''Madame Speaker, just to be clear, you're accusing the CIA of lying to you in September?'' Speaker Pelosi stated, ''Yes'';

Whereas during the same press conference the Speaker subsequently stated, ''So yes, I'm saying they are misleading, the CIA was misleading the Congress'' and further, ''they mislead us all the time'' and ''they misrepresented every step of the way'';

Whereas in a memorandum to CIA employees released publicly on May 15, 2009, Leon Panetta, the CIA Director, stated, ''It is not our policy or practice to mislead Congress. That is against our laws and our values. As the Agency indicated previously in response to Congressional inquiries, our contemporaneous records from September 2002 indicate that CIA officers briefed truthfully on the interrogation of Abu Zubaydah, describing the enhanced interrogation techniques that had been employed'';

Whereas when asked in a press conference held June 4, 2009, ''Madame Speaker, are you still receiving intelligence briefings?'' Speaker Pelosi responded by saying, ''Yes, I am; yes, I am.''; Whereas a June 5, 2009 article on. Human Events.com entitled, ''Pelosi Still Receives CIA. Briefings, But Won't Say If They're Truthful'' stated, ''She refused to answer when asked whether or not she believes intelligence professionals are still lying to her.'';

Whereas national and international media reports on this controversy have damaged the reputation of the House by raising questions about whether the effectiveness of congressional oversight may have been undermined through false or misleading statements by intelligence officials; and

Whereas in order to safeguard the reputation of the House it is imperative to reconcile as soon as possible the aforementioned contradictory statements by Speaker Pelosi and CIA Director Panetta: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) a Select Subcommittee of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence shall be established to review and verify the accuracy of the Speaker's aforementioned public statements;

(2) the Select Subcommittee shall be comprised of four members of the full committee, two appointed by the chairman of the committee and two by its ranking minority member;

(3) The subcommittee shall have the same powers to obtain testimony and documents pursuant to subpoena authorized under clause 2(m) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House; and,

(4) the Select Subcommittee report its findings and recommendations to the House not later than sixty calendar days after adoption of this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Utah wish to present argument on why the resolution is privileged for immediate consideration?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Yes, I do. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. This is very similar—it is not exactly the same, but it is similar to a resolution we presented a few weeks ago. It is presented again for one simple reason. The reason that this is before here is still that there is no cloture on this particular issue.

In ''A Man for All Seasons,'' Sir Thomas More may have used silence as his legal argument that silence denotes consent; but in a political setting as we are here, silence is not a solution. In an era in which perception is the same thing as reality, silence does not solve the problem, and indeed, harms are still there.

If an agency of government intentionally misleads Congress—and the CIA has denied they did that. If they intentionally mislead Congress or a Member, an important or a significant Member of Congress, it creates a problem for the integrity of the House as a whole.

If the data we are to receive is in question, then the solutions and the arguments we derive are equally in question, and that becomes an untenable decision. All of our decisions, therefore, become suspect. There is only one solution to this, and it is the same solution that we have said before:

If we don't want this issue to simply be subject to political maneuverings, establish a bipartisan committee—two Republicans, two Democrats. Make that committee a subset of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, so they understand the verbiage, so they understand the questions, so they don't have to have a lot of time to be brought up to speed.

If you have that kind of committee, their report will, by the very nature of the makeup of that committee, not be subject to political spin, and we may be able to move on. That's the important part. It is the integrity of the House that is in question here, and that needs to be answered so decisions of this House will be considered without any other kind of question or implication.

Now, as we are starting the appropriations process, it becomes an ideal time in which any kind of solution we may wish to impose on this particular situation should be before the House and should be done.

Mr. Speaker, I do this as a former speaker in Utah where several times you had to stand up to defend the integrity of the institution. This is about the integrity of the institution, to make sure we were not intentionally misled by an agency of government.

I yield back.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The resolution proposes to direct a select subcommittee of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence ''to review and verify the accuracy of'' certain public statements of the Speaker concerning communications to the Congress from an element of the executive branch.

Such a review necessarily would include an evaluation not only of the statements of the Speaker but also of the executive communications to which those statements related. Thus, the review necessarily would involve an evaluation of the oversight regime that formed the context for those communications as well. In reviewing and verifying the accuracy of ''the aforementioned public statements,'' the select subcommittee would be assessing not only the probity of the Speaker's actions but also the probity of the actions of executive branch officials.

On these premises, the Chair finds that the instant resolution is not materially different from House Resolution 470, which was held on May 21, 2009, not to present a question of privilege. The Chair therefore holds that the resolution is not privileged under rule IX. Instead, as was the case with House Resolution 470, the instant resolution may be submitted through the hopper.

The gentleman from Utah is recognized.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to table the appeal of the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to table will be followed by 5-minute votes on motions to suspend with respect to H.R. 2247 and H.R. 403.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 247, nays 171, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 342]

YEAS—247

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
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
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
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
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NAYS—171

Aderholt
Akin
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Boehner
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
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
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
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary

Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
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)
Souder
Stearns
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—15

Alexander
Berkley
Blunt
Bonner
Connolly (VA)
Costello
Gutierrez
Kennedy
Larson (CT)
Lewis (GA)
Moore (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sullivan
Wilson (OH)
Young (FL)

□ 1427

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT IMPROVEMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2247, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2247, as amended.

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. 343]

YEAS—414

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett
Bean
Becerra
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bono Mack
Boozman
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
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
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.
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
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
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, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
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
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
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
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
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
Radanovich
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
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
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
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
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
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—19

Alexander
Barton (TX)
Berkley
Bonner
Broun (GA)
Connolly (VA)
Costello
Diaz-Balart, M.
Kennedy
King (IA)
Larson (CT)
Lewis (GA)
McCarthy (NY)
Rangel
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Sullivan
Wilson (OH)
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1433

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOMES FOR HEROES ACT OF 2009

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 403.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 403.

The question was taken.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 417, noes 2, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 344]

AYES—417

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
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
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
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
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
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, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
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
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
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
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Radanovich
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
Rush
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)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
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
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOES—2

Flake
Paul

NOT VOTING—14

Alexander
Berkley
Bonner
Connolly (VA)
Costello
Green, Gene
Kennedy
Larson (CT)
Lewis (GA)
Peterson
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sullivan
Wilson (OH)
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1440

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 344, had I been present, I would have votd "aye."

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2346, SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2009

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 545 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 545

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2346) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2009, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

SEC. 2. The Chair may postpone further consideration of the conference report to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 545.

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

There was no objection.

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

H. Res. 545 provides for consideration of the supplemental conference report, legislation that supports our military in the field in both Iraq and Afghanistan. This spending plan provides our troops with everything they will need during the remainder of this fiscal year, and the President has said this will be the last supplemental spending request he will send to Congress. I hope this will be the case.

I, along with a majority of my colleagues, share the President's goal of winding down the war in Iraq and leaving behind an Iraq run by Iraqis. This conference report takes a step towards that goal by providing for the training of security forces, economic development, and diplomatic operations.

We are also looking to secure Afghanistan, and this conference report provides for training of Afghan security forces and counterinsurgency measures in bordering Pakistan.

Although there are no deadlines or timelines in this conference report, I think we share in the desire to have troops wrap up their missions abroad and return home to their families. It's my hope that we will see the beginning of that troop drawdown this year.

This report also provides for a few key domestic economic priorities like the Cash For Clunkers program, which will allow Americans to trade in old vehicles for new ones with higher fuel efficiency.

This conference report also includes $1.5 billion for response to the swine flu pandemic to help State and local governments but also to fund global efforts to track, contain, and slow down the spread of this flu.

Although it is not perfect legislation, it provides some essential funding, and I will support it and urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

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

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

Mr. DREIER. Let me begin by thanking my friend from Utica for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

I have to say that it's with extreme disappointment and sadness that I rise in opposition to this rule, having been very supportive of it when we had it just, it seemed, a few weeks ago.

The underlying measure of the supplemental appropriations bill that's supposed to fund our troops began auspiciously as a wonderfully bipartisan effort. In fact, when the House first considered the funding measure last month, Republicans were very proud to have what was our first opportunity, Mr. Speaker, our first opportunity of this 111th Congress to consider a major bill that had been developed in a bipartisan way.

□ 1445

I noted on that occasion that the President's call for bipartisan action had previously been completely thwarted by the Democratic majority; and, frankly, the record proves that to be the case. But finally when it came to the issue of funding our troops, even the Democratic leadership that had thwarted efforts to follow the Obama directive for bipartisanship, we had concluded that they weren't about to politicize the process of funding our troops. While the bill that we considered last month was not perfect, it did accomplish the key issue at hand, adequately providing for the protection and welfare of our troops. And as I said, we were very proud to do it in a bipartisan way, something the President wants, something that the American people want, and frankly, it's something that I believe a majority of Democrats and Republicans in this House want. But unfortunately the Democratic leadership does not seem to have that same goal.

Now the Democratic leadership is, unfortunately, back to what has very unfortunately been determined to be business as usual, which is concerning a measure which should have been as depoliticized as possible, considering it in an extraordinarily partisan way.

The conference report before us actually cuts troop funding in order to pay for billions of dollars of additional non-troop non-emergency spending. This includes $5 billion for the International Monetary Fund in order to provide additional global bailouts. Now any country, Mr. Speaker, can apply for this money. So there's nothing to ensure that United States taxpayer dollars don't go to countries like Iran or Venezuela. The question of whether to provide this new IMF funding is a controversial one; and it may end up being a right decision; but it's one that should be fully debated, not airdropped into a conference report. Again, whatever the outcome of that debate on IMF funding, it is clearly something that should not be considered as emergency funding. It should be part of the regular appropriations process, which we're in the midst of right now, where tough decisions are made, priorities are set, and a proposal to send $5 billion to the International Monetary Fund can be weighed against other priorities that Members of this House may have, like transportation funding or some other issue that it may be determined through the deliberative process is a higher priority.

Mr. Speaker, our military is on the verge of running out of money. We all know that. That, frankly, is why we're here. The resources needed for our troops to conduct their mission and return home safely are nearly depleted. This, the issue of troop funding, is a true emergency. This is what this supplemental appropriations bill is all about—to protect and support the men and women in harm's way defending our country. The Democratic leadership, instead, chose to cut troop funding and load this bill up with other very controversial funding that does not support our troops. Republicans made it clear that we could not support a troop funding bill that does not, in fact, fully fund our troops. So the leadership on the other side of the aisle found itself in a dilemma. They had lost Republican support with their partisanship, their controversial programs and their cuts for troop funding. So what could they do? How could they win the votes necessary to pass this conference report?

The obvious solution would have been to return to bipartisanship. It's what the President of the United States has called for; it's what the American people want; and it's what I believe a majority of Democrats and Republicans in this House would like. But instead, the Democratic leadership chose to push the contents of this bill as far to the left as they possibly could in the hopes of picking up support from the fringes of their own party. Having left the middle ground, the fringe was the only place left to go.

So how did they appeal to the very, very extreme left? First they watered down language related to moving terrorists to U.S. soil from Guantanamo Bay. Well, Republicans have supported much stronger language to ensure that no terrorists are ever moved to or set free on American soil. The original language would have at least required consultation with Congress and slowed down the process until we could act definitively to ensure the protection of our communities. But inexplicably, as Democrats, Republicans and Independents across the country have voiced their outrage over the prospect of having terrorists potentially released on American soil, today's conference report further weakens the already weakened language. It leaves our neighborhoods even more vulnerable to the movement of Gitmo terrorists. Furthermore, the Democratic leadership removed protections to ensure that information that could put our troops in danger would not be released. Many on the far left opposed these protections, so the Democratic leadership bartered for their support of this bill by stripping them out completely. Without those protections in place, our troops in the field will be subject to even greater harm. This was the price the Democratic leadership paid in order to negotiate with the far left rather than return to the bipartisanship and common sense that had guided earlier debates on this funding bill.

To see just how far out of the mainstream this approach is, Mr. Speaker, look no further than the vote on the motion to instruct conferees that we had just this past Friday. It was a Republican motion which handily passed the House by a vote of 267–152. Mr. Speaker, by a vote of 267–152, this House called for a clean bill that restores full funding for the troops and keeps in place the protections to prevent the release of information that could potentially endanger our troops. That strong bipartisan vote just this past Friday in favor of this motion indicates how much support there is in this House for a clean, bipartisan full troop funding bill. For those of us who naively thought that the funding of our troops was the one issue that could not be politicized, this is a very, very sobering moment. Clearly the Democratic leadership cannot help themselves. Even when bipartisanship would be the easy choice, they were compelled to move in the exact opposite direction.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this rule, demand a clean troop funding bill, one that fully provides the resources they need, one that is stripped of all extraneous controversial non-emergency funding and one that includes full protections for American communities as well as our troops in the field.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to point out that this bill does provide for the troops; and it provides very well for our troops because that is the most important thing that we, as Members of Congress, can do. It provides $1.9 billion more than requested for MRAPs and $2.5 billion above the President's request for U.S. troops. Those are the kinds of things that we need to do as a Congress to make sure that our troops are provided for.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. I have a question to my friends, and that is: How do we support the troops by keeping them in a war that's based on lies? How do we support the troops by keeping them in another war which keeps expanding and they're getting shot at from all sides? How do we support the troops by festering a war on the Afghan border with Pakistan and putting them in even more peril because they don't have the support?

How do we support the troops? We support them by bringing them home. That's what we should be appropriating money for, not to keep them there. Beyond that, isn't it interesting—we've got another $80 billion here for war, but we don't have money to keep people in their homes because there are still 13 million Americans who are losing their homes; we don't have money for the 50 million Americans who don't have any health care; we don't have money to save jobs; we don't have money to save our steel mills and our auto plants. What we have is, we have money for war.

Support the troops indeed. America has to start taking care of things here at home, and we can't do it by continuing to support wars that are based on lies. The Democrats took control of the Congress based on an opposition to the war. We should be opposing this

war instead of deferring to the President. We have the constitutional obligation under article I, section 8 of the Constitution to decide whether a war should continue or not. We should end it here. We shouldn't be continuing it.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to respond to my friend from Utica who made it very clear that he believes that troop funding is their priority; but yet this measure reduces by $4.7 billion the level of troop funding that we had in the bipartisan bill passed just last month and transfers it to the IMF. So, in fact, this measure does cut troop funding.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to yield 3 minutes to the new ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services, the very distinguished gentleman from Santa Clarita, California (Mr. MCKEON).

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend from California (Mr. DREIER) for yielding the time.

As the ranking member on Armed Services, I rise in opposition to this rule and to the war supplemental conference report for one simple reason. It will endanger our troops in harm's way. Compared with the clean troop funding bill that passed the House with bipartisan support in May, this package cuts $4.7 billion from defense that we passed at that time to create room for a $105 billion global bailout loan program.

What should be a clean military funding bill has become a means for the President's promise to provide more foreign aid to the International Monetary Fund. Those funds will eventually make their way to countries that are less than friendly to the United States at the expense of programs to support our troops. And even more disturbing is the decision by conferees to reject the motion offered by Republicans to prohibit the release of detainee photos that could exacerbate tensions in the very regions our troops are fighting.

Mr. Speaker, let me read to you a statement about those photos by General Petraeus, commander of U.S. Armed Forces throughout the Middle East:

''The release of images depicting U.S. servicemen mistreating detainees in Iraq and Afghanistan, or that could be construed as depicting mistreatment, would likely deal a particularly hard blow to U.S. CENTCOM and U.S. interagency counterinsurgency efforts in these key nations, as well as further endanger the lives of U.S. soldiers, marines, airmen, sailors, civilians and contractors presently serving there.''

General Petraeus is correct, and we should stand with our troops in the field and prohibit the release of these photos. We should not leave it in the hands of ACLU lawyers or at the mercy of activist judges.

I urge my colleagues to reject this package and insist that it be brought back immediately with Senator LIEBERMAN and Senator GRAHAM's language to prohibit release of these photos.

Finally, the Senate-passed troop bill included language prohibiting release or transfer of Guantanamo Bay detainees to U.S. soil. Unfortunately this conference report does not prohibit the transfer or release of detainees after October 1 of this year. This is a huge mistake. I fear we're already beginning to open Pandora's box. We've already begun importing terrorists. These Guantanamo detainees are trained to foment dissent among Americans, and we should do everything possible to keep them away from our local military bases and our prisons.

Again, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this rule and the conference report so we can quickly make these necessary changes to protect our troops in the field and bring back a clean troop funding bill.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

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

Mr. LEVIN. I want to talk about a clearly necessary provision in this bill, the fleet modernization provision; but I do want to say just two things briefly to comment on what has been said here by the minority.

I really think they are looking for reasons to vote ''no'' no matter how illegitimate they are.

□ 1500

Regarding this issue of the release of photos, the President has said, ''I will continue to take every legal and administrative remedy available to me to ensure the DOD detainee photographs are not released.''

Secondly, on the IMF, a commitment was made at the G–20, and this carries out the U.S. commitment. It is not a believable position to vote ''no'' on this bill for that reason.

But I want to say a few words about the fleet modernization proposal that Representative SUTTON, who is here, has worked so hard on with a large number of people.

There is clearly a crisis in the automotive industry. The administration has stepped up to the plate with a plan. That plan is being implemented. It's very difficult. There is a lot of pain involved. It's being carried out.

What hasn't happened effectively is work on the demand side. That's what's lagging here. Sales were down very substantially these last several years. There was an uptick in May, but still the annualized level is far below even a few years ago. And the sales are down not only for the domestic industry but also for the transplants: for Toyota, down 41 percent from last May; Honda, 42 percent; Nissan, 33 percent. So there is an effort to make sure there is effective restructuring for the domestic industry.

We have to work on the demand side, and this today answers that need: a voucher for consumers worth $3,500 to $4,500 to help them pay for more fuel-efficient cars and trucks. It will incentivize approximately 1 million new car and truck purchases. So anybody who votes ''no'' on this supplemental is voting ''no'' on this provision, and that would be a serious mistake.

It is critical that this Nation retain a strong domestic auto industry, and this effort on the demand side is a critical piece of that effort.

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

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. LEVIN. This has not been an easy effort. There have been disagreements in different ways to go about it. And I simply want to say to those who have been in the lead, and especially to Representative SUTTON, this would not have happened without the dedication of herself and others who have been determined that there be continued, in this country, a strong domestic auto industry. It's that clear. Other countries have stepped up to the plate. They have provided support. This is now a necessary implementation of this effort.

So I plead with people on the minority side to listen, to step up to the plate, to not look for arguments or excuses to duck. There is no ducking the need for a strong domestic automotive industry, not only for Ohio, not only for Michigan, not only for Illinois, not only for Indiana, but for the entire United States of America.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this juncture, I don't have any further requests for time. I would inquire of my friend whether he has any further speakers?

Mr. ARCURI. Yes, I have an additional speaker.

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

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Let me thank the distinguished gentleman for his leadership and really thoughtful conversation on what is a challenging time for America.

I rise to support the rule and want to express both my support and concerns for aspects of this legislation. But I will speak to the seeming overall opposition of our friends on the other side of the aisle, and I would hope that in their deliberation they have given a thoughtful assessment of the analysis of opposition.

We are dealing with some very difficult times. I opposed the war in Iraq and remain opposed. I do, however, want the opportunity to be able to stand down in order to safely have our soldiers redeploy. I want to see the standing up of the Iraqis and resources to allow them to proceed in their own

defense and to bring our soldiers home as heroes.

I also want us to make good on the promise we made to Afghanistan. America is good at keeping her promise. Her soldiers have never stepped away from promoting the ideals of democracy and liberty and freedom, and the Afghan people are in need. They need the collaboration of the NATO forces and the United States. They also need to have reconstruction and the empowerment of women and the protection of their children.

And so the part of this legislation addresses that question. It is a recognition that many of us opposed the Iraq war and are asking, as we have been asking for so long since the horrific tragedy of 9/11 when we found that those terrorists, horrific terrorists came from the inner parts of Afghanistan, and we abandoned Afghanistan. We did not pay attention to them. And so it is important now to ensure that we do it in the right way, that we don't maintain an extended force in Afghanistan but we help in a collaborative way for the Afghan people to stand up and to fight the terrorists and to reestablish institutions that will help them build their society, both with respect to education and social services. And so part of this legislation does include that funding.

Our eyes have been on Pakistan. There is a regional effort. Secretary of State Clinton and the President have worked to appoint Ambassador Holbrooke to be an envoy, and he has been in those camps where you have seen 2½ million people be displaced. We cannot abandon them now. We must provide the opportunity for them to return to a rebuilt region. These are individuals who have fought for their freedom, who left the Swat area because they did not want to be overtaken by insurgents, the Taliban, who want to undermine a system of democracy and, yes, terrorists.

One man fled with 13 of his children, living in a tent. He said now his home is occupied by Pakistan soldiers. He's willing to sacrifice and live homeless because he wants freedom. The resources that we now have will allow that to happen, and that is vital.

We also realize that there are areas like Chad, the Congo, and places that are near collapse that we are providing for peace-keeping dollars that are so very important in helping the U.N. Chad is near collapse because it is near Sudan, and many of those who have fled the persecution are there.

From the gulf coast region we have fought consistently to provide reimbursement for Galveston and Houston and the regions that have still been struck and still sacrificing and still living under the shadow of Hurricane Ike. We have the resources to put people in housing and to be able to correct the wrong of that terrible storm but yet the inability to move as fast as we like pursuant to the work that was not done in the last administration.

I think it is important that we are supporting the International Monetary Fund because we cannot stand by while we speak the language of reconstruction and rebuilding and not provide that for particular support. So there is a value in the hard work of our colleagues.

But I do believe it is important to revisit an issue that impacts many States: the sidestepping of the President's mission on stimulus dollars. And the State of Texas is a poster child for that. $3.2 billion was taken from the moneys that should have been utilized for the education of our children. One of my school districts alone has lost $155 million because it has been replaced or reordered or snuck under or left somewhere in what we call a ''rainy day fund.'' We need to fix this. We have an opportunity going forward to be able to fix it, but I would like to fix it now.

So I hope that we will be in the midst of discussion, the congressional delegation of Texans who believe that our children must come first. And we must follow the vision of President Obama, who said, Save a job and create a job. And so we are saving teachers' jobs and helping them if we fight to get that $3.2 billion from Texas where it needs to be.

The underlying bill is an important bill, but the Texas children are important as well.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I just plan to close debate if the gentleman has concluded debate.

Mr. ARCURI. I have one more speaker.

Mr. DREIER. I reserve.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. SUTTON).

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for his leadership on the Rules Committee and for the time.

I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying bill. But as we prepare to send the war supplemental to President Obama, I would be remiss not to express the deep concerns I have about the bill not including an exit strategy for military operations in Afghanistan.

And while I support the supplemental, I am also strongly supporting Representative MCGOVERN's bill to require an exit strategy from Afghanistan. Fairness requires it. Our brave soldiers need to know that we have a plan and that we're looking out for them. And out of fairness to the 185,000 soldiers who have been subject to the stop-loss policy since September 11, 2001, the supplemental that we're about to pass today will provide $500 per month in monthly payments.

And the use of stop-loss has prevented mothers and fathers from returning home to their children, from families and friends from gathering for the momentous occasions that mark their lives. They have gone above and beyond the expectations of their country. So I'm proud to have worked with my colleagues to create the Stop Loss Compensation program and to ensure its funding in this bill.

And I am pleased that we are also funding the bipartisan CARS Act program which Representative LEVIN spoke of a moment ago. That bill was passed overwhelmingly by this House just last week. And while it's called the CARS Act, it's about far more than just cars. It's about the environment and it's about people. It's about consumers, and it's about the millions of families in this great Nation who depend on the strength of our auto and related industries for their livelihood, to put food on the table, to get health care for their children. It's about our friends and our neighbors, and it's about our communities that depend on auto jobs for their tax base, to support schools and police, firefighters and other city services.

And I'm also proud to say that we have worked on language in the bill to allow that SAFER grants that are used to hire firefighters can be used now to rehire and retain much-needed firefighters.

This bill provides stop-loss payments for those who protect us bravely overseas. It funds the consumer-environmental beneficial CARS Act to help shore up the 3 to 5 million jobs in our auto industry that Americans depend upon for a living, and it provides for more adequate staffing for firefighters who bravely protect us at home.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that deserves support. And with that, I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, this has been a fascinating debate that has taken place. It began with some very thoughtful comments from my friend from Utica talking about the need for funding for our troops, and I laude him for referring to the fact that that is the priority of this measure.

We then listened to, on our side, the distinguished new ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services, my friend from Santa Clarita (Mr. MCKEON), talk about the priority of funding for our troops.

And then we listened to speeches made by our colleagues, and there was barely a mention of the issue of troop funding.

We just heard our colleague talk about firefighters. Hey, I'm from southern California where we have fires, and we have horrible fires. Loss of life and property is something that regularly takes place there. It's a very, very important issue. It's an issue that should be considered under the regular appropriations process under the leadership of my California colleagues, Mr. LEWIS and Mr. OBEY, not in a troop funding bill.

Then we listened to our very good friend from Detroit talk about the automobile industry, a serious challenge that we, as a Nation, are trying to address. I personally believe that the notion of continuing to see the government more and more involved in

this area is not the right thing to do, but it's a debate that will go on. And yet our friend, Mr. LEVIN, was talking about the issue of the automobile industry in this troop funding bill.

□ 1515

Then I listened to our friend from Houston, Texas, talk about Darfur, one of the most troubled spots on the face of the Earth, an issue that does need to be addressed, and the challenges of meeting the needs of children in Texas, a very, very important issue, but not as part of a troop funding measure.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said, through the very thoughtful work of the Appropriations Committee last month, we came to this floor with what President Obama and I believe a majority of Republicans and Democrats in this House would like to see us achieve, and I know the American people would like to see us achieve, and that is bipartisanship.

Bipartisanship is a word that is used all the time around here, all the time. Everyone talks about the need for bipartisanship, how important it is. The Speaker in her opening address here to the Congress as we began the 111th Congress talked about how she wanted to work in a bipartisan way. We Republicans say we want to work in a bipartisan way.

But this bill that emerged from the House Appropriations Committee was the first time, the very first time in this 111th Congress that we were able to see a bipartisan work product emerge from the Democratic leadership, and I congratulated them on that, and I have done that when we considered the bill, and I would like to be able to do it today.

But, unfortunately, this bill has crumbled from what it was intended to be, a bill to support funding for our troops. It in fact included a reduction by transferring money that was intended in the House-passed bill to be funding for our troops to the International Monetary Fund.

Now, I will say that that may be a worthwhile cause as we deal with the economic challenges that exist here in the United States and around the world. But, again, Mr. Speaker, that is something that should not be considered as an emergency funding measure. It is something that should be considered under the normal appropriations process, so that we can make a determination whether increasing by $5 billion the funding for the International Monetary Fund is more important than transportation priorities here in the United States or other priorities that we have.

So, some might like to say that this bill is just a continuation of what we considered last month. But, Mr. Speaker, it unfortunately has gone a long way down from where we were, creating the potential, the potential for us to not be able to prevent with absolute certainty the terrorists from Gitmo ending up in the United States. There is no guarantee that that will happen.

On the IMF, on the IMF, there is no guarantee, no guarantee in this measure that funding requests could not be made for countries like Iran or Venezuela.

So, Mr. Speaker, these are the kinds of things that this troop funding bill has ended up addressing, and it was made very clear by an overwhelming majority of the remarks that came from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. That is why I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this rule, so that we can come back and pass in this House what 267 Members last Friday said that they wanted to have passed, and that is a clean bill that funds our troops and ensures that we won't have terrorists in the United States, that ensures that we will not be dramatically expanding a wide range of other programs.

So vote ''no'' on this rule, and, if by chance it passes, I urge a ''no'' vote on the conference report itself, because we can do better.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague from the Rules Committee for his management of this rule and also for talking about what I think is ultimately the most important thing with respect to this bill, and that is, of course, our troops.

There are many of us who opposed the war in Iraq. I was one of them. I continue to oppose it. There are many of us who believe that the funding that this bill contains should be greater. I think on both sides of the aisle there is agreement that we should do as much as we possibly can. And there are things about this bill that clearly are not perfect. But we can't allow the perfect to get in the way of the good.

This bill is a good bill. Let's not deprive our brave sons and our daughters, their husbands and their wives, of what they need to return to their families safely. This is not about what is right or what is wrong. This is about what we as a country, what we as a Congress, need to do, and that is to make sure that our troops, our sons and our daughters, the people who put their lives on the line each and every day, have all and each and every thing they need.

Some people may argue it is not enough, but we need to give them everything that we possibly can. Voting ''no'' simply because you think it is not enough is not a solution. That absolutely is not a solution. We need to do everything we can to ensure that our soldiers have what they need.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, there is much good in this conference report on the FY09 supplemental. I support the IMF monies and I certainly support the funding to respond to the H1N1 flu virus.

But I will vote "no" today on the final bill for the same reason I voted "no" on the original supplemental. This supplemental is primarily a war funding bill. It includes a huge escalation of our military involvement in Afghanistan: an escalation without benchmarks, conditions, or most importantly, without an exit strategy.

I hope all my concerns about Afghanistan are wrong. There is a different team in the White House no—who I believe are trying very hard not to repeat the mistakes of the previous Administration.

President Obama and others have said there is no military solution in Afghanistan, only a political solution. I believe this, too. So I am very concerned when we put billions of dollars building up the U.S. military presence in Afghanistan without a clear mission and without an exit strategy.

Just as I insisted that the Bush Administration provide Congress with clear benchmarks and an exit strategy for Iraq, then we should the same with this Administration for Afghanistan.

I am not advocating an immediate withdrawal of our military forces in Afghanistan. I understand that our humanitarian mission may have to be protected in the near term. All I am asking for is a plan. If there's no military solution for Afghanistan, then please, tell me how we will know when our military contribution to the political solution has concluded.

I suspect that the votes are in place to pass this supplemental conference report. But I am deeply concerned. I'm concerned that we are moving ahead with a significant military escalation in Afghanistan without any real debate or any sense for how we will eventually bring our troops home.

Some have suggested that we have that debate at some point in the future. I respectfully disagree. I am not and never will be an advocate for "cutting and running" from Afghanistan. But we need to provide the American people and the people of Afghanistan a clearly defined mission, which includes a clearly defined plan for departure.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. DREIER. 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, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2847, COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 544 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 544

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. 2847) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, and Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, 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 Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no amendment to the bill shall be in order except: (1) those received for printing in the portion of the Congressional Record of June 15, 2009 (or earlier) designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII; and (2) pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate. Each amendment so received may be offered only by the Member who submitted it for printing or a designee and shall be considered as read if printed. 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. Clause 9(b)(2) of rule XXI is amended by inserting ''such'' after ''no''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, for purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART). All time yielded during consideration of this rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 544.

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 544 provides for the consideration of H.R. 2847, the Departments of Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2010. I want to thank the distinguished chairman of the committee and ranking member for reporting out this bill that does not pay mere lip service to making communities safer, but makes critical investments in our Nation's communities.

The bill provides $802 million for Community Oriented Policing Services, which we know as the COPS program, 45 percent above the current funding level. As a former prosecutor, I know how vitally important these programs are in assisting local law enforcement to hire and train new officers, to participate in community policing, purchase and deploy new crimefighting techniques and technologies, and develop and test new and innovative policing strategies.

So often State and local governments are critical of the Federal Government's programs because they pass down mandates without funding them. But this bill appropriates money to put more police on the street, funds successful drug court programs, and increases Byrne funding to help develop new and innovative law enforcement techniques which put violent criminals in jail and keep our streets safe for our children.

This funding includes $298 million for the COPS hiring grants program, which help our local law enforcement agencies put more police on the street. When combined with the $1 billion provided in the Recovery Act for the COPS hiring grants, the funding in H.R. 2847 will enable the hiring of more than 7,000 police officers. Those are officers in each and every State in this country.

Increasing the number of police on the street will help local law enforcement agencies to reduce violence and get illegal guns off the street. As a former prosecutor, I know that the vast majority of the violent crimes committed with guns in this country are committed with illegal guns, not legal guns. By putting more police officers on the street, it will give officers the ability to better enforce the laws on the books, not by creating new laws, but by reducing the number of illegal guns, which is the cause of the majority of gun violence in this country.

This bill provides $15 million for the Weed and Seed program. Weed and Seed helps localities develop programs to weed out and deter crime and then take the all-important step often left out, that is, seeding the formerly high crime areas with programs to promote neighborhood revitalization. The funds will be used to carry out this mission in sites and communities such as my home in Utica and Rome, New York, cities which I represent.

H.R. 2847 also includes $384 million for Juvenile Justice programs, $11 million above the 2009 level. This underscores the strong Federal commitment to supporting States and communities in their efforts to develop and implement prevention and intervention programs and to improve the juvenile justice system so that it protects public safety and holds offenders accountable while also providing rehabilitative services that are tailored to meet the needs of juveniles and their families.

Additionally, the underlying bill includes $45 million for grants, technical assistance, and training to State and local governments to develop dedicated drug courts that subject nonviolent offenders to an integrated mix of treatment, drug testing, incentives and sanctions.

As a district attorney, I quickly learned that no matter what initiatives law enforcement took to reduce the supply of drugs, it never really affected the demand for drugs, which never seemed to go down and therefore created a market for drug dealers. One thing I saw is that reducing the supply can work, but reducing the demand for drugs always works.

When my office established a drug court program, I realized the powerful effect that the program had on helping enrolled participants get control of their addiction, thereby freeing them and their families from their awful addiction and reducing the demand for drugs. The appropriation of $45 million for drug courts provided by H.R. 2847 is 12.5 percent more than the current level, and I congratulate the committee on that increase.

The bill also includes funding for upgrades to emergency communications systems around the country.

Mr. Speaker, I have addressed only a handful of the important programs for which H.R. 2847 would appropriate funds. My remarks are focused on the criminal justice aspects of this bill, but there are many other important areas addressed in this legislation.

It provides funding for critical scientific research, including programs to keep America on the cutting edge of technology, innovation and those that study climate change as well as funding the Department of Commerce and Economic Development Administration. The Appropriations Committee has approved a bill which would provide funding for these critical programs, and I once again thank them for their work and welcome the chance to vote in favor of this legislation.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ARCURI), for the time and yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in opposition to this unorthodox rule brought forth by the majority. It continues the precedent the majority set last year when they decided to no longer allow the House to consider appropriations rules with open rules and instead use a restrictive rule that requires Members to preprint any proposed amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

□ 1530

So this is a restrictive rule, even though the majority calls it an open rule with a preprinting requirement. It was not long ago when the majority felt quite differently. At the end of 2004, the current distinguished chairwoman of the Rules Committee, then a member of the minority and ranking member of the Rules Committee, released a report called, ''Broken Promises: The Death of Deliberative Democracy.'' On Page 26 of the report the chairwoman said that she considers rules with preprinting requirements, like today's rule, restrictive and not

open. Why exactly is this a restrictive rule? Let, me, again, quote the chairwoman's 2004 report. ''A preprinting requirement blocks any amendment proposal that might emerge during the course of debate.''

For example, Mr. Speaker, Members will be blocked from offering germane changes to their own amendments if an issue surfaces during debate, or if there is a minor drafting error. That is why, during yesterday's rules hearing, I made a motion to modify the rule to allow Members who have preprinted their amendments, as specified in this rule, to make germane modifications to such amendments. My commonsense amendment was defeated by a straight party-line vote.

I will provide you an example, Mr. Speaker, why I believe my amendment was important. During last year's consideration of the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs appropriations bill, Representative BUYER submitted an amendment for consideration. However, the amendment had a drafting error and did not comply with one of the rules of the House.

Once Congressman BUYER realized the problem, he asked unanimous consent to change his amendment to achieve its original purpose, and also to comply with the rules of the House. However, the majority blocked his unanimous consent request.

If the bill had been considered under an open rule, Representative BUYER could simply have introduced a new amendment. But, just like the bill being brought to the floor today, that bill was not considered under an open rule, and Members were blocked from making germane changes to their amendments, unless they received concurrence of every Member through a unanimous consent agreement.

Yesterday, during the hearing on the supplemental appropriations bill, the Rules Committee ranking member, Mr. DREIER, attempted to ask the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. OBEY, how the majority would handle another occurrence like occurred last year with the Buyer amendment.

But when Mr. DREIER began asking his question, the Rules Committee chairwoman did not allow Mr. DREIER from going forward with the question. The Rules Committee chairwoman explained her ruling by saying, the hearing on the underlying legislation was complete, and the committee was now considering the supplemental funding bill; a bill that is an appropriations bill just like the underlying legislation. And yet, the chairwoman found that asking the Appropriations chairman about the upcoming appropriations process during a hearing on an appropriations bill was inappropriate. I think that was unfortunate.

Please let me quote Chairwoman SLAUGHTER's report from 2004. Restrictive rules block ''duly elected Members of Congress the opportunity to shape legislation in a manner that they believe is in the best interest of their constituents and the Nation as a whole.'' They also block, and I continue quoting, ''the full and free airing of conflicting opinions.''

Mr. Speaker, I will insert the relevant parts of the chairwoman's report into the RECORD.

If the rule was restrictive under the majority's definition in 2004, why is it not the same today?

What makes this restrictive rule more unfortunate is that the House has a long tradition of allowing open rules on appropriations bills in order to allow each Member the ability to offer germane amendments without having to preprint their amendment or receive approval from the Rules Committee.

Other than the recent use by the majority to restrict debate on appropriations bills, we have to look back nearly 15 years to the last time a restrictive rule was used. So this is not a one-time aberration but, in fact, the way the majority plans to continue to consider all of the appropriations bills this year.

So I believe that the majority is really not only subverting the rights of every Member, and also bipartisan and open debate on appropriations bills, but I think they're setting a dangerous precedent that is unfortunate. Excessive partisanship is unnecessary and unfortunate.

BROKEN PROMISES: THE DEATH OF DELIBERATIVE DEMOCRACY

A CONGRESSIONAL REPORT ON THE UNPRECEDENTED EROSION OF THE DEMOCRATIC PROCESS IN THE 108TH CONGRESS.

Compiled by the House Rules Committee Minority Office

The Honorable Louise M. Slaughter, Ranking Member

4. Rules with Pre-Printing Requirements are not ''Open Rules''

During the 108th Congress, the Rules Committee reported out four rules with a so-called ''pre-printing'' requirement. This provision requires Members to submit their amendments for publication in the Congressional Record, in accordance with clause 8 of Rule XVIII, on the day preceding floor debate of the legislation. While the majority optimistically calls such rules ''modified open rules,'' we consider them ''restrictive'' rules and have scored them as such in the appendices attached to this report.

While we concede that considering a bill with a pre-printing requirement is less restrictive than the more common tactic of limiting amendments to those printed in the Rules Committee report;[31] there is a significant difference between an open rule and a rule with a pre-printing requirement. A pre-printing requirement forces Members to reveal their amendments in advance of floor consideration, something that may assist the floor managers, but can disadvantage the Member offering it. In addition, a pre-printing requirement blocks any amendment proposal that might emerge during the course of the debate. When Chairman Dreier was in the minority, he made the following statement about the preprinting requirement during debate on a rule on national, service legislation:

''This rule also requires amendments to be printed in the Congressional Record. That might not sound like much, but it is another bad policy that belittles the traditions of House debate. If amendments must be preprinted, then it is impossible to listen to the debate on the floor, come up with a new idea to improve the bill, and then offer an amendment to incorporate that idea. Why do we need this burdensome preprinting process? Shouldn't the committees that report these bills have a grasp of the issues affecting the legislation under their jurisdiction? Again, Mr. Speaker, I think we can do better.[32]

We agree with Chairman Dreier's statement that the purpose of the amendment process on the floor is to give duly elected Members of Congress the opportunity to shape legislation in a manner that they believe is in the best interest of their constituents and the nation as a whole. It is not to help the foor manager with his or her job. A majority interested in allowing ''the full and free airing of conflicting opinions'' would allow at least some House business to occur in an open format—-in a procedural framework that allows Members to bring their amendments directly to the floor for discussion and debate under the five-minute rule.[33]

II. REPUBLICANS EXPANDED THE CONSIDERATION OF SUSPENSION BILLS TO CROWD OUT REAL DELIBERATION IN THE HOUSE

Another aspect of the disturbing trend towards curtailing real deliberation on controversial issues in the House has been the Republican leadership's tendency to devote more and more floor time to debating bills under the suspension of the rules. In the 108th Congress, standing House Rule XV permitted the House to consider bills under suspension of the rules on Mondays and Tuesdays, and during the last six days of a session of Congress. The suspension procedure allows for 40 minutes of debate, requires a two-thirds vote for a bill to pass, and allows no amendments except by the floor manager.

The ostensible purpose of the suspension day procedure is, as the Republican majority describes it in one of its Parliamentary Outreach newsletters, ''to dispose of non-

I reserve.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. OBEY.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to rise to express my concern about the ability of this House to get its crucial work done under the circumstances in which we're operating.

As I think every Member of the House understands, President Obama inherited an economic crisis and a foreign policy mess, and so the Congress

[31] According to our records, 50% (64) of the non-conference report/non-procedural rules reported by the Committee in the 108th Congress were rules restricting debate to amendments printed in the Committee report. In the ''Additional Views'' they filed in the *102nd Congress Survey of Activities* Republican Rules Committee members, including Chairman Dreier, complained this type of restrictive rule had become ''a favored method of the majority.'' Under this procedure, the Rules Committee ''selectively determines which [amendment] to make in order and which may not be offered on the floor. Usually, the amendments made in order are subject to strict time limits, as opposed to open debate under the five-minute rule, and are not subject to amendment. On rare occasions the Rules Committee has allowed all amendments submitted to be offered, but this is the exception, not the rule.'' *H. Rept. 102–1101, 102nd Survey*, p. 109.

[32] *Congressional Record* July 20, 1993, p. H4820.

[33] As we have noted above, most appropriations bills are debated under technically open rules, but amendments are subject not just to the normal restrictions of germaneness, but also a number of other restrictions set out in rule XXI and in the Congressional Budget Act.

first had to turn our attention to dealing with that economic crisis, and we finally got that out of the way in the form of the Recovery Act. We then had to finish all of last year's domestic appropriation bills, which took a considerable amount of time, and then we had to turn to the supplemental appropriation bill which we will be debating later today to finish funding the Middle Eastern war efforts for the remainder of the fiscal year, because the previous administration had a practice of only asking for funding for that endeavor 6 months at a time.

And now we are trying to bring up the first of 12 appropriation bills. And in order to stay on schedule so we can do the people's business by the end of the fiscal year, we need to deal with all 12 of those bills in the next 6 weeks. I think that means that we have a problem.

In fiscal '03 there were no amendments offered to this bill. In fiscal '04 there were 10 amendments offered by Republicans and 6 by Democrats. In fiscal '05 there were 19 amendments offered by Republicans and 11 by Democrats. In fiscal '06 the number increased to 19 and 27, and in '07 we had 38 amendments offered by Republicans and 37 offered by Democrats. Today, we have had filed on this bill 127 amendments.

Now, in the schedule that I announced last week for appropriation bills, we announced a schedule that would allow us to finish all of these appropriation bills by the August recess, provided that we were able to stick to that schedule. That schedule allocates about 7 to 8 hours of debate on all amendments on average for each bill.

The problem that I see here with this bill is that we already have amendments filed that will take at least 23 hours, and even if amendments are considered out of order, it still takes 10 minutes or so to dispose of each of those amendments.

So last week the majority leader and I met with my friend, the ranking member of the committee, and the minority leader, asking whether or not it would be possible to reach agreement on time and on the number of amendments offered so that we could finish this bill along the schedule that we had outlined; and at that time, the prospect did not seem too promising, if I can be polite about it.

And I would simply like to ask my friend from California at this point, before we get into this bill, whether, in light of the time squeeze that we have, whether the gentleman would be in a position to agree to a proposition that would, in fact, limit the number and the time of amendments to that amount of, or to that number and to that amount of time, that would enable us to cut that 23 hours down to about 7 or 8 hours?

And I would be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LEWIS of California. In exchange with my colleague, I was interested in his commentary regarding the number of amendments in the past on this bill and other bills like it. I too am very concerned about the time difficulty that we are having. I'd much prefer to have us get back to regular order where we'd have open rules on these bills.

But at this point in time, because of the requirements of the majority, the preprinting requirements, et cetera, there are a lot of Members who are very frustrated by this bill, and they'd like to make some serious changes, but they find themselves in a position where they can't provide amendments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's 5 minutes has expired.

Mr. ARCURI. I yield the gentleman from Wisconsin an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of California. We can continue this exchange. There is, as a result of the change in the rules and the way we can provide amendments, there had been as many as 127 amendments preprinted on this bill, 104 of them by the minority who feel they've essentially been cut out of the process. And because of that, and because of the importance of the issues that are a part of this bill, I cannot agree to a time limitation.

I think the time limitation you were discussing was like for 8 hours or something. I'm afraid my conference might very well have a revolution on its hands, and you might have a new ranking member.

Mr. OBEY. Well, I thank the gentleman for his frankness. I regret the content of his response, but I do appreciate the fact that he is forthright and honest in laying out what the prospects would be.

And Mr. Speaker, I think that that presents a dilemma to the House, because we want to finish our business, and I would point out that the schedule that we've set out can be adhered to only if we can work out reasonable time limits with each of these bills.

And I would point out that what we're trying to do with that schedule is to allow ample time for discussion of these appropriation bills and also still leave time on the calendar to deal with the crucial issues of health care, of climate change and the military authorization bill, among others.

So I think at this point the House has a problem. And I hope that we will face up to it forthrightly, because I think we do have an obligation to try to get the people's business done on time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. POSEY).

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my serious concerns about the bill before us today and about the lack of sufficient funding for NASA's next-generation human space flight.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us has a $6.7 billion increase in spending over last year. That's a 12 percent increase over last year's spending.

And while the overall NASA budget gets a slight increase from last year, the budget for our Nation's next generation-human space flight vehicle constellation is cut by $566 million.

While lawmakers can talk about supporting space exploration, the bottom line is that the United States will soon yield its preeminence in space to Russia after the last shuttle flight, currently scheduled for 2010. This legislation does nothing to avert America's human space flight gap.

Those who follow our Nation's space budget realize what's at risk. Soaring rhetoric and good intentions of playing financial catch-up later with space funding can easily surrender to other competing initiatives. Delays and studies are the road to the graveyard for many legislative proposals.

□ 1545

The bill's $566 million cut for our next generation human spaceflight vehicle sends the wrong message to the hardworking men and women who are developing Constellation now. It sends the wrong message to college students who are seeking advanced engineering and science degrees. It tells them that human spaceflight is not really a priority in this country. This message will not go unnoticed in Beijing or in Moscow.

This Congress passed the stimulus bill in February, including an additional $400 million for the Constellation program. Yet, today, the bill before us essentially takes all of that funding back and then some—poof—like a shell game. If the inadequate funding level for NASA that is contained in this bill is allowed to stand as it is, then our Nation's human spaceflight program will be dealt a very, very serious blow.

For a comparison, let's look at several of the spending items in the bill. The bill would increase funds for the COPS program by $252 million over 2009, and this is on top of over $1 billion in the stimulus bill. The bill spends $7.4 billion on the census, an increase of $4.2 billion over last year. The bill increases funding for the National Science Foundation by $446 million over 2009 to promote scientific research by students. Yet it cuts funding for human spaceflight, a fountainhead of patents and scientific discovery.

I would say to the chairman of the subcommittee, I appreciate the work that you do and the challenges before you. Without a robust manned space program, the United States cannot maintain our leadership in space nor can we carry crews beyond low Earth orbit. It is for this reason that we must work to restore the funding that was cut from this program.

I look forward to working with you and with my colleagues over the next several months to restore the funding so that we can get our Nation's next human spaceflight vehicle back on track. A cut of this magnitude at this critical stage cannot and absolutely must not be allowed to stand.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio, a former colleague from the Rules Committee (Ms. SUTTON).

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, my good friend from New York, for the time and for his leadership.

I also want to thank Chairman OBEY for all of the hard work he has put into developing this bill that will fund some of our Nation's most critical needs, including the funding for prisons, for law enforcement and for initiatives related to the southwest border, along with promoting important scientific research and development.

This bill provides $30.6 billion for investments in science, technology and innovation, including $6.9 billion for the National Science Foundation, whose grants in the past have allowed researchers in our colleges and universities to discover fundamental particles of matter, to develop carbon-14 dating of ancient artifacts and to decode the genetics of viruses, to name just a few.

It provides $1 billion to science, technology and math education for our students, from graduate students all the way down through kindergarten. So we're going to educate our students for the future and will continue to be leaders in innovation in this global world.

It also invests $781 million in the National Institute of Standards and Technology, which is very important for the area that I represent. It provides for scientific and technical research services. Along with $125 million for the manufacturing extension partnerships, we will be investing $125 million to help small- and mid-sized manufacturers compete globally by providing them with technical advice and access to technology. As well, we will be leveraging private funds to save and create jobs. This program has been vital to the 13th District of Ohio, resulting in jobs that can be directly linked to it. We are also investing $70 million to fund high-risk, high-reward research into areas of critical national need done by U.S. businesses, colleges and universities, and labs. That is through the Technology Innovation Program.

In addition, this bill provides much-needed funding for the Bureau of Prisons to protect American citizens. According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics, in a 15-State study, over two-thirds of the released prisoners were rearrested within 3 years. Now, with this in mind, the Bureau of Prisons is provided with $6.2 billion to address long-standing critical shortages in corrections staffing, education and drug treatment, as well as an investment for Second Chance Act offender reentry programs.

The bill also provides the much-needed $298 million for the COPS hiring program, which, when combined with the $1 billion provided in the Recovery Act for the program, will put 7,000 new police officers on the streets of American communities, improving the safety for our constituents.

The ongoing drug violence on our southwest border is also addressed in this bill by providing funds for the DEA to combat the flow of illegal drugs across the border, for the ATF to reduce violent crime and to enforce Federal firearm and explosive laws, and for the department-wide Southwest Border Initiative to secure our border against violence and drug trafficking.

With all of that in mind, I rise in support of the rule and of the underlying bill.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, like all of my colleagues—and I know I speak for all of my colleagues when I say that I revere this institution.

220 years ago this summer, James Madison, following the urging of his constituents, came back to the House of Representatives, doing something that he actually opposed when he penned the U.S. Constitution: that being the implementation of the very important Bill of Rights, which is something that we as Americans spend a lot of time thinking about and which is something that the rest of the world looks to. There are people in Iran today who are looking at our Bill of Rights as they think about the need to pursue democracy and as they choose their leaders in their country. Peoples all over the world continue to look to our Bill of Rights. It was 220 years ago this summer that James Madison moved the Bill of Rights through this institution. I'm going to, next month, spend some time talking about that historic summer 220 years ago.

I say that simply to underscore the fact that I have such great regard for the precedents and for the rules of the House of Representatives, and I consider it a great privilege to serve with Mr. DIAZ-BALART, with Mr. ARCURI and with the other members who serve on the House Rules Committee. I take the work there very, very seriously.

I believe that we're at a troubling moment when it comes to the deliberative nature of this institution. We had the exchange that took place between the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations on this process of filing amendments. We had a rigorous debate that took place in the Rules Committee yesterday about the fact that appropriations bills are considered as privileged.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, what that means is there is no need for a special rule for the consideration of appropriations bills. Constitutionally, it is a very important part of the process. Article I, section 9 of the Constitution makes it very clear that spending doesn't emanate from the White House; it emanates from the United States Congress. By tradition, it begins here in the House of Representatives.

As I stand here, I'm thinking about conversations that I had with one of the greatest Members to ever serve here, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. Natcher), who was chairman of the Appropriations Committee and who was the long-time chairman of the Health Subcommittee. I remember his saying to me that he believed appropriations bills should come to the floor without being considered with a special rule because they are considered as privileged; but the tradition over the past several decades has been that the need for a special rule would allow for the protection of the bill, meaning that points of order could not be raised against the work product of the Appropriations Committee and that we would then allow for an open amendment process, meaning that any Member could stand up here in the House and offer a germane amendment to the appropriations bill.

It is true that the appropriations process can be prolonged, and it has been in the past; but when we were in the majority, having presided regularly over the Treasury-Postal Appropriations bill, I remember witnessing the chairman and the ranking member of the full committee or of the subcommittee come together and have an agreement that amendments would be addressed and that they would put an outside time limit for the consideration of those amendments.

Over my nearly three decades here, Mr. Speaker, I've seen that happen on a regular basis. Guess what? It has worked out pretty doggone well. Now, there are people who are disturbed over the fact that 127 amendments were filed yesterday at the Rules Committee to the Commerce, Justice, Science Appropriations bill. That was not necessary. That was not necessary, and it would not have happened had we had the standard open amendment process for the consideration of measures.

Yes, there are a number of very important issues that I and my colleagues believe should be addressed in this appropriations bill. I will say that it could be done under an open amendment process, but unfortunately, the majority has decided to not only have a preprinting requirement but to set an arbitrary deadline so that, if appropriations bills may be considered more than a day or so later, one could not file additional amendments for the consideration of the measure. In our attempt to get a commitment that we would simply be able to allow Members to make germane modifications to their amendments, we have been denied that.

In fact, we had a vote in the Rules Committee last night. I know, Mr. Speaker. I apologize. This is very inside baseball. I know I may not be quite on message, but I think the message is a very clear one: It's fairness in dealing with the challenges that the American people are facing. So we had

a party-line vote, Mr. Speaker. We had this vote, and we were denied the opportunity to allow Members to even make germane modifications to amendments that had been submitted to the Rules Committee.

Now, Mr. DIAZ-BALART is going to make an attempt to defeat the previous question. This vote on the previous question is one that will simply say that we, as an institution, want the American people, through their elected Representatives, to have the chance to think about, to deliberate and to vote on the measures included in this appropriations bill and we hope in the other I guess it is 11 now appropriations bills, in addition to the one that we're considering here today.

It is a troubling pattern which undermines deliberative democracy. Now, it's not unusual, but it is very troubling. I don't know how many amendments would have been offered if we'd had an open amendment process; but guess what? I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, for a second that 127 amendments would have been offered. I think there would have been many, many fewer than that. When the Members of this House, Democrats and Republicans alike, are told that they can't even make germane modifications to their amendments, there is little choice other than to have Members file many, many, many different amendments so that we will at least be able to allow this process to proceed.

Chairman OBEY referred to the fact that the issue of global climate change and the issue of health care are both issues that the Democratic majority wants to bring to the forefront in the next couple of months. We understand that elections have consequences, and those are issues that they clearly have a right to bring up. I want to address those issues. On our side, we want to address those issues in a slightly different way, but we don't believe that we should be addressing those issues at the expense of the very important process enshrined in article I, section 9 of the U.S. Constitution, and that is the power of the purse: the appropriations process.

□ 1600

So, Mr. Speaker, I am going to urge my colleagues to join Mr. DIAZ-BALART, the gentleman from Miami, in attempting to defeat the previous question in the name of deliberative democracy so that we can allow elected representatives to in fact represent their constituents. And if by chance the previous question is passed, I am going to urge my colleagues to join in opposition to the rule because we can do a better job.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from California for sharing with us his thoughts. Clearly, his institutional knowledge of this grand institution is second to none. But there is one point that I think is important to clear up, and that is the fact that this bill has a preprinting requirement that in no way, shape, fashion, or form means that anyone is precluded or prevented from filing an amendment. What it does, however, mean is that any amendment that an individual Representative files has to be filed by a certain period of time, and that was yesterday. That does one thing. And I would submit that that enables our constituents to have the very, very best legislation that they can because it does one thing, it gives the Representatives an opportunity to read that amendment to see what that amendment means and to have an opportunity to interpret it and determine whether or not it is the best thing for the bill or, in fact, whether it should be pulled.

Mr. DREIER. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARCURI. If I could finish my thought.

So I would submit that, in fact, it is a good thing to have a preprinting requirement in this particular bill, and I would yield to my friend.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding, and I appreciate his kind remarks. And I will say that the gentleman is relatively new to the institution. And I would say that, frankly, since the gentleman has been here, we have not really had as many open rules as we should. I know that there has been an attempt made to define a modified open rule as an open rule——

Mr. ARCURI. If I may reclaim my time——

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding. I look forward to getting some time from my friend from Miami.

Mr. ARCURI. The point of it is that this allows individuals to file. In fact, the fact that we have 127 amendments filed, much more than we've had in the past, certainly indicates that in fact Representatives have had an opportunity to file.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California, a member of the Commerce, Justice and Science Subcommittee, Mr. SCHIFF.

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to express my strong support for the Commerce, Justice and Science Appropriation bill and at the outset want to congratulate Chairman MOLLOHAN for the extraordinary job that he has done in putting this bill together.

In particular, I want to highlight a couple of key investments in the bill in the areas of law enforcement and science.

In particular, we invest over $800 million in the COPS program that has been very successful in putting additional cops on the beat and deterring criminal activity and keeping our communities safe. That is a vital investment. The legislation also makes a very important investment to those of us that live in the border States in a program called SCAP, which provides assistance to States that have to incarcerate illegal immigrants and bear the costs of flaws in our Federal immigration policy.

Furthermore, the bill makes a very key investment, very substantial investments in DNA technology and backlog reduction. To the degree we can eliminate backlogs of DNA evidence, we can take murderers and rapists off the streets. Of this there is no question: you can tell from a statistical certainty that when you reduce backlogs, you take murderers and rapists off the streets and prevent them from committing further offenses. This is another key investment.

And, finally, let me speak to a science investment in the bill which I think is also very important and that is this legislation keeps some of our most important space science efforts, like the Mars program, on track, which has brought us new, unprecedented information about the world we live in that has led to scientific improvements and innovation here on the ground and is a vital investment in our Nation's future.

So I want to thank you, Chairman MOLLOHAN, for your extraordinary work on this bill, for the key investments in law enforcement and science, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield again to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) such time as he may consume.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my California colleague, the gentleman from Glendale, Mr. SCHIFF, for his thoughtful remarks. And I want to say that he and I share our commitment to NASA and the very important programs that take place at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory. And that's the point. I mean, there are many important items in this bill which continue to be priorities.

I would like to say to my friend from Utica, who, again, is working very hard, he is very fortunate, Mr. Speaker, he has never had to serve in the United States House of Representatives as a member of the minority. My dream is that one day he might be able to serve as a member of the minority, and who knows how that will come out. I mean, it's always up to the voters to make that determination.

But I would say that those 127 amendments about which my friend referred and then I referred when I was in the well are amendments that I had to encourage our colleagues to file. Why? First, there were only 2 days, 2 legislative days, that this bill was out there. And if we had had an open amendment process, as I said, I can say with absolute certainty there would not be 127 amendments filed to this measure; again, maybe half that, maybe many fewer than that. And many of those amendments are duplicative. And the reason is that Members might find themselves in the same position as Mr.

BUYER did. And that's why I say my friend has served exclusively as a member of the majority; but if one day he is serving here as a member of the minority and were to receive the word that he could not make a minor, germane modification to his amendment, I think that he would understand the concern that we have.

Members on this side of the aisle represent just a little less than half of the American people. And they all have just as much right to be heard as Members of the majority. I recognize that the majority does rule in this place, but that does not mean that we should prevent Members from being able to participate in this process.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART has entered into the RECORD a document that was put forward in the 108th Congress by the now-chairwoman of the Committee on Rules, the then-ranking minority member. She, at that time, held the position that I have. And the document describes what we are using as our procedure for consideration of this measure as a ''restrictive process.''

Now, traditionally, Democrats and Republicans alike have called it a modified open rule. But the preprinting requirement, according to this document, blocks any amendment proposal that might emerge during the course of the debate. Now, those are not my words; those are the words of Ms. SLAUGHTER when she was ranking minority member on the Committee on Rules.

And so all I'm arguing, Mr. Speaker, is that in the name of deliberative democracy, this notion of saying that every Member has had an opportunity to look at this—2 legislative days—and the fact that 127 amendments were filed meant that there was this exhaustive analysis of the bill, I think, is not an accurate way to characterize it.

The 127 amendments were filed—I believe that many of those 127 amendments were filed because we are not having what has been the longstanding tradition allowed to Members of this House, and that is an open amendment process for consideration of the measure. And that's why, again, I urge my colleagues to vote with Mr. DIAZ-BALART in opposition to the previous question. And when that is defeated, make in order his amendment that would simply allow Members to have the right to make germane modifications to their amendments.

I also submit for the RECORD a copy of the announcement I posted on the Committee on Rules Republican web site, instructing Members of the restrictions created by a restrictive pre-printing rule and giving them guidance about how best to preserve their right to have amendments considered.

MAJORITY RESTRICTS AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Earlier today, the Majority announced that next week the House will consider H.R. ____, the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2010.

However, unlike consideration of virtually all of appropriations bills during the years of the Republican Majority, the Democratic Majority has announced its intention to restrict the amendment process by requiring all amendments to be pre-printed in the Congressional Record by the end of the legislative day on June 15, 2009. Members should be aware that this deadline allows barely 2 legislative days to draft and submit amendments for printing.

This is a subtle—yet extremely significant—departure from the long-standing, bipartisan tradition of considering most of the regular appropriations bills under completely open rules. This change means—

Members must file their amendments by the deadline announced by the Majority, or they will not be able to offer their amendments;

If the amendment is not printed in the Congressional Record by the deadline (perhaps due to space limitations imposed by the Government Printing Office or other printing problems), Members will not be able to offer their amendments;

If the Office of Legislative Counsel is unable to keep up with the demand for drafting amendments by the deadline, those Members will be unable to offer their amendments;

If Members need to change their amendments during the process (for instance, if an offset is stricken by an earlier amendment), they will not be permitted to do so;

If a bill is considered over multiple days, Members will not be able to offer amendments if they are printed after the deadline announced by the Majority, even if the bill is still being debated;

In many cases, Members will have to file amendments without the benefit of a review by the Office of the Parliamentarian or the Congressional Budget Office, and may not receive early notice on possible points of order; and,

If Members need to change their own amendments to correct technical errors or reflect a negotiated change, they will not be permitted to do so, except through unanimous consent. The Majority has demonstrated that it is openly hostile to allowing Members to make technical corrections on the floor after an amendment has been printed.

Members and staff are encouraged to watch the video on our website entitled ''The Problem with Pre-Printing'' which demonstrates some of the problems that can arise from a pre-printing rule. You may also wish to review the materials dealing with appropriations bills which are part of our Parliamentary Boot Camp educational series and our fact sheet on pre-printing amendments in the Congressional Record.

In order to assist Members in bringing their ideas to the floor even with this restrictive amendment process, the Rules Committee Republicans suggest the following:

1. Make sure the amendments are printed by the deadline. This is the most important element of a pre-printing rule. Unlike years past, where the rule simply required that the amendment be printed in the Congressional Record at any point during consideration of the bill, the Democratic Majority has set hard deadlines for pre-printing, meaning that you may be deprived of the opportunity to offer your amendment if you miss the deadline, even when the bill is considered on multiple days.

2. Coordinate with the Republican staff of the Appropriations Committee. They will do their best to advise you on possible procedural problems (including compliance with the Budget Act), even if they disagree with the substance of your amendment.

3. File multiple versions of amendments. If you are concerned about possible points of order that may lie against your amendment, such as budget act violations, violations of ''legislating on appropriations bills,'' or other similar points of order, you should file multiple versions of the amendment to give yourself options if you want to offer it. If it is not printed, it cannot be offered.

4. In a pinch, don't be afraid to draft your own amendment. While the Office of Legislative Counsel provides excellent, nonpartisan advice and drafting services, they are not always able to provide drafted amendments by the printing deadline. If they are unable to provide assistance by the deadline, prepare the amendment in your own office and submit it. While it is advisable, there is no requirement that amendments be drafted by the Office of Legislative Counsel.

5. Amendments should be drafted with relative references instead of page and line numbers. The Majority has posted the text of the bill on the Rules Committee's website, but this is not the final version of the bill. When printed by GPO, the page and line numbers will likely change. By drafting references relative to the rest of the bill (i.e., ''In the second sentence of the paragraph captioned . . .'') you will protect yourself against changes resulting from the printing process.

6. Consult with the Parliamentarians, CBO, and the Budget Committee. Even if an amendment is printed in the Record by the deadline, it is still subject to potential points of order or Budget Act violations. However, if you cannot get an answer from these offices by the deadline, you should still file the amendment for pre-printing and continue to pursue your inquiries.

The Republican staff of the Committee on Rules stands ready to assist your offices in dealing with this restrictive amendment process. Should you have any questions, please contact the Republican staff of the Committee on Rules at x5–9191.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia, the distinguished chairman of the Commerce, Justice and Science Subcommittee, Mr. MOLLOHAN.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I thank the gentleman for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule. I think it is a fair rule and comprehensive. And, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out the effort that went into fashioning this bill, which was very exhaustive and very inclusive of all parties.

During the review process, Mr. Speaker, for this bill, the fiscal year 2010 budget request for the Commerce, Justice and Science and Related Agencies Appropriation bill, the subcommittee had a total of 24 budget hearings. I understand that we didn't get the budget request until late this year, but we had budget hearings even before we got the request and budget hearings even after we got the request.

The subcommittee received testimony from Members of Congress—many Members of Congress inputted this process early on before we marked up—and some 68 outside witnesses. This testimony was crucial to our fashioning the bill, and the thoughts and the concerns of those who contributed are incorporated in this bill. In addition, officials of the administration representing all of the Departments in the bill one way or another inputted the legislation by testimony or otherwise.

And this year in particular, Mr. Speaker, the subcommittee focused on a series of hearings on investments for all facets of the scientific enterprise—climate science and mitigation—as well as prisoner reentry programs, recidivism reduction, and criminal justice reform.

Mr. Speaker, we focused on some of those areas because we felt that in the past there had been neglect, and that we needed, for our economy and also for just appropriate operation of these agencies, that additional funding was needed.

In brief, the bill totals $64.4 billion, which is an increase of $6.7 billion over last year, and it's $200 million below the President's request. The bill provides $30.6 billion for investments in science, technology, and innovation, an increase of $1 billion over comparable levels from last year.

I think there is a consensus that investments in science technology and investments in innovation are comparable to economic development necessary for us as we prepare for the new economy, as we work our way out of the recession that we find ourselves in. Investments in the new economy are crucial, and this committee that funds science is at the center in the critical path of that effort.

Within this level, the bill provides $6.9 billion for the National Science Foundation and $18.2 billion for NASA. For NIST, the bill provides $781 million, and NOAA is recommended at $4.6 billion. The committee's recommendation continues to provide the resources consistent with the doubling path identified.

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

Mr. ARCURI. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. It also considers the science and research conducted at NOAA and NASA as critical to the Nation's science enterprise.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the Rules Committee for fashioning a rule that recognizes, first, the welcoming input that this committee has had from our colleagues throughout the process. The minority has been fully a part of the process. We very much appreciate Mr. WOLF's contribution to the bill. Many of his thoughts—I can't think of one that's not incorporated in the legislation one way or another. He was a former chairman of this subcommittee, and therefore his contribution and his insight is particularly beneficial, and we appreciate that contribution.

I support the rule, Mr. Speaker, and hope that our colleagues will as well.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Again, I would like to thank the distinguished gentleman from New York for his ongoing leadership, and that of the Rules Committee.

I join with the chairman of the Subcommittee on CJS, Mr. MOLLOHAN, in congratulating the Rules Committee for constructing this rule, but I also congratulate Chairman MOLLOHAN and Ranking Member WOLF for a constructive overview of important issues that, as a member of the House Judiciary Committee, I have great concern about.

And so I rise to support the rule, but I also want to offer my underlying support for the Community Oriented Policing bill. I was an original cosponsor on the COPS bill out of Judiciary, led by Mr. WEINER. This is an important stopgap for crime across America helping our law enforcement.

As an original long-standing supporter of the Office on Violence Against Women and the VAWA Act, starting with Chairman Hyde, who served so ably in this body, I am delighted to see that we have $11 million more than 2009, with $400 million.

□ 1615

In addition, it is important to note the Second Chance Act. Wherever I go, Mr. Speaker, I'm having ex-offenders who want to straighten their life out, who want to get back with their families, who need mental health services, and they truly need to have the second chance. I hope that we can ensure that this makes it through the Senate, comes into conference, and we get this money out so that we can redeem Americans who want to get back on the right track. This is an important issue to be involved in.

I also want to speak about an issue that is very near and dear. I am a member of the NASA Action Team. And we note that the space exploration, human spaceflight, has gotten a mark out of this committee of $400 million less than the President's mark. First, I'm delighted that the President has nominated General Bolden, who is in line to be the next NASA Director. But to my colleagues, it is important to note that we're not just talking about money going into space; we're talking about the International Space Station, which I have watched being built in my 12 years as a member of the Health Science Committee.

We have an opportunity now to be at the cutting edge of climate research, the cutting edge of health care research and heart disease, HIV, and cancer on the International Space Station. The only way we can communicate visibly and reasonably to provide that kind of human component, human resources, is to have human spaceflight.

So I ask my colleagues, as we consider this bill, to consider the fact that it is not, in essence, money that flies into space but real investment in America's genius and America's science, America's innovation, America's job creation, the very message of this President.

I'm disappointed that this mark is less than the President's mark and would hope to be able to present my side of the story, if you will, to this august body. But I want to work with my colleagues to ensure that we know that this is out of sincerity and recognition of the vitality of science. I'm very pleased with the money that has been put into climate measures, money put into NOAA because I come from the gulf region.

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

Mr. ARCURI. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Speaker, I realize how important it is to have these other elements of science. As I indicated, the $1.3 billion, including $150 million to deal with space-based climate measurements, is important. For those of us who are in the gulf region, the issues dealing with hurricanes and climate control and NOAA are very important, and the National Science Foundation.

But let us work together as we look at science in its totality to view the International Space Station as something we created, something we built. This massive football field that is in space is a miracle, in essence. Let's utilize it in a vital way by supporting our human spaceflight.

I thank my colleagues and I ask my colleagues to support the rule.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend Mr. ARCURI for his courtesy and all who have participated in the debate on the rule for bringing this appropriations bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I will be asking for a ''no'' vote on the previous question so that we can amend this rule and allow Members who have preprinted their amendments, as specified in the rule, to make germane modifications to their amendments.

As I mentioned in my opening remarks, this restrictive rule we are considering today will not allow Members from amending their own amendments, even if they are simply trying to correct a minor drafting error or make changes to the amendment to comply with the rules of the House. One of the reasons we have so many amendments filed is because Members have filed duplicative amendments to avoid the possibility of errors such as this.

In order to make sure an amendment complies with the rules of the House, Members must consult with four different offices: the Office of the Legislative Counsel, the Parliamentarian, the Congressional Budget Office, and the Budget Committee. If any of those offices find an issue with an amendment, then the Member has to make changes to the amendment. This becomes particularly difficult when Members are only given an average of 2 legislative days to draft their amendments and consult all the relevant offices and make changes and then consult with the offices again. Given this scenario, it is quite plausible that a Member didn't have enough time and included a

minor drafting error and that, for example, is not caught until it is too late. We saw it last year with an amendment by Mr. BUYER on the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs appropriations bill. So as to not have a repeat of that unfortunate incident, I propose to change the rule to allow Members to make germane changes to their amendments.

I remind Members that by voting ''no'' on the previous question, Members will not be voting to kill or to delay the underlying Commerce, Justice, Science Appropriations bill. I encourage all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote ''no'' on the previous question so that Members will be given the opportunity to make changes to their amendments if necessary.

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 gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART) for his courtesies in this debate and for his very able management of this rule.

Mr. Speaker, on my opening remarks, I chose to focus on the criminal justice programs that are funded under H.R. 2847, but there are many other important areas addressed in this legislation, and we have heard about many of those during the debate. In closing, I would like to take the opportunity to discuss another of these that is of utmost importance to America.

The bill includes $293 million for the Economic Development Administration, which is $20 million above the amount enacted in 2009. The EDA administers several economic programs, including public works grants for upgrading infrastructure, planning, and trade adjustment assistance for communities that bear the burden of jobs outsourced to other countries.

H.R. 2847 includes more than $158 million for the Economic Development Administration's Public Works Program, $25 million more than last year. H.R. 2847 also makes critical investments in scientific research and NASA's space program. The bill includes $6.9 billion for the National Science Foundation. This level of funding will support the doubling of NSF's budget over the next 10 years and represents a true commitment to investment in basic research and development which will provide for innovation and future technologies to help the United States be competitive.

H.R. 2847 includes over $18.2 billion for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. NASA's unique mission is to pioneer the future in space exploration, scientific discovery in aeronautics research, and this appropriation enables them to accomplish this mission. This recommendation also provides for the continued efforts of NASA's Mars exploration and provides funds for the completion of the Mars science laboratory to launch in 2011. Exploration has always been critical to mankind. We live in America today because of exploration. We must continue to explore the new frontier for future generations.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would remind my colleagues that so far we have discussed only a handful of the important programs that are funded by the fiscal year 2010 Commerce, Justice, Science Appropriations bill. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 2847. I urge a ''yes'' vote on the previous question and on the bill.

The material previously referred to by Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 544 OFFERED BY MR. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART OF FLORIDA

On page 2, line 21, after ''if printed.'' insert the following new sentence, ''The proponent of each such amendment may make germane modifications to such amendment.''

(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. Mr. Speaker, 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.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART. 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, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Adoption of House Resolution 545, by the yeas and nays;

ordering the previous question on House Resolution 544, by the yeas and nays;

adoption of House Resolution 544, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2346, SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2009

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of House Resolution 545, 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 resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 183, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 345]

YEAS—238

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Becerra
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
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McGovern
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
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)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NAYS—183

Aderholt
Akin
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
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
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
Fallin
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Guthrie
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kaptur
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Kratovil
Kucinich
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
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Minnick
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Waters
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—12

Alexander
Bean
Berkley
Hall (TX)
Kennedy
Larson (CT)
Lewis (GA)
McDermott
Pence
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sullivan
Young (FL)

□ 1648

Messrs. McHUGH, McKEON, KINGSTON, SESSIONS, and RUSH changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

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.

Ms. BEAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 345, H. Res. 545, had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2847, COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 544, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 247, nays 176, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 346]

YEAS—247

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
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
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
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
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
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
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
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
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NAYS—176

Aderholt
Akin
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)

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
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
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
McHugh
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
Radanovich
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)
Souder
Stearns
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—10

Alexander
Berkley
Cuellar
Kennedy
Larson (CT)
Lewis (GA)
Reyes
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sullivan
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1656

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 247, nays 174, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 347]

YEAS—247

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
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
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
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
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
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
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NAYS—174

Aderholt
Akin
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
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
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
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
McHugh
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
Radanovich
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)
Souder
Stearns
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—12

Alexander
Berkley
Boozman
Carnahan
Green, Gene
Kennedy
Larson (CT)
Lewis (GA)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sullivan
Walz
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Two minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1702

Ms. WATERS changed her vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

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.

Stated for:

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 347, had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

REPORT ON H.R. 2892, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111–157) on the bill (H.R. 2892) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1 of rule XXI, all points of order are reserved.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2346, SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2009

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 545, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2346) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2009, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 545, the conference report is considered read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 12, 2009, at page H6683.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is the last of last year's business. We have a huge amount of work that we have to do before the August recess. We have to pass all 12 appropriation bills, we have to make time on the schedule for health care reform, for the military authorization bill, and for historic climate change legislation. I just think we ought to get on with it.

I think everybody understands what is in this bill, and the sooner we can get on with it, the sooner we can get on with this year's business.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that we at least for now appear to be returning to regular order on appropriations bills as we deal with this emergency supplemental that is before us. However, I must confess to being disappointed at the turn this final product has taken in recent days as compared to where we began with our original House-passed bill. The majority has chosen to go to the high-dollar level for every account in this conference report, except as it relates to the primary purpose of the legislation, the critical troop funding in the Department of Defense and Military Construction accounts.

My understanding of the final conference agreement is that it cuts the House level for DOD and MilCon by $4.6 billion. More disconcerting is that the final package includes $5 billion for IMF funding that was not a part of the original House package. This $5 billion for foreign aid will secure a whopping $108 billion in loans.

Mr. Speaker, I must say, this is such an important message and important piece of legislation, I think it is important that our constituents, as well as our colleagues, pay careful attention to this debate.

In essence, in this package the IMF is funded at a level almost $30 billion more than what is provided for our troops, which supposedly was what this bill was all about. What began as a troop funding bill has become a means of fulfilling the President's promise to provide more IMF funding, or foreign aid, for international bailouts.

If that isn't bad enough, the conference agreement also includes $1 billion in emergency spending for the Cash for Clunkers program that was not a part of either the House or the Senate package, nor was it requested by the President.

I understand the conferees have dropped the Graham-Lieberman-McCain language relating to the release of detainee photos. The conferees have also significantly watered down language relating to the release or transfer of detainees at Guantanamo Bay. This is an issue that is and will continue to be of great concern to many of us, as well as the American people.

Just last week, the President approved having a Guantanamo detainee transferred to New York City and ordered the release and transfer of four Uyghers to Bermuda. The President appears to be racing to move these detainees to their new homes before Congress can act substantively on the issue of closing Guantanamo.

During last week's conference meeting, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. GRANGER and I offered several amendments. The first, offered by Ms. GRANGER, sought approval of the Senate provision prohibiting the release of detainee photos. The second motion, offered by Mr. YOUNG, insisted upon the higher House funding level for DOD and MilCon spending in this conference agreement. And the third motion, which I offered, insisted upon agreeing to section 202(a) and section 315 of the Senate bill prohibiting the transfer or release of Guantanamo detainees. All three amendments were defeated in a party-line vote by the House conferees.

As I prepare to close, let me make one additional point. Much has been made about the total cost of this emergency supplemental. I note for the record that the final conference agreement is $106 billion, which is $14 billion more than the President's request, $9 billion more than the House-passed bill, and $15 billion more than the Senate-passed level.

Again, we have increased funding for everything in this bill except for the troops. Arguments about maintaining some level of fiscal responsibility certainly ring hollow when we lard up a troop funding bill with taxpayer dollars to support foreign aid for hostile governments and cash for cars past their prime. This is a troubling pattern that is being repeated in many of our funding bills this year.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, it is a shame that a process that began in a spirit of bipartisanship has concluded in such a partisan manner. We began as a united, bipartisan House seeking to support our troops, but have ended this process by appeasing the very Members who opposed this emergency funding in the first place.

I strongly support our troops, but cannot and will not support an international bailout for hostile regimes disguised as a troop funding bill.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include tabular and extraneous material on the conference report to accompany H.R. 2346.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I would simply note in light of the gentleman's comments on the IMF that in 1999, the last time we voted on it, the IMF funding was attached to the Transportation bill and 162 Republicans voted for it. They didn't seem to have any problem at that time. I find it interesting that today, with a different President, they do.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY).

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the ranking member.

The distinguished chairman of the committee said we know what is in this bill. That may or may not be accurate, but we certainly know what is not in this bill. The conferees ignored the specific instructions of a bipartisan vote to include instructions to protect the detainee photos of alleged abuses that went on in our custody.

Mr. Speaker, the protection of these photos, to prevent their release, requires a legislative fix, in my view. I don't believe the President has full authority to stand against the judicial branch, so we need to protect these photos from release.

Even the court has recognized the validity of the claims of harm that would come from release of these photos, whether it is recruitment of additional jihadists or inflaming the current jihadists into doing things they might not otherwise have done, but also perhaps squelch the growing protests in Iran if we were to release the photos showing this abuse. Think back to the cartoon that was released in the Danish paper that insulted Mohammad and the overreaction to that cartoon. Think what the release of these photos would do to our relationships.

The military leadership, Generals Odierno and Petraeus, both oppose the release of these photos. They have persuaded Secretary Gates and President Obama to change their original position, and they too now oppose the release of these photos.

The release of these photos will serve no good purpose. They will get young

Americans hurt that don't need to get hurt. I am disappointed that the conferees did not include the instructions that we specifically gave them to protect these photos from disclosure.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this supplemental.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve my time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), the finest whip Virginia has ever produced.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill. America has the best military in the world. I think all of us who have traveled and who have seen the commitment of our Armed Forces are overwhelmed by their patriotism. The success of our military has much to do with the character and the courage of the men and women in uniform who fight every single day for our freedom.

□ 1715

And what we can do, as Members of this Congress, to speak to that courage and that commitment on the part of those men and women is to stand up and to remove politics from bills affecting their ability to execute on their mission to protect us.

Mr. Speaker, we can pass a bipartisan bill. This House has shown several weeks ago, we passed a bill with a 368–60 vote, clearly, a bipartisan bill sending the message that this Congress stood for our troops and nothing got in the way.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, we now find a conference report that will make its way to this House that is vastly different from the bill approved in a bipartisan way.

Number one, Mr. Speaker, the provisions in the conference report that will make its way to this floor seem to put the rights of terrorists before the security of Americans. When we see that this body somehow wants to remove language prohibiting the transfer of detainees at Guantanamo Bay to U.S. soil, when this House allows for that transfer, what that says is we are willing to take on untold risk at the expense of the security of the people that our troops are trying to protect.

Next, Mr. Speaker, we have seen the conferees take out language that would prohibit the release of photographs that we know will endanger the lives of our troops. Our commander on the ground in Iraq, General Odierno, was very clear in his admonition several weeks ago when he said our troops will be put in greater harm's way, and specific units will have enhanced danger immediately, if these photographs are allowed to be released.

And I know that the majority says that we've got protections, that the White House will stand up and not allow for their release. But at the end of the day, we have the ability to stop it and to act now.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield the gentleman another 1 minute.

Mr. CANTOR. And I ask that this House stand up, act now, and make sure that these photos don't make their ways to brochures for recruitment of al Qaeda or make their way on to Internet sites to help attract more terrorists in the fight against our troops.

And lastly, Mr. Speaker, to burden our troops with $108 billion of a loan guarantee to a global bailout is not putting our troops first. That's putting politics before our troops, and that's unacceptable to the American people.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) a member of the Defense Subcommittee of Appropriations.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, if the defense portion of the supplemental were considered as a standalone legislation it would receive my support and the majority of those on this side of the aisle. We recognize that we need to provide our deployed men and women, all volunteers, with the funding and resources they need to accomplish their important ongoing missions in Iraq and Afghanistan. But unfortunately, the majority has added items to this measure totally unrelated to these wars.

First, the much-debated IMF provision, which interestingly enough, allows our country drawing rights for the first time in the history of the IMF.

Secondly, the majority stripped language from this bill that would have prevented release of photographs of detainees, thus endangering U.S. citizens and members of our own Armed Forces overseas.

Thirdly, the majority inserted watered-down language on the closing of Guantanamo Bay, allowing for these dangerous prisoners to be brought to the U.S. for trial 45 days after the Obama administration submits certain paperwork to Congress. These all represent reasons to vote ''no,'' to send this legislation back to the drawing board, and to come back with a straightforward bill that supports our troops.

But I want to use this time to talk about the direction of our national security funding, our defense spending. If you believe the administration, this will be the last supplemental appropriations bill to fund our operations in Afghanistan and Iraq, even though our forces will remain in Iraq for a significant number of years and our efforts in Afghanistan are just now ramping up.

The administration says it's putting such costs for future soldier needs into the base appropriations bill. However, it doesn't take a green eyeshade to determine that the administration's request, combined with the rate of inflation, essentially adds up to no growth. We're standing still. We're treading water.

And in a world where the North Koreans threaten conventional nuclear war, Russia is becoming more resurgent and aggressive, and China is rapidly increasing its aggressiveness.

For these reasons, I rise to oppose this conference report.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, could I please check and see how much time there is on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 17½ minutes remaining. And the gentleman from Wisconsin has 29 minutes remaining.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to TOM COLE, one of the fabulous new members on our side of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this conference report, and I do that with a heavy heart, quite frankly. When this measure was initially before us I supported it enthusiastically. And in my remarks I praised the President. I thought he'd made a tough decision and deserved bipartisan support. I praised the majority because they had brought us, I think, a very good and finely crafted bill. And frankly, I was proud of the minority because we stepped up unconditionally, supported the President, provided the votes that he needed to win and make a difference to have not just a bipartisan majority, but Republican votes that put us in the majority.

I felt like we dealt with the President and the administration in good faith. And frankly, I don't think, since that point, that faith has been reciprocated. Over the course of the process as this legislation's moved through, IMF funding has been added. It scores at $5 billion but it's a considerably greater amount of money that will be deployed.

We've had this issue with the photos. We've had the issue of detainees. And frankly, throughout that, there's been no effort to negotiate with our side of the aisle, which did provide the funding again, the votes needed to pass the original bill, you know, without condition. And frankly, it's almost as if there was assumption on the other side that we would either roll over or be blackmailed or be bullied into supporting the bill simply because of the military funding in it.

And I wonder whether or not, in retrospect, it was worth losing literally dozens and dozens of Republicans that were prepared to support this bill in a bipartisan fashion in order to add these other measures which could have, frankly, been brought to the floor on their own.

So I'm forced to urge the rejection of this conference report. I would hope that we could restore the military funding that was taken out. I would hope that we could strip the unrelated IMF funding, and I would hope that we

could practice once again the bipartisanship that led us to such an overwhelming success in the original bill. And if we go back to that method, I think that the President and the administration will be able to rely on continued bipartisan support in the tough decisions they have to make going forward.

Mr. OBEY. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. I rise in strong support of this legislation. Eighty percent or more of this bill is to support the young men and women, and some not so young, whom we have sent in harm's way in Iraq and Afghanistan to confront terrorism. We passed that bill. We passed it with 368 votes.

It then went to the Senate, and the Senate amended the bill and added additional funding for the IMF, the International Monetary Fund. That did not squeak by on some partisan vote. In fact, more than two-thirds of the Senators voting on that issue, including approximately 25 percent of the Republicans voting on that issue, voted to include the IMF. Why? Because, like Ronald Reagan, President George Bush in the 1990s, President George Bush in 2008, because they believed that the IMF itself was an important asset in the seeking of security by the United States of America.

Now, we didn't put it in that bill. But it's supported by two-thirds of the United States Senate, supported by the President of the United States, who, when he met with the G–20, pledged to play our part in trying to bring the security that this country has paid so dearly to achieve. Our share is approximately 20 percent. The other members of the G–20, 19 nations, will be putting up 80 percent. Why? Because they too believe this is enhancing the security of their countries and also what they think it does to lift up the poorest nations of the world. Not Iran, who hasn't gotten any money since 1984 when Ronald Reagan was President, the last time Iran got money from the IMF. Not Hezbollah, no discussions with them. The United States would clearly weigh in to stop such funding; properly so.

So we have a bill that seeks security and peace, and it's two-pronged now, not one. And I suggest to you that it is my belief that if it were a Republican President asking for this that this bill would pass with some 368 votes again. Why? Because Democrats would join in the Republican President's request, as we have in the past, and say this is for America's security, for international security, and we'll support it.

Now, this bill does some other things. We have a pandemic flu, swine flu, H1N1 flu, that is now at a level that the World Health Organization says is 41 years historically in the context. And the administration has said, because of that, we need additional funds for new vaccines.

We didn't have that in our bill. Clearly, there's not a Member in this House that doesn't want to take care of the health of our people. I might say, although he doesn't carry a lot of weight on your side of the aisle, that Jim Leach has strongly endorsed this effort; for the same reason, Ronald Reagan, who we honored just the other day. Just the other day we heard so many people say what a great leader Ronald Reagan was.

I'm going to quote Ronald Reagan for you, if I can find it real quickly. Ronald Reagan said this: The IMF is the linchpin of the international financial system. That's Ronald Reagan. He went on to say, I have an unbreakable commitment to increased funding for IMF. That's not a Democrat. That is a conservative leader that you revere, who led this country, and was strongly supported by this country.

And I want you to know that I supported Ronald Reagan on most of his security initiatives, as my good friend JERRY LEWIS knows, because I believed that we needed to make America stronger and to tell our Soviet adversaries that we were prepared to invest in the security of our country.

□ 1730

I think, in doing so, they ultimately decided that they couldn't compete, and glasnost and perestroika came about.

The first President Bush said this: ''The IMF and the World Bank are at the crossroads of our cooperative efforts.''

Remember the responsibility of Speaker Gingrich when he said in 1998: ''We have an obligation to work with the International Monetary Fund.''

This is not a partisan issue, but I suggest to you it has been made a partisan reason to oppose this bill and to try to embarrass Democrats, very frankly, that we can't pass funding. We can and we will. I urge you to join us. I urge you to forget the partisan rhetoric. I urge you to think of Ronald Reagan, of George Bush, of the second George Bush, of Newt Gingrich, and of so many other Republican leaders who I won't take the time to quote, who have said that this is a critical component of our security apparatus.

We did not have it in our bill, but we all know how the legislative process works. The other body, particularly when it does so by a two-thirds vote, adds legislation. The President of the United States believes that's good legislation, and very frankly, I believe it's good legislation, and many in this House do as well. Would we have added it? We didn't, but it's here.

Do not use this addition by the United States Senate as a reason to say, ''I can't vote,'' for 80 percent of this bill supports those young men and women and, as I said, some not so young who are deployed abroad in the defense of freedom and in the furtherance of our security.

I will tell you, my friends, on numerous occasions, as most of you know who have served with me, I have put my card in the slot or have come to this well or have raised my voice on behalf of Republican Presidents who sought to further the security of this country. I am proud of those votes. I am proud of that voice. I ask you to join me today to support our troops, to support our national security, to support propping up countries that will be the repositories of economies that will further the ability of terrorists to recruit in countries that find themselves without jobs, without economic opportunity for their young people and that will have them turn and be recruited by those who would undermine their lives and would recruit them as terrorists.

So I urge each one of my colleagues: This is a vote for America, for its interests and for its troops. Do not delude yourselves that this is not a vote to support the troops. Eighty percent plus of this bill is about American servicemen and women in harm's way. Stand up for them.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for the majority leader, and he is very eloquent at the microphone, but he forgot to mention a couple of things that, I think, the American people would like to know.

For instance, 80 percent of this bill is helping the troops, but this is a war supplemental; 100 percent should be helping our troops. In addition to that, he did not mention that this is a 22 percent reduction from what was in the supplemental last year, so we're actually cutting funding to the troops by 22 percent over what we did last year, and we're just expanding our operation into Afghanistan. So I think that the people ought to really get the whole picture. The whole picture is that this is a war supplemental, and it's being cut over what we spent last year for the same type of legislation.

Now, he mentioned the International Monetary Fund, the $5 billion for that. This is a war supplemental. This is not an IMF bill. It's going to create $108 billion in additional loaning capability by the IMF. A few of the countries that will benefit from this with Special Drawing Rights are people who are not our friends—like Venezuela, Mr. Chavez down there; like Iran, a terrorist state; Yemen; Syria; Zimbabwe; and Burma.

So I would just like to say—and I would never admonish the majority leader, because he is a great man, and I really like him—let's get all of the facts out there and not just part of them.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

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

Mr. PENCE. I thank the distinguished ranking member of the Appropriations Committee for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant opposition to the military supplemental bill that is before Congress today. I was pleased to join many of my Democratic colleagues in supporting the bipartisan military supplemental bill that passed this House earlier in this Congress.

It seems to me, when it comes to providing our soldiers with the resources they need to get the job done and to come home safe, it's the right time to set aside politics as usual—the partisan divide—and go forward to the best of our abilities in a united front. We did that, but I cannot support this military supplemental bill today. I see it as a disservice to the taxpayers of this country and as a disservice to those brave men and women who defend us every day.

You know, in the midst of difficult economic times, it's easy for some people to forget that we are a Nation at war, and it's easy to go back to politics as usual and to spending as usual; but with American soldiers in harm's way, we must never falter in our effort to make sure those soldiers have everything they need to get the job done and to come home to us and to their families safely.

Emergency war funding bills should be about emergency war funding. This legislation, which includes $108 billion in loan authorizations for a global bailout for the International Monetary Fund at a time when this government has run up a $2 trillion annual deficit I believe does a disservice to taxpayers and to those who defend us. Passing a $108 billion global bailout on the backs of our soldiers is just not right.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this conference report. Stand with our troops. Stand with the American taxpayer. Stand against one more bailout. Let's reject this bill tonight, and let's come right back to this floor here tomorrow and bring a clean emergency war funding bill, in a bipartisan fashion, back into the legislative process.

It is time for us to reject this legislation, to reject the changes that were made in the United States Senate, to get our soldiers the resources they need, and to do it in a way that serves the broadest possible interests of the American taxpayer.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. McCOTTER), a member of our leadership.

Mr. McCOTTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report precisely because it is about our troops. The bill that left this Chamber with broad bipartisan support was 100 percent about our troops, and it is precisely now why it is only 80 percent about our troops. We should not allow for that 20 percent reduction to delude us that somehow this is a better bill.

I had the opportunity today to read in the detroitfreepress.com that the Treasury Department had said that $10 billion in loan guaranties to auto manufacturing suppliers was a nonstarter. They didn't have it. I come here tonight. I hear that we have $108 billion for the IMF.

This is not only about our troops. It is about the hardworking men and women who put money into the Federal Government not only to defend our troops but to defend their own way of life and their own prosperity and to make sure that it's here when they get back.

Of the $108 billion going off to the IMF, I did not hear of anyone at the IMF losing their jobs in a painful restructuring. I did not hear of anyone at the IMF being asked to take reductions in their lifetimes of hard-earned health care benefits. I did not see anyone lose anything from the IMF for the $108 billion underwriting by the U.S. taxpayers; but for $85 billion, I did see back home in Detroit people losing their jobs under a painful restructuring. I saw retirees losing health care benefits. I saw dealerships closing. I was told this was necessary. I was told by this administration that we've got to be careful not to put money into a sinkhole. Well, this is also about equity.

When those troops come home, when they come home to the Midwest, when they come home to my Michigan, I will look them in the eye and say, ''As long as I have been here, I have defended and supported our troops, but I have also made sure that, when you came home, you came back to the American opportunities that you left behind to defend us.''

As for the future that the majority leader has talked about, I don't have to speculate. Let me read you a statement:

If people tell you that we cannot afford to invest in education or in health care or in fighting poverty, you just remind them that we are spending $10 billion a month in Iraq.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. McCOTTER. If we can spend that much money in Iraq, we can spend some of that money right here in Cincinnati, Ohio, and in big cities and in small towns in every corner of this country.

That was candidate Barack Obama.

I would never take money from funds appropriated for our troops and use it for domestic spending. I have said that before; but if you're going to add $108 billion to fund a conference report for our troops, then spend it here in the United States. Spend it on the men and women who support our troops every day. Spend it on their families so they stay employed. Do not send it to the IMF. I oppose this bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it was a proud moment for us to be able to come together in a bipartisan fashion here in the House, as put together in the House, and support the supplemental for the troops; but to add this mess that's coming down here from the conference that the Senate stuck in—over $100 billion for the IMF? I mean they're loaning money that they get from us and that we're going to have to borrow from China in order to give it to countries that hate us and that would love to see us go away. That makes no sense.

If we are going to add this additional burden onto the American taxpayer, which is going to work counter to the troops who are out there, who are putting their lives at risk, why not just bring them home and not pay our enemies all that extra money and just call it a wash? If we're going to give money that we're going to have to borrow from the Chinese, let's just call it a wash and bring our troops home instead of funding our enemies. That's ridiculous. We should not go there. Let's stop this, and let's get back to the good bill we had in the House before.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of our time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I must mention I have only got one speaker remaining, so I would like to inquire of my colleague from Wisconsin just the status of his circumstances: You would be the person to close?

I will have to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I understand that we have the right to close, and we have only one remaining speaker.

I continue to reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, I have one additional speaker.

As long as you're giving me all of this flexibility, just let me mention that, as we began this process on this bill, both my chairman and I were very pleased by the fact that there was broadly based bipartisan support for giving the kind of assistance to our troops that is fundamental to our success in the Middle East. To have that package now come back from conference in the shape of being a bill that has reduced the President's request for troop funding by approximately $4.7 billion and, in turn, has a cost factor of some $5 billion for the IMF is most disconcerting to this Member.

I may have two additional speakers since my colleague here is standing.

□ 1745

Mr. NUNES. If the gentleman will yield.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. NUNES. I have a question for the gentleman because I know he has spent a lot of time on approps. I know you're from California, and we've talked a lot about the water issue in California.

Because this bill is going to go to the President and become law, this is one of our last opportunities to actually make law and get pumping levels back up to historic levels so we can provide water not only to San Joaquin Valley, but also to Los Angeles and San Diego. Do you think there's any possibility we could amend this bill and get something changed here so it will go to Obama's desk?

Mr. LEWIS of California. The gentleman is asking a very, very important question, and I will try to be straightforward in my response. This is a conference report in which both the House and the Senate have come together. The gentleman has raised his concerns about water in central California at a level that has gotten almost the entire country's attention. Indeed, if there were any way I could amend this package to help you solve this problem, the desperate need to get those pumps going to get water to our crops and the farmlands in Central Valley, I would do so. But, unfortunately, in this case, I am unable to help, but stand ready to try.

Mr. NUNES. Well, I would hope the gentleman would yield again.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Sure.

Mr. NUNES. As we go through the approps process, I know you will be helpful in trying to get the point across that we have 40,000 people right now without jobs in the San Joaquin Valley, long food lines, 20 percent unemployment. These are very serious issues, and I would hope that your committee will be helpful.

Mr. LEWIS of California. As we go through with our hearings, I might mention in just a few days ahead we will be discussing agriculture problems and challenges to funding for programs for the 2010 year. Indeed, one way or another, we are going to do everything we can to help the gentleman. So I very much appreciate his inquiry.

Mr. NUNES. Thank you.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I do have one additional speaker, and I am very proud to yield 1 minute to the Republican leader, Mr. BOEHNER.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I said earlier this year that when the President does what we think is the right thing for the American people, that he will have no stronger allies than House Republicans. We believe that the President has a responsible strategy in Iraq and in Afghanistan, and we have in fact supported him.

When this troop funding bill left the House, it left with a broad bipartisan majority. And as this bill is now considered, after a conference with the Senate, there are a couple of very troubling parts of this bill.

First and foremost, the addition of a $108 billion line of credit for the International Monetary Fund I think is unnecessary in this bill. And it's unnecessary because to ask our troops to carry money for a global bailout, frankly, I think is unfair. There is only about $80 billion in this bill for our troops, and here we're asking them to spend nearly $30 billion more to carry this global bailout.

Now, I've got to tell you, we may have enough money in the United States to solve our economic problems, but I'll guarantee you we don't have enough money to solve the world's economic problems. And when you think about the fact that we don't have $108 billion to loan to the IMF, so what's going to happen here? The United States is going to go to China, we're going to borrow $108 billion, we're going to give it to the IMF, and they're going to give it to countries, most of whom don't like us very much.

Now, I would suspect that most of my constituents would say, This is a bad deal, and, BOEHNER, we expect you to vote ''no.'' And trust me, I am going to vote ''no.'' But the fact is, it doesn't belong in this bill. That issue should be debated on its own and should be voted up or down on its own.

The second issue is that the Senate included language in their bill that would have protected these photos of detainees from being released. General Petraeus, General Odierno, and others, have made it clear that the release of these photos will endanger our troops. I believe it will also cripple the ability of our intelligence officials to do their job. And yet while it was supported in this House last week with another broad bipartisan vote, the language isn't in the bill; it's been taken out at the demands of the fringe left. And so I would suggest to my colleagues that this is not a bill that I can support.

I'm going to do everything I can to help our troops. They're doing a marvelous job on our behalf in helping to keep Americans safe. But to load this bill up with this kind of political gamesmanship is not what the American people expect of their Congress.

So I would ask my colleagues to stand up and say ''no'' to this bill. Let's bring back the broad bipartisan majority that passed the first bill and take care of our troops the right way. This is not the answer, though.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 4 minutes remaining; the gentleman from Wisconsin has 28 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, as I noted at the beginning of the debate, this item represents last year's left-over business. It is the last item of last year's left-over business.

We have been mired in a war for over 7 years. The President previous to this one has continually minimized the cost of that war by financing it on the installment plan. Instead of providing a full estimate of a yearly cost for the war, he would ask to fund that war in 6-month increments. And when he left office, there was still one 6-month increment left to go that was not yet paid for left over from his watch. And so this bill today, in the process of supporting the President's policies of trying to wind down that war, is providing the remaining funding for this fiscal year to help accomplish that.

In addition, this new President is trying to change the way that that war has been breaking in Afghanistan, and by necessity, Pakistan, which is integrally tied to the Afghanistan situation. And what he is trying to do is, through a combination of military action, political action, and diplomacy, he is trying to change the mix and gradually extricate ourselves from that conflict and stabilize that region politically in the process. I doubt that that will succeed. But this President, having inherited a God awful mess both at home and abroad, has a right to try to fix this situation. That's what the American people, in part, elected him to do. And so this bill provides the financing to do that.

And, yes, it added some other items that were not in the bill when it left the House. It did add funding for the IMF, about which our friends on the other side of the aisle roundly complain. But I would point out, in 1999, the last time I believe that we voted on this, the majority party then, our friends on the other side of the aisle, added IMF funding to the Transportation bill and 162 Republicans voted for it. I find it interesting that today, with a new President, they decline to provide that support.

We also added something else. The GI bill education proposal that the Congress passed last year, had one remaining gap which needed to be filled. That legislation said that if you served your country in the military a sufficient length of time, you could then obtain education benefits; and if you did not use them yourself, you could convert them to the use of your spouse or your children. This bill closes a gap because the one thing that that bill did not do last year was to enable a combat veteran who was killed in combat to make that same transfer of education benefits to a spouse or children. This bill provides that expanded benefit for our fighting men and women. It was not in the bill when it left the House. It is now. If you vote against this bill, that's one of the provisions you will be voting against.

We also have additional money for military hospitals that the administration did not request. We have additional help for the auto industry. I didn't think that was a Federal offense to try to provide some assistance to that industry. And, yes, we have a significant amount of additional funding for pandemic flu. Now, we tried to put that money initially in the original economic recovery package. We did put it in when the bill left the House. It

went to the Senate and we were laughed at. People said, ''Oh, what does the flu have to do with the economy and with jobs?'' Well, Mexico found out when they had to shut down their entire economy for 2 weeks because of the turmoil in that country with the flu. It is now estimated that as many as one-third of Americans will be hit by that flu. This bill has billions of additional dollars to try and meet that challenge. And I would submit to you that the average American family has a greater chance of being hit by that flu than it does to be hit by any terrorist presently ensconced in Guantanamo.

Now, we are also told that the IMF funding is bad because it borrows money in order to give to other countries. You know, this is a tough reality; we have to participate in the world. And when the world economy becomes shaky, we have a responsibility to ourselves to try to stabilize that world economic situation. That is one of the roles that the IMF tries to play. It certainly does it imperfectly—and I've had many arguments with them in the past—but to say that our contribution to the IMF does not benefit us is to be ignorant of history and to be ignorant of how the world economy works.

The fact is that we created the IMF after World War II. Why? Because we saw what led up to World War II. We saw the world's financial system collapse in the thirties. As a result, in Germany, Hitler came to power and 50 million people died. We would kind of like to avoid that this time. And so what we're trying to do is to provide the President with all the tools he needs internationally to defend our economic stability and to stabilize the economy of our trading partners because our economy does not function and we do not create sufficient jobs in this economy unless we help create economic conditions in other countries so they can buy our goods. That's why we do it. It's called enlightened self-interest.

In addition, it has been suggested that somehow money that we appropriate to the IMF is going to go to Iran. Well, let me tell you something, Mr. Speaker. Iran has not had a loan from the IMF since 1962. And under this legislation, the United States representative at the IMF is required to oppose any loan or assistance to countries such as Iran that have been designated by the Secretary of State as a state sponsor of terrorism.

The United States can effectively block loans that it opposes. We've got by far the largest block of votes of any single member. And I doubt very seriously that the IMF is going to approve any loan that we don't approve of.

One other thing. We've been told that somehow the President is endangering national security because he has not allowed the Congress to pass the Lieberman amendment with respect to the release of those pictures. The fact is the President sent to the conferees a letter and made quite clear that he will do everything in his power to prevent the use of those pictures. I want to quote one paragraph from his letter:

□ 1800

''I deeply appreciate all you have done to help with the efforts to secure funding for the troops and assure you I will continue to take every legal and administrative remedy available to me to ensure that DOD detainee photographs are not released. Should a legislative solution prove necessary, I am committed to work with the Congress to enact legislation that achieves the objectives we all share.''

Now, each of us can nitpick or object to certain specifics in this bill, but the great thing about democracy is that after we've had a chance to state our first preferences and fight for what we believe in, in the end we also have an obligation to reach consensus and move on. That's what this bill tries to do. It must be finished before we can move on to finish the rest of our appropriation bills and to get to the other huge items on the agenda, including health care and climate change.

I urge an ''aye'' vote for the bill.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT 2009 (H.R. 2346) CONFERENCE AGREEMENT (H.REPT. 111-151)
(Amounts in thousands)

	Request	House	Senate	Conference Agreement	Conference vs. House	Conference vs. Senate
SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2009						
TITLE I						
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE						
Foreign Agricultural Service						
Public Law 480 Title II Grants	300,000	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	500,000	700,000	---	-500,000	-700,000
(emergency)	---	---	---	700,000	+700,000	+700,000
TITLE I GENERAL PROVISION						
Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program Account:						
Additional Loan authorizations:						
Farm ownership loans:						
Direct	---	(360,000)	(360,000)	(360,000)	---	---
Farm operating loans:						
Direct	---	(400,000)	(225,000)	(400,000)	---	(+175,000)
Unsubsidized guaranteed	---	(50,201)	---	(50,201)	---	(+50,201)
Subtotal	---	(450,201)	(225,000)	(450,201)	---	(+225,201)
Additional Loan subsidies:						
Farm ownership loans:						
Direct (overseas deployments and activities)	---	22,860	---	---	-22,860	---
Direct (emergency)	---	---	22,860	22,860	+22,860	---
Farm operating loans:						
Direct (overseas deployments and activities)	---	47,160	---	---	-47,160	---
Direct (emergency)	---	---	26,530	47,160	+47,160	+20,630
Unsubsidized guaranteed:						
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	1,250	---	---	-1,250	---
(emergency)	---	---	---	1,250	+1,250	+1,250
Subtotal	---	48,410	26,530	48,410	---	+21,880
Rural Development mission (rescission)(emergency)	---	-71,270	-49,390	---	+71,270	+49,390
Total, Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund	---	---	---	71,270	+71,270	+71,270
(Loan authorization)	---	(810,201)	(585,000)	(810,201)	---	(+225,201)
Total, Title I	300,000	500,000	700,000	771,270	+271,270	+71,270
Appropriations	(300,000)	---	---	---	---	---
Emergency appropriations	---	---	(49,390)	(771,270)	(+771,270)	(+721,880)
Overseas deployments and activities	---	(571,270)	(700,000)	---	(-571,270)	(-700,000)
Rescissions (emergency)	---	(-71,270)	(-49,390)	---	(+71,270)	(+49,390)
TITLE II						
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE						
Economic Development Administration						
Economic development assistance programs (emergency)	---	---	40,000	40,000	+40,000	---
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE						
General Administration						
Salaries and expenses	30,000	---	---	---	---	---
Detention trustee:						
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	---	60,000	---	---	-60,000
(emergency)	---	---	---	60,000	+60,000	+60,000
Total, General Administration	30,000	---	60,000	60,000	+60,000	---
Legal Activities						
Salaries and expenses, general legal activities	1,648	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	1,648	1,648	---	-1,648	-1,648
(emergency)	---	---	---	1,648	+1,648	+1,648
United States Attorneys, Salaries and expenses	5,000	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	5,000	5,000	---	-5,000	-5,000
(emergency)	---	---	10,000	15,000	+15,000	+5,000
Total, Legal Activities	6,648	6,648	16,648	16,648	+10,000	---

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT 2009 (H.R. 2346) CONFERENCE AGREEMENT (H.REPT. 111-151)
(Amounts in thousands)

	Request	House	Senate	Conference Agreement	Conference vs. House	Conference vs. Senate
United States Marshals Service						
Salaries and expenses:						
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	---	10,000	---	---	-10,000
(emergency)	---	---	---	10,000	+10,000	+10,000
National Security Division						
Salaries and expenses	1,389	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	1,389	1,389	---	-1,389	-1,389
(emergency)	---	---	---	1,389	+1,389	+1,389
Federal Bureau of Investigation						
Salaries and expenses (emergency)	---	---	35,000	35,000	+35,000	---
Drug Enforcement Administration						
Salaries and expenses:						
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	---	20,000	---	---	-20,000
(emergency)	---	---	---	20,000	+20,000	+20,000
Bureau of Alcohol Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives						
Salaries and expenses	4,000	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	4,000	14,000	---	-4,000	-14,000
(emergency)	---	---	---	14,000	+14,000	+14,000
Federal Prison System						
Salaries and expenses	5,038	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	5,038	5,038	---	-5,038	-5,038
(emergency)	---	---	---	5,038	+5,038	+5,038
Total, Department of Justice	47,075	17,075	162,075	162,075	+145,000	---
GENERAL PROVISIONS						
Office of Inspector General:						
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	3,000	---	---	-3,000	---
(emergency)	---	---	---	3,000	+3,000	+3,000
(rescission) (emergency)	---	-3,000	---	-3,000	---	-3,000
Total, Legal Activities	---	---	---	---	---	---
Total, Title II	47,075	17,075	202,075	202,075	+185,000	---
Appropriations	(47,075)	---	---	---	---	---
Emergency appropriations	---	---	(85,000)	(205,075)	(+205,075)	(+120,075)
Overseas deployments and activities	---	(20,075)	(117,075)	---	(-20,075)	(-117,075)
Rescissions (emergency)	---	(-3,000)	---	(-3,000)	---	(-3,000)
TITLE III						
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE						
Military Personnel						
Military Personnel, Army	10,195,106	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	10,924,641	11,455,777	11,750,687	+826,046	+294,910
Military Personnel, Navy	1,354,782	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	1,716,827	1,565,227	1,627,288	-89,539	+62,061
Military Personnel, Marine Corps	1,419,979	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	1,577,850	1,464,353	1,524,947	-52,903	+60,594
Military Personnel, Air Force	1,390,554	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	1,783,208	1,469,173	1,500,740	-282,468	+31,567
Reserve Personnel, Army	284,155	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	381,155	387,155	418,155	+37,000	+31,000
Reserve Personnel, Navy	39,478	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	39,478	39,478	39,478	---	---
Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps	29,179	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	29,179	29,179	29,179	---	---
Reserve Personnel, Air Force	16,943	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	16,943	14,943	14,943	-2,000	---
National Guard Personnel, Army	1,439,333	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	1,373,273	1,542,333	1,775,733	+402,460	+233,400
National Guard Personnel, Air Force	17,860	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	101,360	46,860	45,000	-56,360	-1,860
Total, Military Personnel	16,187,369	17,943,914	18,014,478	18,726,150	+782,236	+711,672

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT 2009 (H.R. 2346) CONFERENCE AGREEMENT (H.REPT. 111-151)
(Amounts in thousands)

	Request	House	Senate	Conference Agreement	Conference vs. House	Conference vs. Senate
Operation and Maintenance						
Operation & Maintenance, Army	14,119,401	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	14,024,703	13,933,801	13,769,418	-255,285	-164,383
Operation & Maintenance, Navy	2,390,116	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	2,367,959	2,337,360	2,274,903	-93,056	-62,457
(Transfer out)	(-129,503)	(-129,503)	---	---	(+129,503)	---
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps	1,090,842	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	1,084,081	1,037,842	1,034,366	-49,715	-3,476
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force	6,294,031	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	6,216,729	5,992,125	5,980,386	-236,343	-11,739
Operation & Maintenance, Defense-Wide	5,667,483	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	5,353,701	5,065,783	5,101,696	-252,005	+35,913
(Transfer out)	(-30,000)	(-30,000)	---	---	(+30,000)	---
Operation & Maintenance, Army Reserve	115,017	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	101,317	110,017	110,017	+8,700	---
Operation & Maintenance, Navy Reserve	25,569	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	24,318	25,569	25,569	+1,251	---
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	30,775	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	30,775	30,775	30,775	---	---
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	34,599	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	34,599	34,599	34,599	---	---
Operation & Maintenance, Army National Guard	203,399	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	178,446	203,399	178,446	---	-24,953
Subtotal, Operation and Maintenance	29,971,232	29,416,628	28,771,270	28,540,175	-876,453	-231,095
Iraq Freedom Fund	415,000	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	365,000	---	---	-365,000	---
Afghanistan Security Forces Fund	3,606,939	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	3,606,939	3,606,939	3,606,939	---	---
Iraq Security Forces Fund (overseas deployments and activities)	---	---	1,000,000	---	---	-1,000,000
Pakistan Counterinsurgency Capability Fund 1/	400,000	---	---	---	---	---
Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund (overseas deployments and activities)	---	400,000	400,000	400,000	---	---
Total, Operation and Maintenance	34,393,171	33,788,567	33,778,209	32,547,114	-1,241,453	-1,231,095
Procurement						
Aircraft Procurement, Army	762,604	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	1,285,304	315,684	1,192,744	-92,560	+877,060
Missile Procurement, Army	767,141	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	677,141	737,041	704,041	+26,900	-33,000
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	1,683,371	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	2,233,871	1,434,071	1,983,971	-249,900	+549,900
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	230,075	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	230,075	230,075	230,075	---	---
Other Procurement, Army	8,121,572	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	8,039,349	7,029,145	7,113,742	-925,607	+84,597
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	600,999	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	691,924	754,299	636,669	-55,255	-117,630
Weapons Procurement, Navy	99,540	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	31,698	31,403	29,498	-2,200	-1,905
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps	348,919	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	348,919	348,919	348,919	---	---
Other Procurement, Navy	264,826	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	172,095	207,181	197,193	+25,098	-9,988
Procurement, Marine Corps	1,638,386	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	1,509,986	1,658,347	1,526,447	+16,461	-131,900
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	2,378,818	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	5,138,268	2,064,118	4,592,068	-546,200	+2,527,950
Missile Procurement, Air Force	57,416	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	57,416	49,716	49,716	-7,700	---
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force	183,684	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	183,684	138,284	158,684	-25,000	+20,400
Other Procurement, Air Force	1,834,953	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	1,745,761	1,910,343	1,802,083	+56,322	-108,260
Procurement, Defense-Wide	197,068	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	200,068	237,868	237,868	+37,800	---
Mine Resistant Ambush Protection Vehicle Fund	2,693,000	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	4,843,000	4,243,000	4,543,000	-300,000	+300,000
National Guard and Reserve Equipment (overseas deployments and activities)	---	500,000	500,000	500,000	---	---
Total, Procurement	21,862,372	27,888,559	21,889,494	25,846,718	-2,041,841	+3,957,224

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT 2009 (H.R. 2346) CONFERENCE AGREEMENT (H.REPT. 111-151)
(Amounts in thousands)

	Request	House	Senate	Conference Agreement	Conference vs. House	Conference vs. Senate
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation						
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Army	73,734	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	73,734	71,935	52,935	-20,799	-19,000
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Navy	144,536	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	96,231	141,681	136,786	+40,555	-4,895
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Air Force	108,259	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	92,574	174,159	160,474	+67,900	-13,685
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide	483,368	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	459,391	498,168	483,304	+23,913	-14,864
Total, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation	809,897	721,930	885,943	833,499	+111,569	-52,444
Revolving and Management Funds						
Defense Working Capital Fund, Army	443,200	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	443,200	443,200	443,200	---	---
Defense Working Capital Fund, Air Force (overseas deployments and activities)	---	---	15,000	15,000	+15,000	---
Defense Working Capital Fund, Defense-Wide	403,526	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	403,526	403,526	403,526	---	---
Total, Revolving and Management Funds	846,726	846,726	861,726	861,726	+15,000	---
Other Department of Defense Programs						
Defense Health Program:						
Operation and maintenance	845,508	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	845,508	845,508	845,508	---	---
Procurement	30,185	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	50,185	30,185	50,185	---	+20,000
Research and development	33,604	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	201,604	33,604	159,604	-42,000	+126,000
Total, Defense Health Program	909,297	1,097,297	909,297	1,055,297	-42,000	+146,000
Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense	141,198	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	137,198	123,398	120,398	-16,800	-3,000
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund:						
Attack the Network	499,830	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	499,830	349,830	349,830	-150,000	---
Defeat the Device	607,389	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	457,389	457,389	457,389	---	---
Train the Force	333,527	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	333,527	283,527	283,527	-50,000	---
Staff and infrastructure	26,000	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	26,000	26,000	26,000	---	---
Total, Joint IED Defeat Fund	1,466,746	1,316,746	1,116,746	1,116,746	-200,000	---
Office of the Inspector General	9,551	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	9,551	9,551	9,551	---	---
Total, Other Department of Defense Programs	2,526,792	2,560,792	2,158,992	2,301,992	-258,800	+143,000
Department of Defense General Provisions						
Special DE transfer authority (this title only)	(4,000,000)	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	(2,000,000)	(2,500,000)	(2,500,000)	(+500,000)	---
Additional transfer authority	(1,500,000)	---	---	---	---	---
Defense Cooperation Account	6,500	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	6,500	6,500	6,500	---	---
Iraq Security Forces Fund	1,000,000	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	1,000,000	---	---	-1,000,000	---
(emergency)	---	---	---	1,000,000	+1,000,000	+1,000,000
(rescission) (emergency)	-1,000,000	-1,000,000	---	-1,000,000	---	-1,000,000
Afghanistan Security Forces Fund	125,000	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	125,000	---	---	-125,000	---
(rescission) (emergency)	-125,000	-125,000	---	---	+125,000	---
Fuel (rescission)	-2,900,000	-3,010,000	---	-1,003,007	+2,006,993	-1,003,007
(overseas deployments and activities) (rescission)	---	---	---	-1,906,993	-1,906,993	-1,906,993
Classified (rescission)	-10,000	---	---	---	---	---
Classified and other (overseas deployments and activities) (rescission)	---	---	---	-1,051,160	-1,051,160	-1,051,160
Fuel, Classified, and Other (Rescissions)	---	---	-925,203	---	---	+925,203
(overseas deployments and activities) (rescission)	---	---	-3,646,633	---	---	+3,646,633
Personnel: Army, Army Reserve, & Army National Guard	470,900	---	---	---	---	---
Procurement, Army (rescission)	-470,900	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities) (rescission)	---	---	---	-354,000	-354,000	-354,000

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT 2009 (H.R. 2346) CONFERENCE AGREEMENT (H.REPT. 111-151)
(Amounts in thousands)

	Request	House	Senate	Conference Agreement	Conference vs. House	Conference vs. Senate
Personnel: Army, Army Reserve, and Army National Guard (by transfer) (overseas deployments)	---	(150,600)	---	---	(-150,600)	---
Procurement, Army (transfer out)	---	(-150,600)	---	---	(+150,600)	---
Operation and maintenance, Defense-wide (rescission)2/	-181,500	-181,500	---	---	+181,500	---
(overseas deployments and activities) (rescission)	---	---	---	-181,500	-181,500	-181,500
Stop Loss Transfer Fund (overseas deployments and activities)	---	734,400	---	534,400	-200,000	+534,400
Total, DOD General Provisions	-3,085,000	-2,450,600	-4,565,336	-3,955,760	-1,505,160	+609,576
Total, Title III	73,541,327	81,299,888	73,023,506	77,161,439	-4,138,449	+4,137,933
Appropriations	(78,228,727)	---	---	---	---	---
Emergency appropriations	---	---	---	(1,000,000)	(+1,000,000)	(+1,000,000)
Overseas deployments and activities	---	(85,766,988)	(77,595,342)	(81,658,099)	(-4,108,889)	(+4,062,757)
Rescissions	(-3,562,400)	(-3,342,100)	(-925,203)	(-1,003,007)	(+2,339,093)	(-77,804)
Rescissions (emergency)	(-1,125,000)	(-1,125,000)	---	(-1,000,000)	(+125,000)	(-1,000,000)
Rescissions (overseas deployments and activities)	---	---	(-3,646,633)	(-3,493,653)	(-3,493,653)	(+152,980)
(Transfer out)	(-159,503)	(-310,103)	---	---	(+310,103)	---
(Transfer authority)	(5,500,000)	---	---	---	---	---
Overseas deployments and activities:						
(Transfer out)	---	(150,600)	---	---	(-150,600)	---
(Transfer authority)	---	(2,000,000)	(2,500,000)	(2,500,000)	(+500,000)	---

Title III:
1/ House recommends an additional $400M under International Security Assistance, Pakistan Counterinsurgency Capability Fund (Title XI)
2/ Budget request includes rescission to fund Military Construction, Defense-Wide

TITLE IV

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Corps of Engineers - Civil

Operation and maintenance (emergency)	---	---	38,375	42,875	+42,875	+4,500
Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies (emergency)	---	---	804,290	754,290	+754,290	-50,000
Total, Corps of Engineers - Civil	---	---	842,665	797,165	+797,165	-45,500

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Energy Programs

Strategic Petroleum Reserve

Strategic Petroleum Reserve (by transfer)	(21,586)	(21,586)	---	---	(-21,586)	---
(By transfer) (emergency)	---	---	(21,586)	(21,586)	(+21,586)	---

National Nuclear Security Administration

Weapons activities:						
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	---	34,500	---	---	-34,500
(emergency)	---	---	---	30,000	+30,000	+30,000
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	89,500	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	55,000	55,000	---	-55,000	-55,000
(emergency)	---	---	---	55,000	+55,000	+55,000
Total, National Nuclear Security Administration	89,500	55,000	89,500	85,000	+30,000	-4,500
Total, Title IV	89,500	55,000	932,165	882,165	+827,165	-50,000
Emergency appropriations	---	---	(842,665)	(882,165)	(+882,165)	(+39,500)
Overseas deployments and activities	---	(55,000)	(89,500)	---	(-55,000)	(-89,500)
(By transfer)	(21,586)	(21,586)	---	---	(-21,586)	---
(By transfer) (emergency)	---	---	(21,586)	(21,586)	(+21,586)	---

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT 2009 (H.R. 2346) CONFERENCE AGREEMENT (H.REPT. 111-151)
(Amounts in thousands)

	Request	House	Senate	Conference Agreement	Conference vs. House	Conference vs. Senate
TITLE V						
DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY						
Departmental Offices						
Salaries and expenses (emergency)	---	---	4,000	---	---	-4,000
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT AND FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT						
Unanticipated Needs						
Unanticipated needs for influenza 1/	(3,500,000)	---	---	---	---	---
Pandemic preparedness and response (emergency)	---	---	1,500,000	---	---	-1,500,000
National Security Council						
Salaries and expenses	2,936	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	2,936	2,936	---	-2,936	-2,936
(emergency)	---	---	---	2,936	+2,936	+2,936
Total, Executive Office of the President	2,936	2,936	1,502,936	2,936	---	-1,500,000
THE JUDICIARY						
Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services						
Salaries and expenses:						
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	---	10,000	---	---	-10,000
(emergency)	---	---	---	10,000	+10,000	+10,000
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES						
Securities and Exchange Commission						
Salaries and expenses (emergency)	---	---	10,000	10,000	+10,000	---
Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission						
Salaries and expenses (emergency)	---	---	---	8,000	+8,000	+8,000
TITLE V GENERAL PROVISIONS						
Federal Deposit Insurance Act amendment	---	---	4,000	---	---	-4,000
(emergency)	---	---	---	4,000	+4,000	+4,000
Total, Title V	2,936	2,936	1,530,936	34,936	+32,000	-1,496,000
Appropriations	(2,936)	---	(4,000)	---	---	(-4,000)
Emergency appropriations	---	---	(1,514,000)	(34,936)	(+34,936)	(-1,479,064)
Overseas deployments and activities	---	(2,936)	(12,936)	---	(-2,936)	(-12,936)

Title V:
1/ Amount of new budget authority request that the House and Conference considered and funded under Health and Human Services, Title VIII

TITLE VI						
DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY						
U.S. Customs and Border Protection						
Salaries and expenses:						
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	---	46,200	---	---	-46,200
(emergency)	---	---	---	46,200	+46,200	+46,200
Air and marine interdiction, operations, maintenance and procurement:						
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	---	5,000	---	---	-5,000
(emergency)	---	---	---	5,000	+5,000	+5,000
Total, Customs and Border Protection	---	---	51,200	51,200	+51,200	---
U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement						
Salaries and expenses:						
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	---	66,800	---	---	-66,800
(emergency)	---	---	---	66,800	+66,800	+66,800

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT 2009 (H.R. 2346) CONFERENCE AGREEMENT (H.REPT. 111-151)
(Amounts in thousands)

	Request	House	Senate	Conference Agreement	Conference vs. House	Conference vs. Senate
Coast Guard						
Operating expenses (overseas deployments and activities)	---	---	139,503	139,503	+139,503	---
Federal Emergency Management Agency						
State and local programs:						
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	---	30,000	---	---	-30,000
(emergency)	---	---	---	30,000	+30,000	+30,000
TITLE VI GENERAL PROVISIONS						
FEMA Disaster Relief (rescission of emergency)	---	---	-100,000	-100,000	-100,000	---
FEMA State and local programs (emergency)	---	---	100,000	100,000	+100,000	---
Federal Share of Disaster Assistance (emergency)	---	---	---	---	---	---
Total, Title VI	---	---	287,503	287,503	+287,503	---
Emergency appropriations	---	---	(100,000)	(248,000)	(+248,000)	(+148,000)
Overseas deployments and activities	---	---	(287,503)	(139,503)	(+139,503)	(-148,000)
Rescissions (emergency)	---	---	(-100,000)	(-100,000)	(-100,000)	---
TITLE VII						
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR						
Department-wide Programs						
Wildland fire management:						
Wildfire suppression and emergency rehabilitation	50,000	---	---	---	---	---
(emergency)	---	50,000	50,000	50,000	---	---
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE						
Forest Service						
Wildland fire management:						
Wildfire suppression and emergency rehabilitation	200,000	---	---	---	---	---
(emergency)	---	200,000	200,000	200,000	---	---
Total, Title VII	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	---	---
Appropriations	(250,000)	---	---	---	---	---
Emergency appropriations	---	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)	---	---
TITLE VIII						
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES						
Administration for Children and Families						
Refugee and entrant assistance:						
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	---	82,000	---	---	-82,000
(emergency)	---	---	---	82,000	+82,000	+82,000
Office of the Secretary						
Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund 1/	1,500,000	---	---	---	---	---
(contingent funds)	2,000,000	---	---	---	---	---
(emergency)	---	1,850,000	---	1,850,000	---	+1,850,000
(contingent emergency)	---	---	---	5,800,000	+5,800,000	+5,800,000
Total, PHSSEF	3,500,000	1,850,000	---	7,650,000	+5,800,000	+7,650,000
TITLE VIII GENERAL PROVISIONS						
Department of Education: Career, Technical, and Adult Education (by transfer)	---	---	(17,678)	(10,260)	(+10,260)	(-7,418)
Total, Title VIII	3,500,000	1,850,000	82,000	7,732,000	+5,882,000	+7,650,000
Emergency appropriations	---	(1,850,000)	---	(1,932,000)	(+82,000)	(+1,932,000)
Contingent emergency appropriations	---	---	---	(5,800,000)	(+5,800,000)	(+5,800,000)
Overseas deployments and activities	---	---	(82,000)	---	---	(-82,000)
(By transfer)	---	---	(17,678)	(10,260)	(+10,260)	(-7,418)

Title VIII:
1/ Budget request and Senate proposes funds under the Executive Office of the President

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT 2009 (H.R. 2346) CONFERENCE AGREEMENT (H.REPT. 111-151)
(Amounts in thousands)

	Request	House	Senate	Conference Agreement	Conference vs. House	Conference vs. Senate
TITLE IX						
JOINT ITEMS						
Capitol Police						
General expenses	71,606	---	71,606	---	---	-71,606
(emergency)	---	71,606	---	71,606	---	+71,606
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE						
Salaries and expenses	---	---	2,000	---	---	-2,000
(emergency)	---	---	---	2,000	+2,000	+2,000
Total, Title IX	71,606	71,606	73,606	73,606	+2,000	---
Appropriations	(71,606)	---	(73,606)	---	---	(-73,606)
Emergency appropriations	---	(71,606)	---	(73,606)	(+2,000)	(+73,606)
TITLE X						
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE						
Military construction, Army	1,229,731	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	1,407,231	1,229,731	1,182,989	-224,242	-46,742
(emergency)	---	---	49,000	143,242	+143,242	+94,242
(Rescission) (emergency)	---	-142,500	-49,000	-143,242	-742	-94,242
Military construction, Navy and Marine Corps	239,031	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	235,881	243,083	235,881	---	-7,202
Military construction, Air Force	280,970	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	279,120	265,470	281,620	+2,500	+16,150
(rescission) (emergency)	---	-30,000	---	---	+30,000	---
Military construction, Defense-Wide 1/	181,500	---	181,500	---	---	-181,500
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	1,086,968	---	661,552	-425,416	+661,552
Subtotal, Military construction	1,931,232	2,836,700	1,919,784	2,362,042	-474,658	+442,258
North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment program	100,000	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	100,000	100,000	100,000	---	---
Department of Defense Base Closure Account 2005	263,300	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	263,300	230,900	263,300	---	+32,400
Total, Title X	2,294,532	3,200,000	2,250,684	2,725,342	-474,658	+474,658
Appropriations	(2,294,532)	---	(181,500)	---	---	(-181,500)
Emergency appropriations	---	---	(49,000)	(143,242)	(+143,242)	(+94,242)
Overseas deployments and activities	---	(3,372,500)	(2,069,184)	(2,725,342)	(-647,158)	(+656,158)
Rescissions (emergency)	---	(-172,500)	(-49,000)	(-143,242)	(+29,258)	(-94,242)

Title X:
1/ Budget request includes rescission of $181.5M from O&M, Defense-Wide under Title III

	Request	House	Senate	Conference Agreement	Conference vs. House	Conference vs. Senate
TITLE XI						
DEPARTMENT OF STATE						
Administration of Foreign Affairs						
Diplomatic and consular programs	594,315	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	1,016,215	645,444	997,890	-18,325	+352,446
Worldwide security protection	(117,983)	(403,983)	(117,983)	(146,358)	(-257,625)	(+28,375)
(transfer authority)	(137,600)	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	(157,600)	(135,629)	(137,600)	(-20,000)	(+1,971)
International Broadcasting Operations, Pakistan-Afghanistan Border Region (by transfer)	---	(10,900)	(10,000)	(10,000)	(-900)	---
(transfer out)	---	---	(-40,000)	---	---	(+40,000)
Office of Inspector General	7,201	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	17,123	22,200	24,122	+6,999	+1,922
Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction (by transfer)	---	---	(7,000)	(7,000)	(+7,000)	---
Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction (by transfer)	(7,201)	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	(7,201)	(7,200)	(7,200)	(-1)	---
Embassy security, construction, and maintenance	898,728	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	989,628	820,500	921,500	-68,128	+101,000
Total, Administration of Foreign Affairs	1,500,244	2,022,966	1,488,144	1,943,512	-79,454	+455,368

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT 2009 (H.R. 2346) CONFERENCE AGREEMENT (H.REPT. 111-151)
(Amounts in thousands)

	Request	House	Senate	Conference Agreement	Conference vs. House	Conference vs. Senate
International Organizations						
Contributions for international peacekeeping activities, current year	836,900	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	836,900	721,000	721,000	-115,900	---
(by transfer)	---	---	(155,900)	---	---	(-155,900)
Total, International Organizations	836,900	836,900	721,000	721,000	-115,900	---
Total, Department of State	2,337,144	2,859,866	2,209,144	2,664,512	-195,354	+455,368
UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT						
Funds Appropriated to the President						
Operating expenses	152,600	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	152,600	112,600	157,600	+5,000	+45,000
(by transfer)	---	---	(40,000)	---	---	(-40,000)
Capital investment fund	48,500	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	48,500	48,500	48,500	---	---
Office of Inspector General (overseas deployments and activities)	---	3,500	3,500	3,500	---	---
(by transfer)	---	(2,000)	---	(2,000)	---	(+2,000)
BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE						
Funds Appropriated to the President						
Global Health and Child Survival (overseas deployments and activities)	---	300,000	50,000	150,000	-150,000	+100,000
Development assistance	38,000	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	---	38,000	---	---	-38,000
International disaster assistance	230,000	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	200,000	245,000	270,000	+70,000	+25,000
Economic Support Fund	3,004,500	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	2,907,500	2,828,000	2,973,601	+66,101	+145,601
(transfer out)	---	(-2,000)	---	(-2,000)	---	(-2,000)
Assistance for Europe, Eurasia and Central Asia	242,500	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	242,500	230,000	272,000	+29,500	+42,000
Assistance for Georgia (overseas deployments	---	---	---	---	---	---
and activities)	---	---	42,500	---	---	-42,500
Subtotal, Europe, Eurasia, and Central Asia	242,500	242,500	272,500	272,000	+29,500	-500
Department of State						
International narcotics control and law enforcement	389,500	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	483,500	393,500	487,500	+4,000	+94,000
Migration and refugee assistance	333,000	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	343,000	345,000	390,000	+47,000	+45,000
Nonproliferation, anti-terrorism, demining and related programs	122,000	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	98,500	102,000	102,000	+3,500	---
Total, Bilateral Economic Assistance	4,359,500	4,575,000	4,274,000	4,645,101	+70,101	+371,101
INTERNATIONAL SECURITY ASSISTANCE						
Peacekeeping operations	50,000	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	80,000	172,900	185,000	+105,000	+12,100
(transfer out)	---	---	(-155,900)	---	---	(+155,900)
International Military Education and Training	2,000	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	2,000	2,000	2,000	---	---
Foreign Military Financing Program	98,400	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	1,349,000	98,000	1,294,000	-55,000	+1,196,000
Pakistan Counterinsurgency Capability Fund 1/	---	400,000	---	700,000	+300,000	+700,000
Total, International Security Assistance	150,400	1,831,000	272,900	2,181,000	+350,000	+1,908,100
Total, Title XI	7,048,144	9,470,466	6,920,644	9,700,213	+229,747	+2,779,569
Appropriations	(7,048,144)	---	---	---	---	---
Overseas deployments and activities	---	(9,470,466)	(6,920,644)	(9,700,213)	(+229,747)	(+2,779,569)
(By transfer)	(137,600)	---	---	---	---	---
(By transfer)(overseas deployments & activities)	---	(175,701)	(159,829)	(161,800)	(-13,901)	(+1,971)

Title XI:
1/ Budget request includes $400M under Title III

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT 2009 (H.R. 2346) CONFERENCE AGREEMENT (H.REPT. 111-151)
(Amounts in thousands)

	Request	House	Senate	Conference Agreement	Conference vs. House	Conference vs. Senate
TITLE XII						
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION						
Office of the Secretary						
Payments to air carriers (Airport & Airway Trust Fund)	---	---	13,200	---	---	-13,200
(emergency)	---	---	---	13,200	+13,200	+13,200
Federal Aviation Administration						
Grants-in-aid for airports (Airport and Airway Trust Fund (rescission of contract authority)	---	---	-13,200	-13,200	-13,200	---
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT						
Public and Indian Housing						
Tenant-based rental assistance (emergency)	---	---	30,000	30,000	+30,000	---
TITLE XII GENERAL PROVISIONS						
Federal Highway Administration, Emergency Relief (North Dakota) (outlays only)	---	---	---	---	---	---
(emergency) (outlays only)	---	---	---	---	---	---
Federal Transit Administration, Transit Capital Assistance (emergency) (outlays only)	---	---	---	---	---	---
Total, Title XII	---	---	30,000	30,000	+30,000	---
Appropriations	---	---	(13,200)	---	---	(-13,200)
Emergency appropriations	---	---	(30,000)	(43,200)	(+43,200)	(+13,200)
Rescission of contract authority	---	---	(-13,200)	(-13,200)	(-13,200)	---
TITLE XIII						
CONSUMER ASSISTANCE TO RECYCLE AND SAVE ACT						
Consumer Assistance to Recycle and Save (emergency)	---	---	---	1,000,000	+1,000,000	+1,000,000
Total, Title XIII	---	---	---	1,000,000	+1,000,000	+1,000,000
Appropriations	---	---	---	---	---	---
Emergency appropriations	---	---	---	(1,000,000)	(+1,000,000)	(+1,000,000)
TITLE XIV						
OTHER MATTERS						
INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS						
International Monetary Programs						
United States Quota, International Monetary fund and Loans to International Monetary fund	5,000,000	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	---	5,000,000	---	---	-5,000,000
(emergency)	---	---	---	5,000,000	+5,000,000	+5,000,000
Total, Title XIV	5,000,000	---	5,000,000	5,000,000	+5,000,000	---
Appropriations	(5,000,000)	---	---	---	---	---
Emergency appropriations	---	---	---	(5,000,000)	(+5,000,000)	(+5,000,000)
Grand total	92,145,120	96,716,971	91,283,119	105,850,549	+9,133,578	+14,567,430
Appropriations	(96,832,520)	---	(272,306)	---	---	(-272,306)
Emergency appropriations	---	(2,171,606)	(2,920,055)	(11,583,494)	(+9,411,888)	(+8,663,439)
Contingent emergency appropriations	---	---	---	(5,800,000)	(+5,800,000)	(+5,800,000)
Overseas deployments and activities	---	(99,436,936)	(93,229,913)	(94,386,957)	(-5,049,979)	(+1,157,044)
Rescissions	(-3,562,400)	(-3,191,500)	(-925,203)	(-1,003,007)	(+2,188,493)	(-77,804)
Rescissions (emergency)	(-1,125,000)	(-1,371,770)	(-198,390)	(-1,246,242)	(+125,528)	(-1,047,852)
Rescissions (overseas deployments and other activities)	---	---	(-3,646,633)	(-3,493,653)	(-3,493,653)	(+152,980)
Rescission of contract authority	---	---	(-13,200)	(-13,200)	(-13,200)	---
(By transfer)	(28,787)	(349,887)	(373,407)	(174,060)	(-175,827)	(-199,347)
(Transfer out)	(-159,503)	(-310,103)	---	---	(+310,103)	---
(Transfer authority)	(5,637,600)	---	---	---	---	---
(By transfer) (emergency)	---	---	(21,586)	(21,586)	(+21,586)	---
Overseas deployments and activities:						
(By transfer)	---	(328,301)	(355,729)	(163,800)	(-164,501)	(-191,929)
(Transfer out)	---	(-2,000)	(-195,900)	(-2,000)	---	(+193,900)
(Transfer authority)	---	(2,000,000)	(2,500,000)	(2,500,000)	(+500,000)	---

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT 2009 (H.R. 2346) CONFERENCE AGREEMENT (H.REPT. 111-151)
(Amounts in thousands)

	Request	House	Senate	Conference Agreement	Conference vs. House	Conference vs. Senate
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET RECAP BY TITLE						
TITLE I DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE	300,000	500,000	700,000	771,270	+271,270	+71,270
Appropriations	(300,000)	---	---	---	---	---
Emergency appropriations	---	(-71,270)	---	(771,270)	(+842,540)	(+771,270)
Overseas deployments and activities	---	(571,270)	(700,000)	---	(-571,270)	(-700,000)
TITLE II DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, AND JUSTICE	47,075	17,075	202,075	202,075	+185,000	---
Appropriations	(47,075)	---	---	---	---	---
Emergency appropriations	---	(-3,000)	(85,000)	(202,075)	(+205,075)	(+117,075)
Overseas deployments and activities	---	(20,075)	(117,075)	---	(-20,075)	(-117,075)
TITLE III DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE	73,541,327	81,299,888	73,023,506	77,161,439	-4,138,449	+4,137,933
Appropriations	(74,666,327)	(-3,342,100)	(-925,203)	(-1,003,007)	(+2,339,093)	(-77,804)
Emergency appropriations	(-1,125,000)	(-1,125,000)	---	---	(+1,125,000)	---
Overseas deployments and activities	---	(85,766,988)	(73,948,709)	(78,164,446)	(-7,602,542)	(+4,215,737)
TITLE IV DEPARTMENTS OF DEFENSE (CIVIL), AND ENERGY	89,500	55,000	932,165	882,165	+827,165	-50,000
Appropriations	(89,500)	(-21,586)	(-21,586)	(-21,586)	---	---
Emergency appropriations	---	---	(864,251)	(903,751)	(+903,751)	(+39,500)
Overseas deployments and activities	---	(76,586)	(89,500)	---	(-76,586)	(-89,500)
TITLE V EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, JUDICIARY, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES	2,936	2,936	1,530,936	34,936	+32,000	-1,496,000
Appropriations	(2,936)	---	(4,000)	---	---	(-4,000)
Emergency appropriations	---	---	(1,514,000)	(34,936)	(+34,936)	(-1,479,064)
Overseas deployments and activities	---	2,936	12,936	---	-2,936	-12,936
TITLE VI DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY	---	---	287,503	287,503	+287,503	---
Appropriations	---	---	---	---	---	---
Emergency appropriations	---	---	---	(148,000)	(+148,000)	(+148,000)
Overseas deployments and activities	---	---	(287,503)	(139,503)	(+139,503)	(-148,000)
TITLE VII DEPARTMENTS OF THE INTERIOR, AND AGRICULTURE	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	---	---
Appropriations	(250,000)	---	---	---	---	---
Emergency appropriations	---	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)	---	---
Overseas deployments and activities	---	---	---	---	---	---
TITLE VIII DEPARTMENTS OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION	3,500,000	1,850,000	82,000	7,732,000	+5,882,000	+7,650,000
Appropriations	(3,500,000)	---	---	(-10,260)	(-10,260)	(-10,260)
Emergency appropriations	---	(1,850,000)	---	(7,742,260)	(+5,892,260)	(+7,742,260)
Overseas deployments and activities	---	---	(82,000)	---	---	(-82,000)
TITLE IX LEGISLATIVE BRANCH	71,606	71,606	73,606	73,606	+2,000	---
Appropriations	71,606	---	73,606	---	---	-73,606
Emergency appropriations	---	71,606	---	73,606	+2,000	+73,606
Overseas deployments and activities	---	---	---	---	---	---
TITLE X DEPARTMENTS OF DEFENSE, AND VETERANS AFFAIRS	2,294,532	3,200,000	2,250,684	2,725,342	-474,658	+474,658
Appropriations	(2,294,532)	---	(181,500)	---	---	(-181,500)
Emergency appropriations	---	(-172,500)	---	---	(+172,500)	---
Overseas deployments and activities	---	(3,372,500)	(2,069,184)	(2,725,342)	(-647,158)	(+656,158)
TITLE XI DEPARTMENT OF STATE	7,048,144	9,470,466	6,920,644	9,700,213	+229,747	+2,779,569
Appropriations	(7,048,144)	---	---	---	---	---
Emergency appropriations	---	---	---	---	---	---
Overseas deployments and activities	---	(9,470,466)	(6,920,644)	(9,700,213)	(+229,747)	(+2,779,569)
TITLE XII DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT	---	---	30,000	30,000	+30,000	---
Appropriations	---	---	---	(-13,200)	(-13,200)	(-13,200)
Emergency appropriations	---	---	30,000	43,200	+43,200	+13,200
Overseas deployments and activities	---	---	---	---	---	---
TITLE XIII CONSUMER ASSISTANCE TO RECYCLE AND SAVE	---	---	---	1,000,000	+1,000,000	+1,000,000
Appropriations	---	---	---	---	---	---
Emergency appropriations	---	---	---	1,000,000	+1,000,000	+1,000,000
Overseas deployments and activities	---	---	---	---	---	---
TITLE XIV INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS	5,000,000	---	5,000,000	5,000,000	+5,000,000	---
Appropriations	5,000,000	---	---	---	---	---
Emergency appropriations	---	---	---	5,000,000	+5,000,000	+5,000,000
Overseas deployments and activities	---	---	(5,000,000)	---	---	(-5,000,000)
GRAND TOTAL, SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 2009	92,145,120	96,716,971	91,283,119	105,850,549	+9,133,578	+14,567,430
Appropriations	(93,270,120)	(-3,363,686)	(-687,683)	(-1,048,053)	(+2,315,633)	(-360,370)
Emergency appropriations	(-1,125,000)	(799,836)	(2,743,251)	(16,169,098)	(+15,369,262)	(+13,425,847)
Overseas deployments and activities	---	(99,280,821)	(89,227,551)	(90,729,504)	(-8,551,317)	(+1,501,953)

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, there are a number of reasons to vote for this bill. The bill funds our withdrawal from Iraq, stop-loss compensation for our troops, a more robust pandemic flu response, extends the 21st Century GI Bill of Rights education benefits to children of members of the armed forces who die while on active duty, additional international food and refugee assistance during the current global economic crisis, and other worthy programs as well. But candidly, those issues are ancillary to the real issue before us: this vote is essentially about whether or not we support current Administration policy in Afghanistan and Pakistan. I hope the President does not let the country down on this.

Does the Congress want to support and fund the President's new military plan? Looking back at this vote from the future, it will be seen as a vote on the war in Afghanistan and Pakistan. Will a vote for this bill move us closer to a peaceful resolution of the conflict in southwest Asia?

In this dangerous, complicated world it is never clear how to advance peace, prosperity, and justice for ourselves and the rest of the world. We Members of Congress are called on to exercise our best judgment, and in my best judgment what the President has done so far in Afghanistan is not the way forward, and the President will have to change the policy. The President is doing much good at home and abroad, and I want to support him wherever I can. However, he so far has not changed the policy in Afghanistan in a way that shows he has learned the lessons of Iraq. Nevertheless, I am willing to give him the opportunity to operate from a position of strength in forming that new policy.

The chairman of the full committee has suggested that he is willing to give the President a year to turn things around in Afghanistan and Pakistan, but no more than that—an argument that has considerable merit. The problem, though, is that the President's new policy may not be new enough—not enough of a clean break with the past policy that placed excessive reliance on the use of force to solve what are by definition political problems. We should take a lesson from Iraq where it was not an American troop surge that reduced violence, but rather empowering local provincial forces. And as in Iraq, it will be a reduced American combat presence that will ultimately allow the country to find some peace. So-called surgical strikes—with inevitable civilian casualties—and remote assassinations will not remove the threat of militant extremists.

Our understanding of Afghanistan is inadequate and our poor intelligence in Afghanistan and Pakistan limits our ability to carry out any strategy. We are moving forward in Afghanistan with too much military bravado and too little genuine understanding. Other countries are opting out of combat, not because they are cowards, but because they do not see the situation the same way. Some of us have asked for a plan of success or a plan of withdrawal before sending another wave of soldiers. We have received no such plan.

As with other tragic wars without a clear plan of how to get out, I fear we may be taking a first step that will be followed by sending soldier after soldier to redeem our sunk costs. Alexander the Great, the Mongols, the Mughals, the British, the Soviets—all their military interventions in this region ended badly because they misread the people and the history of this region. I am giving the President the benefit of the doubt on this request by supporting it, with this caveat: my patience has limits.

I will not support an endless military commitment in this region. Reading between the lines, I suspect I see the letter Q in Afghanistan—as in quagmire. If a year from now I do not see unambiguous indicators of success—fewer civilian casualties, Afghan and Pakistani security forces in the lead on the security mission, genuine progress in rebuilding Afghanistan's shattered infrastructure and civil institutions—I will not support further funding for operations and will support only measures that will bring our forces home, and quickly.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the fiscal year 2009 Iraq/Afghanistan Defense Supplemental Appropriations bill provides $105.9 billion, 77 percent of which would be to cover costs relating to the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq for the rest of this fiscal year. I voted for these funds because I chose to give President Obama time to implement his Afghanistan strategy and withdraw troops from Iraq. But it was not an easy decision.

The war in Afghanistan has entered its eighth year without clearly defined objectives and an exit strategy. With a deteriorating security situation and no comprehensive political outcome yet in sight, some experts view the war in Afghanistan as open-ended. Had the Bush Administration not shifted its focus to the unnecessary war in Iraq, we may have already brought Al Qaeda and the Taliban to justice. I believe President Obama made an error by ordering an additional 17,000 troops to Afghanistan before first completing a detailed review of U.S. Afghanistan policies. Continuing the vaguely defined strategies of the Bush Administration is not acceptable.

The President did finally lay out a strategy for Afghanistan in late March of this year. It made some significant improvements to the Afghanistan strategy, but fell short in other areas. For example, I was pleased to see a regional approach, ''treating Afghanistan and Pakistan as two countries but one challenge,'' and a commitment to ''devote significantly more resources to the civilian efforts in both Afghanistan and Pakistan.'' These are significant improvements over the Bush Administration's approach.

Unfortunately, the President's new Afghan strategy fails to set clear benchmarks for the Afghanistan and Pakistan governments and fails to lay out the consequences of not meeting the benchmarks. It is not surprising that the President has also failed to set benchmarks for the Pentagon and State Department too.

Thankfully, the supplemental bill lays out detailed benchmarks for Afghanistan and Pakistan and the President must report back to Congress on the:

(1) Level of political consensus and unity of purpose across ethnic, tribal, religious and party affiliations to confront the political and security challenges facing the region.

(2) Level of government corruption and actions taken to eliminate it.

(3) Performance of the respective security forces in developing a counterinsurgency capability, conducting counterinsurgency operations and establishing population security.

(4) Performance of the respective intelligence agencies in cooperating with the United States on counterinsurgency and counterterrorism operations and in purging themselves of policies, programs and personnel that provide material support to extremist networks that target U.S. troops or undermine U.S. objectives in the region.

(5) Ability of the Afghan and Pakistani governments to effectively control the territory within their respective borders.

In addition, I am an original cosponsor of the McGovern bill that simply states, ''Not later than December 31, 2009, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report outlining the United States exit strategy for United States military forces in Afghanistan participating in Operation Enduring Freedom.'' I firmly believe that the United States is best served by outlining a clear exit strategy that the American public can support and that the Afghani public can be reassured that we have no long-term desire to occupy their nation.

Unfortunately, President Bush's disregard for the complexities of Afghanistan and the damage that came from his disregard may make this war unwinnable. We also must not forget that the Soviet military, with over a hundred thousand troops on the ground, lost decisively in Afghanistan. Today, our troops are fighting some of the very same warlords who defeated the Soviets with our covert support.

As you may know, Secretary of Defense Bill Gates, removed the commanding general of Afghanistan in a bid to change the-on-the ground strategy in Afghanistan. With a new White House strategy, a new commanding general, and 21,000 additional troops, I believe this is now President Obama's war.

The bill also funds the continued presence of our troops in Iraq. Despite the continued bursts of violence in Iraq, I am thankful the President has committed to a responsible redeployment of troops out of Iraq. This bill recognizes and supports President Obama's plan to withdraw all U.S. combat brigades from Iraq by August 31, 2010 and all U.S. military forces by December 31, 2011. The bill continues to prohibit the construction of any base for the permanent stationing of U.S. forces in Iraq and U.S. control over any oil resource of Iraq. To ensure accountability, the bill directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to Congress every 90 days that includes:

1. How the Government of Iraq is assuming responsibility for reconciliation initiatives;

2. How the drawdown of military forces complies with the President's timeline; and

3. The roles and responsibilities of remaining contractors in Iraq as the U.S. mission evolves.

The bill does some very good things besides funding wars for Afghanistan and Iraq. I am very supportive of the $534 million for additional pay for more than 170,000 troops who have had their enlistments involuntarily extended since Sept. 11, 2001. These funds allow for payments of $500 per month for every month a soldier was held on active duty under ''stop-loss'' orders. The average payment should be above $4,000. Stop loss orders were used by the Bush Administration to avoid tough decisions on deployment and troop increases, creating a de facto draft for current soldiers. These payments are a good step to honor the sacrifice unfairly asked of these brave men and women.

I also support some of the foreign aid in the bill. The $660 million for bilateral economic, humanitarian, and security assistance for the West Bank and Gaza represents an important

commitment to the Middle East peace process. In addition, the bill includes $889 million for United Nations peacekeeping operations, including an expanded mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and a new mission in Chad and the Central African Republic. Finally, the bill includes $700 million for international food assistance to alleviate suffering during the global economic crisis.

Finally, I was pleased that the conference agreement provides $7.7 billion for efforts to address a potential pandemic flu. The total includes $1.5 billion for the Health and Human Services Department and the Center for Disease Control to supplement federal stockpiles, develop and purchase vaccines, and to expand detection efforts, and $5.8 billion in contingent emergency funds. Of the $1.5 billion, $350 million was set aside to assist state and local governments in preparing for and responding to a pandemic.

Unfortunately, the conference agreement included a $108 billion loan to the International Monetary Fund (IMF). I objected to this loan because Congress should not be in the business of bailing out Central and Eastern European nations that lost money speculating in highly deregulated financial markets and now are indebted to European banks.

The $108 billion loan to the IMF is an unreasonable and irresponsible burden to place on the backs of American taxpayers. They're already paying through the nose for the $700 billion blank check passed by Congress for ''too big to fail'' banks. For the record, I voted against the bank bailout. And, now, Congress is returning to the American taxpayers hat in hand for a rescue package to bailout European banks.

The fact that we continue to run annual deficits means the Federal Reserve will print the $108 billion or borrow it from China. In other words, the U.S. will borrow funds from China to, lend to the International Monetary Fund, which will lend to a Central or Eastern European country to help rescue a foreign bank caught in the credit bubble.

We should be focusing on economic recovery at home rather than loaning billions of dollars to the IMF to rescue troubled European banks. I vehemently oppose the inclusion of the $108 billion for the IMF in the War Supplemental bill. Had this provision been voted on separately—as it should have—I would have voted against this provision.

Reluctantly, I voted in favor of this bill because it reversed the Bush Administration's irresponsible approach to the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. I will continue to watchdog the IMF and look for opportunities to rein in their misguided attempt at restructuring poorer nation's economies.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in stroll support of H.R. 2346, the FY09 Emergency Supplemental Conference Report. This legislation provides the resources our military, diplomatic, and development personnel need to make our nation more secure.

The Obama administration's policy to defeat the Taliban and al Qaeda in Afghanistan and Pakistan is critical to prevent the region from being a base for terrorist plots against the United States and our allies. H.R. 2346 provides $3.8 billion for economic security initiatives in the region and funds our diplomatic and development personnel and their security.

I welcome the administration's efforts to forge a lasting peace between Israel and the Palestinian Authority. This legislation provides economic, humanitarian, and security assistance to the West Bank and Gaza to encourage stability and political moderation. It ensures that Hamas and other terrorist organizations do not receive taxpayer funds and conditions funds for a potential Palestinian unity government on all its ministers publicly recognizing Israel's right to exist, renouncing violence, and adhering to past agreements.

The conference agreement provides $420 million to help Mexico fight violent narcotraffickers with surveillance aircraft, helicopters, and law enforcement equipment, and to support rule of law programs, bringing to $1.12 billion the total appropriated in 2008 and 2009 for these purposes.

The bill exceeds the President's request for assistance programs and diplomatic operations in Iraq to ensure a smooth transition from the military mission to a civilian-led effort.

The bill includes $5 billion to provide the IMF with the resources necessary to respond to the global economic crisis. This funding is a central component of a comprehensive economic strategy to protect American families and jobs.

In addition, the bill addresses significant humanitarian and development priorities by providing $225 million to address the growing displacement of civilians in Pakistan and to help refugees in other countries; $836.9 million for peacekeeping; $256 million for countries impacted by the global financial crisis, including Haiti and Liberia; and the House-passed level of $100 million for the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Conference Report to H.R. 2346, the Supplemental Appropriations Act of 2009.

The agreement reached by the House and Senate negotiators provides our troops needed equipment on the battlefield and adequate pay for their service through the remainder of the 2009 fiscal year, compensation of $500 for every month they were forced to remain on active-duty for longer than planned since 2001, funding to fulfill President Obama's promise to end the Iraq War, support for refocusing our military and civilian operations in Afghanistan, and assistance for new counterterrorism, economic, and diplomatic initiatives in Pakistan.

In addition, this legislation contains much-needed funding to respond to urgent humanitarian crises involving refugees and internally displaced persons (IDPs). While I thank the Committee for including this assistance, I am hopeful such funding is just a sign on more to come. I am especially hopeful the U.S. will continue to respond to the dire needs to Iraqi refugees and IDPs, the largest refugee crisis since Palestinian Diaspora of 1948.

I would also like to thank Chairman OBEY for providing $1 billion for the program authorized by the Consumer Assistance to Recycle and Save Act (also known as ''cash-for-clunkers.'') I was pleased to cosponsor and help craft the cash-for-clunkers legislation which will result in meaningful reductions in vehicle fleet carbon emissions and fuel consumption, while providing much-needed stimulus for our ailing automakers and economy.

Finally, as a long-time supporter of the Department of Health and Human Services and front-line public health agencies such as the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, I am pleased that the Supplemental Appropriations Act includes $1.5 billion for these Federal programs, along with an additional $5.8 billion in contingent emergency appropriations for priority efforts to respond to the pandemic flu. Further, it provides $350 million to assist State and local governments, who play an important role in protecting the public, in preparing for and responding to a pandemic.

After the recent outbreak of H1N1, which has been confirmed in 75 countries, it became apparent that the United States must work swiftly to ensure our readiness. The funding provided in the bill will allow the United States to take important steps forward in protecting Americans from a dangerous outbreak, including the expansion of detection efforts, shoring up Federal stockpiles, and securing sufficient vaccinations.

I thank Chairman OBEY, the Appropriations Committee, and the conference negotiators for including these provisions, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Conference Report to H.R. 2346.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, we live in difficult times. Families continue to struggle to make ends meet. Two major American auto companies have crumbled before our eyes. And the US faces threats from groups and individuals across the globe who endeavor to do us harm.

Today, the bill before us—hopefully the last war supplemental funding measure of its kind—attempts to tackle at least one of these looming problems.

It finances the targeted strategy President Obama has crafted to minimize security threats to the United States and stabilize one of the most volatile regions of the world. The Supplemental's provisions on Afghanistan and Pakistan focus on preventing them from becoming failed states and safe havens for terrorists.

It is also a needed course-correction from the Bush Administration's policies in Iraq, Afghanistan and Pakistan—one that makes ending corruption and improving governance, not projection of military force, the top priority.

The President has asked me—personally—to support this measure.

And I will support it for three reasons. First, this bill funds a very clear strategy in Afghanistan and limits the military mission there. Second, it provides the means to end the combat mission in Iraq and requires the Secretary of Defense to report on troop drawdown status there.

Third, there is no funding for US troops to Pakistan—only non-military aid and counter-insurgency training to enable Pakistani forces to defeat the ominous Taliban threat inside their borders. It rightly focuses on programs that can and should succeed, rather than open-ended engagements that lack achievable goals.

Governance is the key—providing the Afghan and Pakistani people an alternative to the false promise of safety and security offered by insurgent groups who are in fact terrorizing local populations. Earning the trust of the people of those countries is crucial—reforming the police, cleaning up the court systems and targeting corruption are necessary to restore confidence.

One of the most important provisions contained in this bill is the requirement that the President submit a report to Congress within

the next year assessing the success of the Af/Pak policy—the extent to which the Afghan and Pakistan governments have supported counterinfurgency operations and governance reforms, and the ways in which they effectively governing the shared border region.

The oversight measures contained in this bill will ensure that the mission is focused and that our goals are met. Investments are specific and intended to funs a finite objective.

But this measure funds more than our engagements abroad. It provides $7.7 billion for H1N1 pandemic flu preparedness and response efforts—most of which will be used to expand our ability to detect the virus and supplement vaccine stockpiles. While this pandemic has not been as extreme as initially expected, many scientists fear that H1N1 could recur—in a stronger form—next year. This is a strategic investment in the federal government's contingency planning efforts.

Finally, the legislation honors America's wounded warriors, providing funds for health and rehabilitation programs.

I have long opposed conducting US military operations "off the books." President Obama is committed to ending this practice, which I believe is necessary to making sure our missions are effective and Americans can understand the real trade-offs involved.

Statement on Conference Report of HR 2346, FY 2009 War Supplemental Appropriations 15 June 2009

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this conference report on the War Supplemental Appropriations. I wonder what happened to all of my colleagues who said they were opposed to the ongoing wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. I wonder what happened to my colleagues who voted with me as I opposed every war supplemental request under the previous administration. It seems, with very few exceptions, they have changed their position on the war now that the White House has changed hands. I find this troubling. As I have said while opposing previous war funding requests, a vote to fund the war is a vote in favor of the war. Congress exercises its constitutional prerogatives through the power of the purse.

This conference report, being a Washington-style compromise, reflects one thing Congress agrees on: spending money we do not have. So this "compromise" bill spends 15 percent more than the president requested, which is $9 billion more than in the original House bill and $14.6 billion more than the original Senate version. Included in this final version—in addition to the $106 billion to continue the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq—is a $108 billion loan guarantee to the International Monetary Fund, allowing that destructive organization to continue spending taxpayer money to prop up corrupt elites and promote harmful economic policies overseas.

As Americans struggle through the worst economic downturn since the Great Depression, this emergency supplemental appropriations bill sends billions of dollars overseas as foreign aid. Included in this appropriation is $660 million for Gaza, $555 million for Israel, $310 million for Egypt, $300 million for Jordan, and $420 million for Mexico. Some $889 million will be sent to the United Nations for "peacekeeping" missions. Almost one billion dollars will be sent overseas to address the global financial crisis outside our borders and nearly $8 billion will be spent to address a "potential pandemic flu."

Mr. Speaker, I continue to believe that the best way to support our troops is to bring them home from Iraq and Afghanistan. If one looks at the original authorization for the use of force in Afghanistan, it is clear that the ongoing and expanding nation-building mission there has nothing to do with our goal of capturing and bringing to justice those who attacked the United States on September 11, 2001. Our continued presence in Iraq and Afghanistan does not make us more safe at home, but in fact it undermines our national security. I urge my colleagues to defeat this reckless conference report.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I opposed the 2001 resolution authorizing the use of force because I believed it gave President Bush and any future President a blank check to wage war anywhere on the globe, starting in Afghanistan.

Unfortunately, we will be unable to avoid such ill-fated actions in the future until we repeal the 2001 authorization.

Today, nearly eight years later, I oppose the supplemental appropriations bill for the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq because it continues us down the path of open-ended military escalation that can lead to war without end.

I oppose this $94 billion supplemental because:

It favors military activities over diplomatic, development, and reconstruction efforts by a ratio of 8 to 1;

It does not include an exit plan for Afghanistan;

It does not require the fully funded redeployment of troops and military contractors out of Iraq within 12 months; and

It does not include the strong regional approach the situation demands including a strong nuclear non-proliferation effort in Pakistan.

Madam Speaker, it is time we maximize our nation's "smart power" by increasing our use of diplomatic, development, and reconstruction activities.

Unfortunately, the supplemental appropriations bill does not reflect a fundamental shift in direction.

Therefore, I cannot support it.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of myself and my four colleagues from the U.S. territories to express our concern with Section 14103 of the Conference Report on H.R. 2346, the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2009, relative to a funding prohibition on the release or transfer of individuals currently detained at U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

Today, my colleagues and I have written a letter to President Barack H. Obama to convey this concern. I submit the text of our letter for print and inclusion in the official RECORD.

Washington, DC., June 16, 2009.

President BARACK H. OBAMA,
The White House,
Washington DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We write to respectfully request that your Administration not release or transfer any individual who is currently detained at U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba to any territory of the United States.

The Supplemental Appropriations Act (H.R. 2346), which is expected to be approved by Congress later this week, prohibits the use of funds made available in the Act to release or transfer any individual detained at Guantanamo Bay to the 50 states or the District of Columbia. However, the Act technically does not prohibit the use of funds to release or transfer such individuals to any of the U.S. territories.

Although we have no reason to believe that your Administration intends to release or transfer any detainees to the U.S. territories, we write to express our concern about any decision in this context that may treat the territories differently than the 50 states or the District of Columbia. The safety of the U.S. citizens and nationals residing in the territories is no less important than the safety of their fellow Americans residing in the 50 states. We are certain that your Administration fully subscribes to this view and, therefore, that you will treat the territories the same as the 50 states and the District of Columbia with respect to the release or transfer of individuals detained at U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

We thank you for your attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,
Pedro R. Pierluisi.
Madeleine Z. Bordallo.
Donna M. Christensen.
Eni F.H. Faleomavaega.
Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill.

I wanted to come down to the House floor to let the troops know I support them and how much I appreciate the work they're doing around the world. I have been to Afghanistan and to Guantanamo Bay this year to see the work they're doing, and it is tremendous. We should all be proud of their effort.

Unfortunately, today's vote misuses critical funding for our troops to push through billions in foreign spending. People in east Tennessee question why we're giving $5 billion and over $100 billion in loan guarantees to the International Monetary Fund to bail out other countries when we have so many needs right here at home.

Additionally, because this legislation designates everything as "emergency" spending, this spending is not offset and breaks the already-inflated spending caps. The way I see it, the only emergency I see is that a month has passed and the Democrats haven't added a few billion to our already record deficit in new spending.

I urge members to defeat this bill and force the Democratic Leadership to bring us back a clean supplemental that supports the troops.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the conference report will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the motion to suspend the rules on House Resolution 366.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 202, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 348]

YEAS—226

Abercrombie	Arcuri	Becerra
Ackerman	Baca	Berman
Adler (NJ)	Baird	Berry
Altmire	Barrow	Bishop (GA)
Andrews	Bean	Bishop (NY)

Blumenauer
Boccieri
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Cao
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (TX)
Ellsworth
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fattah
Foster
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McHugh
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sestak
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Spratt
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Wu
Yarmuth

NAYS—202

Aderholt
Akin
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
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
Capito
Capuano
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Conyers
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doggett
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Ehlers
Ellison
Emerson
Fallin
Farr
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Grijalva
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Honda
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kaptur
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Massa
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McGovern
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Waters
Watson
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—6

Alexander
Berkley
Kennedy
Lewis (GA)
Sullivan
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1827

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF NATIONAL EYE INSTITUTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 366, 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 Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 366.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 411, nays 0, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 349]

YEAS—411

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett
Bean
Becerra
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)
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
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)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
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
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
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
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts

Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Radanovich
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
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
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 (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stearns
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
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
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—22

Alexander
Barton (TX)
Berkley
Berman
Carter
Edwards (TX)
Frank (MA)
Grijalva
Harman
Honda
Kagen
Kennedy
Larson (CT)
Lewis (GA)
Maloney
McHenry
Neal (MA)
Poe (TX)
Smith (TX)
Stark
Sullivan
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1835

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, on June 16, 2009, I missed rollcall votes 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347 and 349, due to illness. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on all.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 544 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. 2847.

□ 1835

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. 2847) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, and Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes, with Mr. ALTMIRE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in regard to H.R. 2847, the legislation appropriating funds for Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for 2010.

Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume in general debate.

Mr. Chairman, if this is June, it must be appropriations season, and today I'm pleased to present to the House the first of the appropriations bills for fiscal year 2010, H.R. 2847, the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriation bill.

While the summer may be hot and humid, as is typical in the Nation's Capital, with the assistance of this body, our days and nights need not be long for the House to fully consider this and the other 11 appropriations bills in regular order, or so we hope.

I want to thank the ranking member of this subcommittee with most sincerity for his assistance, help, counsel, and guidance in the development of this bill. Mr. FRANK Wolf of Virginia was chairman of this committee for a number of years, served on it for a great number of years. We served on it together. He brings to this bill a lot of experience and knowledge and that is really helpful as you work up an appropriation bill, and I appreciate, Frank, very much your assistance on the bill and the credibility and knowledge you bring to it.

I also want to thank publicly and personally the chairman of the full committee, Mr. OBEY, for his assistance in developing this bill. Mr. OBEY's courtesy and the assistance of the front office has been very much appreciated, and we also appreciate, Mr. Chairman, the allocation that you've given us for this bill that's allowed us to do what we are allowed to do, however short the allocation may be.

I would also like to sincerely recognize the staff: the excellent work of the clerk, John Blazey, and the leadership he's provided to the rest of the staff, and all of them have done excellent work, which I appreciate: Adrienne Simonson, Dixon Butler, Diana Simpson, Darek Newby, Tracey LaTurner, Scott Sammis, all with the subcommittee; Mike Ringler and John Martens on the minority staff. And then on my personal staff, Sally Moorhead and Julie Aaronson.

It's a lot of work putting together one of these appropriation bills, as anybody who's been involved with it or close to it understands, and they have worked long hours diligently with great competence to move this bill forward, and I most sincerely thank them for the efforts. We couldn't do this without them.

Mr. Chairman, in brief summary, this bill totals $64.4 billion, an increase of $6.7 billion over last year, but it is $200 million below the President's budget request. The bill provides $30.6 billion for investments in science, technology, and innovation, an increase of $1 billion over comparable levels from last year.

Within this level, the bill provides $6.9 billion for the National Science Foundation and $18.2 billion for NASA. For NIST, the bill provides $781.1 million. For NOAA, it's recommended at $4.6 billion. The committee's recommendation continues to provide resources consistent with the doubling path identified for NSF and NIST in the COMPETES Act. It also considers the science and research conducted at NOAA and at NASA as critical to the Nation's science enterprise just as that performed by NSF and NIST.

For law enforcement and other agencies of the Department of Justice, the bill provides a total of $27.7 billion. Full funding of $7.9 billion for the FBI, $2 billion for the DEA, and $1.1 billion for ATF.

For the Bureau of Prisons, the bill provides $6.2 billion to address longstanding critical shortages in corrections' staffing and education, in addition to drug treatment. For State and local law enforcement activities, the bill provides a total of more than $3.4 billion, restoring, in large part, reductions proposed by the administration.

For programs funded through the Office of Violence Against Women, the bill provides an increase of $11 million, including a $10 million increase for STOP Formula Grants, and a $1 million increase for Sexual Assault Victims Services.

I want to be clear that while the funding table in the report for the Office of Violence Against Women may appear in the report to show a funding decrease, that is only because the bill moves a number of programs to the Office of Justice programs which actually administers those programs.

So, let me repeat, the bill increases funding for the Office of Violence Against Women by $11 million.

The bill provides a full funding of $298 million for the COPS hiring program. In other areas within the Justice Department, the bill provides $325 million—an increase of $41 million over the fiscal year 2009 level—for the Adam Walsh Act.

With respect to border security, the bill provides $1.5 billion, a 30 percent increase over fiscal year 2009. These funds will be used to address firearms and narcotics trafficking between the United States and Mexico, an issue on which every Member of this body has concerns, and we're pleased to provide these increases.

□ 1845

For the Second Chance Act, the bill includes a total of $114 million to develop and implement evidence-based strategies and programs at the Federal and State levels to reduce recidivism and the future costs of incarceration. I want to particularly compliment the authorizing committee for the good job that they have done with the Second Chance Act and other legislation they are considering. We are looking forward and appreciate the opportunity to cooperate with them on the funding side.

A significant initiative across the Department of Justice is increased investments in law enforcement and prosecution efforts in Indian Country, for which the bill provides approximately $155 million, and that is an increase of $65 million over fiscal 2009.

For SCAAP, which the President proposed to eliminate, Mr. Chairman, the bill includes $300 million.

With respect to the Department of Commerce, $4.6 billion is slated for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, an increase of $129 million above the request.

The bill provides $7.4 million for Census, the same level as the budget request.

For NASA, the bill provides a total of $18.2 billion, an increase of $420 million over last year's level. Investments have been made in Earth science to further the decadal surveys. The recommendation, however, acknowledges, and this is important for Members to consider and take note of, that the administration has established a blue ribbon panel, Mr. Chairman, led by Dr. Norm Augustine, to review the current vision for human spaceflight.

Funds are provided in this bill to continue investments in human spaceflight at the level of last year. Reductions from the budget request should not be viewed by this body as any diminution of certainly my support or the committee's support in NASA's human spaceflight activities. Rather, it is a deferral. It is a deferral taken without prejudice. It is a pause. It is a timeout.

Call it what you will, it is an opportunity for the President to establish his vision for human space exploration, looking at the Augustine report when it becomes available in August, and then for his administration to consider what their vision will be, and then, most importantly, certainly for our committee, Mr. Chairman, to come forward with a realistic future funding scheme for the human space exploration program.

We hope it is a vision worthy of the program, and we look forward to realistic funding levels, which we have never had, or haven't had for many, many years, for human spaceflight.

It is also important to note that the total funding contained in this bill for NASA is an increase of $421 million over the fiscal year 2009 level, and, moreover, some $1 billion was provided in the Recovery Act for NASA activities.

Lastly, the bill provides $440 million for the Legal Services Administration. Appropriations for Legal Services increased by almost $90 million over the last couple of years, with which we are very pleased. It is still underfunded compared to base years in the nineties. This is indicative of the rising need for legal support for the poor, particularly because of mortgage fraud and the home crisis.

The bill continues the existing limitations, Mr. Chairman, on the use of these funds, except that it lifts the current restrictions on attorney's fees.

Mr. Chairman, that is a brief summary of the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to join our chairman, the gentleman from West Virginia, in beginning consideration of H.R. 2847, making appropriations for fiscal year 2010 for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, Science and related agencies. The bill provides funding for programs whose impact ranges from the safety of people in their homes and communities to the study and exploration of space.

The bill before the House today addresses a number of national needs and requirements, and I think it is important for the RECORD to show that I believe, and I think any fair-minded person would, to say that the chairman has done a commendable job in balancing the many competing interests and has put together a solid bill in a fair and evenhanded way.

At times I have felt the minority has not been treated very, very fair, and I will say with the gentleman, we have been treated very, very fair, and I think it is important to make sure everyone knows that. We have not been foreclosed from anything.

I also want to thank the members of the subcommittee for their help and assistance, including the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. LEWIS, and the Republican members of the subcommittee, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. ADERHOLT and Mr. BONNER.

I also want to thank the staff on both sides of the aisle who spent long hours in putting this bill and report together. The majority staff: John Blazey, Tracey LaTurner, Dixon Butler, Adrienne Simonson, Diana Simpson, Darek Newby and Scott Sammis. And the minority staff: Mike Ringler and John Martens. And on my staff, Tom Culligan, and on the chairman's staff, Sally Moorhead and Julie Aaronson.

Overall, the bill, as I said, includes important increases to priority programs, including the need to address violent crime, particularly crime related to drug trafficking and gangs; and the need to boost our Nation's competitiveness through more investments in scientific research and improving science, math in education.

However, I believe we could have met the most pressing needs by prioritizing within the lower allocation. This allocation given to the subcommittee is $64.8 billion, which is $6.8 billion or 11.7 percent above 2009. This allocation allows virtually every agency, account and program to grow, and I believe it is more than a sufficient amount to address the highest priority needs.

The rate of increased spending in the bill corresponds with the majority's overall budget blueprint, which increases discretionary spending by $77 billion over the current fiscal year. Since the other party took control of Congress, nondefense, nonveterans affairs discretionary spending has increased by 85 percent.

This rate of spending does not represent a step toward restoring fiscal balance. There was an article today I think in Reuters mentioning that our Nation, if we continue the current course, will lose our triple A bond rating, it is the earliest date I have ever seen, by 2010. It is 2009 now. That means next year. So how we deal with that is really a tough, but an important, issue.

Some highlights: for the Department of Commerce, the bill includes $13.85 billion, including an increase of $4 billion to conduct the 2010 Census.

The chairman has included strong funding for trade enforcement, which I appreciate, particularly with regard to China and the full request for Commerce Department programs to enforce dual-use export controls and respond to cyber-espionage threats.

For the Justice Department, the bill includes $27.5 billion, $672 million above the request. The FBI's operating level is funded at the President's request, which is necessary in order to continue current staffing operation levels, which also fund the urgent increases in counterterrorism programs.

Too often we fail to recognize the critical and often dangerous work that the FBI is doing at home and abroad in order to detect and prevent terrorist attacks. This is incredibly important work, and the bill strongly supports those efforts while also providing necessary funding for the FBI to fulfill its traditional roles and address emerging problems such as mortgage and financial fraud, child exploitation, and the spread of violent gangs.

On the gang issue, this bill includes a new $35 million initiative to fund the FBI's Safe Streets Task Force and ATF Violent Crime Impact Teams. This will fund new task forces and new positions on existing task forces in the areas, which is pretty much the entire country, plagued by gang violence.

The bill increases State and local law enforcement accounts by $197 million. Despite this increased funding for SCAAP, the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, the program is reduced to $300 million from the current level of $400 million, and the chairman,

appropriately so I think, has drafted an amendment to increase SCAAP that I hope will pass with bipartisan support.

In the area of science, the bill includes important initiatives in science competitiveness. Our country is falling behind. We have about 95,000 engineers working for the space program, and China has about 200,000.

The previous administration launched the American Competitiveness Initiative, which included a commitment to double the funding are for basic scientific research over 10 years and also to strengthen education and encourage entrepreneurship. I am pleased that the chairman has done this and also that the new administration embraced this goal.

For the National Science Foundation, the bill provides $6.9 billion, a 6.9 percent increase above the current year for research that will set the groundwork for the development of new technologies and science education that will ensure we have a well-educated and skilled workforce to improve competitiveness.

For NASA, the bill includes $18.2 billion. This includes the full request for aeronautics, the shuttle program and the International Space Station, as well as funding above the request for NASA science and education. However, the bill freezes funding at the current level for exploration activities pending the outcome of a blue ribbon panel review of future options.

The result of this cut is a funding level that will not be sufficient to sustain the current development scheduled for the next generation of space exploration vehicles and would result in severe disruption to the Nation's human spaceflight program.

I look forward to the recommendations, as the chairman does, of the review panel being led by Norm Augustine, and to working with the chairman and other Members to ensure that the final bill will include sufficient funds to continue the U.S. leadership role in human spaceflight.

Finally, I want to acknowledge the important language that is included in the bill regarding the release and transfer of Guantanamo detainees. This bill does not prevent the closure of Guantanamo. It seeks only to ensure in the process of carrying out the executive order that national security, the security of our communities and the security of our men and women in uniform overseas are the highest priority.

The bill prohibits the release of any detainees into the United States. It also prohibits transfer to the U.S. for prosecution as well as transfers or release to other countries unless and until the administration presents a comprehensive report to the Congress on the proposed disposition of each individual. This report will detail security risks and measures to mitigate those risks and will include a certification that affected State governments have been notified in advance.

Regarding transfers to other countries, the report must address the risk of recidivism. Some are going to Saudi Arabia and Yemen. Saudi Arabia has funded many of these radical madrasas up on the Pakistan-Afghan border, and Yemen has been the center of a lot of terrorist activities. The report must address the risks of recidivism and detail the terms of any financial agreements related to the acceptance of the individuals transferred.

The language will ensure that detainees are not released into our communities, and it places important restrictions and conditions on future transfers and releases.

It has become clear in the last few days that the administration is rushing to release and transfer as many of these detainees as possible before the will of Congress to place restrictions can be enacted.

In closing, despite concerns about the overall levels of spending, the bill represents the chairman's best efforts to distribute the allocation he was given to the various competing requirements under the subcommittee's jurisdiction. I commend the chairman and I thank the chairman for his openness and his thoroughness to the minority.

I would say that the chairman held a week of hearings on prison reform. We, unfortunately, have the largest per capita prison population in the world. They were the best hearings that I have seen held in this Congress.

Based on that, and I want to commend Mr. MOLLOHAN, based on that, the Council of Governments and the Pew Foundation will be putting on a major conference this fall that I am sure the chairman will be very much involved in to establish the best practices, because you cannot just put a man or woman in prison and lock them up and throw away the key without any job training and things like that.

There was not a lot of coverage. I don't think The New York Times ever covered the story. I don't think many of the major papers did. But it was the best hearings in the time that I have been here, and I want to thank the chairman for his efforts and concerns. I think a lot of positive things will come out of that.

Lastly, I am pleased to operate under an open rule today, and look forward to the consideration of the many amendments that have been filed and will be urging my Members on this side at final passage to support the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for those kind comments about our Bureau of Prisons hearings. I would like to comment he was the leader with regard to prison reform and has been for a great number of years. Based upon those hearings, he is the one that contacted the State Council of Governments to encourage them to follow up with their proceedings in the fall. Thank you, Mr. WOLF.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the full committee, Mr. OBEY.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio for the purpose of colloquy.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, thank you for discussing with me a matter of great importance to the citizens of the United States.

At the heart of our financial crisis is the housing crisis and at the heart of the housing crisis is mortgage fraud. The FBI redeployed financial special agents in the last decade and have yet to allow the White Collar Crime Division to replace those agents even when it warned the public and the administration in 2004 of the potential for mortgage fraud to become an epidemic. The vast majority of mortgage fraud in fact goes unreported, and thus the depth of mortgage fraud is vastly underestimated.

In the savings and loan investigations of the late eighties and early nineties, approximately 500 FBI agents worked on cases. In February 2009, however, Deputy Director of the FBI John Pistole testified before the Senate stating: ''However, today's financial crisis dwarfs the S&L crisis as financial institutions have reduced their assets by more than $1 trillion related to the current global financial crisis, compared to the estimated $160 million lost during the S&L crisis.''

□ 1900

According to the Department of Justice budget documents, there are currently 175 FBI agents working mortgage fraud and corporate mortgage fraud. That is laughable, given the vast amount of taxpayer dollars still at risk. We know that the FBI Mortgage Fraud Division needs to have an increase in special agents and an increase in the necessary support personnel such as forensic accountants.

I look forward to working with the chairman as the bill moves forward to address this national need.

Mr. OBEY. Let me thank the gentlelady for her comments on this issue and her steadfast advocacy on behalf of those who are suffering during this economic downturn.

The bill we're considering today continues the process of rebuilding the FBI's mortgage fraud capability by adding 50 new agents and $25 million to the white-collar crime program. We look forward to working with the gentlelady to monitor the FBI's progress on mortgage fraud investigations and to ensure as we move through the conference that the Bureau is appropriately resourced and staffed to address a problem of this magnitude.

Ms. KAPTUR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your leadership on this issue and for your leadership on our full committee. I look forward to working with you to bolster the FBI's critical investigative capabilities and deliver justice to the American people through prosecution of those who have perpetrated systemic financial fraud and control fraud, which have brought our Republic to this dangerous juncture.

Mr. WOLF. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON).

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to sincerely thank Chairman MOLLOHAN, Ranking Member WOLF for the bipartisan manner in which this bill was put together. Mr. MOLLOHAN truly has, and Mr. WOLF, opened up this process to all members of the committee to participate. Majority and minority views are included, and it is, truly, the bill was put together in an open, bipartisan way, which I'm very grateful for.

And I especially also want to thank Chairman OBEY, Mr. LEWIS, Chairman MOLLOHAN and Mr. WOLF for the strong commitment that they have made to invest in the sciences, the National Science Foundation, the scientific work that's being done at NASA and NOAA. The scientific advancement that this Nation makes, and throughout our history, has been one of the most important factors in the advance of America throughout our history. And I'm very, very pleased at the investment the committee is making in scientific research.

However, I do have some serious concerns about the bill's reduction in funding from the budget request for NASA's human spaceflight frame.

Mr. Chairman, if I could engage in a colloquy with you, sir, to ask about the manned spaceflight funding and what the committee, what the country and NASA can expect as this bill moves through the legislative process.

Mr. Chairman, I want to ask if you'd agree that the United States must maintain its world leadership in space exploration, and that, in order to lead the world, America must have a robust human spaceflight program; and also, that NASA's human spaceflight program must have a clearly defined mission, and that Congress and the Obama administration should fully fund that mission. And also, Mr. Chairman, that Congress and NASA should do everything possible to mitigate the 5-year gap between the retirement of the shuttle and the initial operating capability of the next generation of human spaceflight.

And then finally, Mr. Chairman, that the Appropriations Committee, we will all work together in an absolutely bipartisan and open way to fully fund the mission of NASA's manned space program as defined by the Augustine Commission, the Obama administration and this Congress.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, let me thank my colleague, Congressman CULBERSON, who is a fine member of our subcommittee, and who brings particular expertise. As I often say, I aspire to know as much about the sciences as he does and he makes significant contributions to our committee. I thank him for his passion to our committee, and also to our Nation's space programs.

I share the sentiments the gentleman just expressed. I should note that the bill before the House today does not cut human spaceflight programs in fiscal year 2010; rather, the bill level funds ongoing activities until such time as the Augustine Commission completes its review, and the Obama administration commits to the next generation of human spaceflight.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I'm very confident that under the leadership of Chairman MOLLOHAN and Ranking Member WOLF that these proposed reductions from the President's budget request will be reviewed once again after the Augustine report is completed in an announcement from the Obama administration on how to proceed in human spaceflight. We genuinely appreciate the chairman's commitment to fund that recommendation with, of course, the input of the authorizing committee and the Appropriations Committee, because for America to surrender the high ground of space exploration, Mr. Chairman, would be as dangerous today as it would have been for General Meade to surrender the high ground of Little Round Top and Cemetery Hill at the Battle of Gettysburg. If General Meade had surrendered the high ground, I don't think there's any doubt that the United States would have lost the Battle of Gettysburg. And just as certainly as America would be at the mercy of our enemies, in position to lose any future war, if America surrenders the high ground of outer space to other nations.

Mr. OLSON. Will the gentleman yield to me for the purposes of continuing this colloquy?

Mr. CULBERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. OLSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for this opportunity to participate in this colloquy with you here today.

This Nation has been the leader in human spaceflight for 50 years, and the decisions we make today will determine whether we will continue to lead in the next 50. And I'm worried that as other nations look at the stars, we're staring at our feet.

The proposed cut in the exploration budget threatens our economic, military and technological standing, and would lead to a loss of up to 4,000 jobs, extend up to 2 years the time needed to fully design and develop the Constellation system, and result in additional cost of up to $8 billion. Therefore, I have prepared an amendment to restore that funding.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your pledge to revisit the funding issues based on the outcome of the Augustine panel, and that if the panel agrees, we will work as a Congress to reassess appropriate funding levels. In light of that commitment, I will not offer my amendment, and look forward to working with you to meet the pressing needs of human spaceflight.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I appreciate the work of both my colleagues from Texas. I appreciate and agree with the sentiments that they've expressed here today. I just wish I could have expressed them as eloquently as my colleague and committee member, Mr. CULBERSON, particularly as he alludes to the Civil War. I can think of no comparison to match it. But the sentiment I agree with.

Mr. WOLF. Reclaiming my time, Mr. CULBERSON is definitely the science man. I mean, he is the science guy. It's not debatable, and if we have an amendment, and he also is a Civil War guy too, but he is the science guy.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. I would point out, Mr. Chairman, those were Texans that were coming up on Little Round Top against Colonel Chamberlain that day, but I did want to point that out.

But I want to appreciate the subcommittee chairman, my good friend, Alan Mollohan, for the hard work him and has staff have done while drafting this bill. It's not an easy job being the committee chairman, but I know you've done a great job to balance these many priorities.

That being said, I just want to echo my comments, my colleague from Texas, JOHN CULBERSON, in regards to the current level of funding for NASA. And hopefully we can, as you said, we'll work with you to make sure that the $700 million, which obviously would be devastating to NASA if that cut stayed in, to make sure that we get that money back in the 2010 Commerce, Justice spending as enacted.

As you know, as has been pointed out, the challenges that we have with other countries that are making major investments in space—China, India, Japan, Pakistan, Russia. And certainly we don't live in a world today where we're the only ones involved in outer space.

So I support the chairman and what he's trying to do with the Augustine panel to wait to find out what the report is. But I'm optimistic we'll work this out with our fellow NASA supporters in Congress to provide necessary funding and the rules and tools it needs to realize the agency's human space exploration under President Obama.

And so I would again thank the chairman for your hard work on that.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I thank the gentleman for his comments, and look forward to working with him on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARNEY).

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to enter into a colloquy with the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee of Justice-Science, Mr. MOLLOHAN. And I want to thank the chairman for the increased funding in the bill to hire more corrections officers in our Federal prison system, which will allow the Bureau of Prisons to hire an additional 1,000 corrections officers nationwide.

And while I fully support such an increase, I believe we must do more,

given that the director of the Federal prison system has asked for an additional 3,000 correctional officers to effectively run our Nation's prison system.

And by bringing this issue to the floor, I hope to raise the awareness of our colleagues in the House regarding staffing levels at the Federal correction facilities located not just in our districts but in our communities all across the country.

The district that I represent, Pennsylvania's 10th, contains three of the 15 high-security penitentiaries operated by the BOP, in addition to one minimum- and one medium-security facility. Also I represent correction officers from communities working at two minimum- and two medium-security Federal penitentiaries in neighboring districts.

Additionally, we have one of the federal penitentiaries in my district, USP Lewisburg, that is in the process of being converted to a ''special management unit,'' the only one of its kind in the entire system. Lewisburg will house inmates from other penitentiaries who prove too troublesome to manage, but who do not qualify for the ADMAX facility at USP Florence in Colorado.

For various reasons, funding for our Nation's corrections officers has failed to keep pace with increased prison populations and increasingly dangerous prisoners over the last several years.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that you are making every effort to reverse the trend of underfunding the BOP and to assure that communities hosting Federal corrections sites, that they are safe, and the corrections staff working within the walls will be able to work together as this bill moves forward to ensure that the Bureau has the funding it needs to catch up with the staffing needs.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I thank the gentleman. I appreciate his rising on this important issue, and I appreciate his leadership in supporting increased funding for the Bureau of Prisons.

BOP funding has simply not kept pace, Mr. Chairman, with the rising prison population and the aging BOP infrastructure. The Bureau of Prisons prisoner population is currently 37 percent above the rated capacity for BOP facilities, and the prisoner-to-staff ratio is an appalling 4.9–1. We must begin to turn that around, and this bill takes a big step in that direction. This committee has had this concern for a number of years and has been working diligently to increase this funding.

The bill provides an increase of $481.5 million above the fiscal year 2009 level for the Bureau of Prisons salaries and expenses, which is $97.4 million above the administration's request. We added that $97.4 million to help restore the BOP's base budget, which has been progressively hollowed out in recent years by inadequate budget requests. These additional funds will enable the Bureau of Prisons to hire additional correctional officers and activate two newly constructed prisons.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I yield another 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Chairman, I understand that you are making every effort to reverse the trend of BOP funding to ensure that communities hosting correction sites are safe, as are the corrections staff working within the facility walls. I hope that we will be able to work together as the bill moves forward, to ensure that the Bureau has the funding it needs to catch up with staffing needs.

□ 1915

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I guess the biggest problem I have with this bill is that we've been talking about cutting spending and about controlling the budget. So far this year, in the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act, the TARP bill, we've spent $700 billion. In the Children's Health Reauthorization Act, the State Children's Health Insurance, we've spent $73.3 billion. In the America Recovery and Reinvestment Act, the stimulus, we've spent $1.16 trillion. In the February '09 consolidated appropriation, the omnibus bill, we've spent $625 billion. Now, I understand the necessity of this bill, but it's 11.6 percent higher than, I think, the same bill last year.

The thing that really bothers me is that, I think, you have 80-some pages of earmarks, of pork bill projects, whatever you want to call them, at a time when we're suffering severely economically and at a time when we're spending way, way more money than the American people can afford. We're spending so much money that they're actually, I think, running the printing presses over at Treasury day and night. I can't understand why we're allowing all of these earmarks, many of which have nothing to do with Commerce, Justice and Science.

So I would just like to say that I think this is something that we ought to take a hard look at when we get into the amendments. I wish that we didn't have this kind of a tremendous amount of additional expenses, and I sure wish we didn't have all of these earmarks.

If there is one thing the American people are very concerned about right now it is all of these additional projects, especially at a time when they're suffering at home. People can't afford their houses. They can't afford to take care of their kids' educational needs. There are so many problems the American people have. The unemployment rate is at—what?—9 percent nationally. Here we are with all of these earmarks, and we're spending all of this money that they don't have and that, certainly, the government doesn't have.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit for the RECORD a June 16, 2009, document on general funding levels.

To: Congressman Dan Burton
From: Legislative Staff
Date: June 16, 2009
Subject: Talking points

GENERAL FUNDING LEVELS:

The bill provides $6.7 billion (11.6 percent more than FY 2009 for programs funded under the CJS Appropriations bill.

Agencies funded through the bill received approximately $16 billion in supplemental appropriations outside the normal FY 2009 appropriations process, the vast majority of which came from the ''stimulus'' bill.

H.R. 2847 would provide $13.85 billion for the Department of Commerce, which is an increase of $4.57 billion, or 49 percent, over FY 2009. The majority of the increase for Commerce is due to a $4.2 billion increase in spending for the Census Bureau.

The bill provides $27.74 billion for the Department of Justice, DOJ, which is an increase of $1.65 billion, or 6.3 percent, above FY 2009.

Funding for science agencies is $25.1 billion, an increase of $868 million, or 3.5 percent, above FY 2009.

Spending for other related agencies is $956 million, which is $83 million, or 9.5 percent, above FY 2009.

CONSERVATIVE CONCERNS ABOUT THE BILL:

Earmarks: The Report accompanying H.R. 2847 contains $386 million in funding for approximately 1,100 earmarks, listed on 80, non-searchable pages.

Earmarks in the bill range from: $180,000 for ''Training the Next Generation Weather Forecasters'' at San Jose State University; $1 million for a forensics laboratory in South Carolina; $100,000 for Tennis, Sports, Literacy and Education Program in New York City

Competitive Bidding Ban: The bill prohibits the Bureau of Prisons from using any funds to enter into a public/private contract under the OMB Circular A–76, which requires private contractors to compete for Federal money to ensure that the U.S. receives maximum value for tax dollars.

Matching Funds Waived: The appropriation grants the Attorney General, AG, authority to waive a legislatively mandated requirement that Federal grants for prisoner reentry programs under the Second Chance Act be matched by State or local funds.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. KOSMAS).

Ms. KOSMAS. Mr. Chairman, I would now like to enter into a colloquy with Mr. MOLLOHAN.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to enter into a colloquy with the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. KOSMAS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to clarify a point in the committee report related to the space shuttle program.

It is my understanding that the committee's position relative to the retirement of the space shuttle is consistent with NASA's testimony and the administration's position that there is no hard date on shuttle retirement. This position that the space shuttle will fly until it completes its current manifest, even if it runs beyond 2010, has also been supported by this Congress, as demonstrated by the inclusion in this year's congressional budget resolution of shuttle funding in fiscal year 2011.

We also expect the administration to fund the fly-out of the shuttle when it submits its fiscal year 2011 budget request.

I hope you can clarify whether this is the committee's position as well.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. The gentlewoman is correct. That is the committee's position.

Ms. KOSMAS. I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for this consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I also rise to express my concern with the level of funding for NASA contained in the bill.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield another 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. KOSMAS. According to preliminary estimates, the funding included in the bill for exploration could cause additional delays of up to 2 years and could increase the cost up to $8 billion. These levels will also mean a greater reliance on Russia, a loss of our highly skilled workforce, and it could create a situation that could be detrimental to over 1,500 businesses that supply NASA and commercialized spinoff technologies. This level would result in thousands of layoffs in 2010. This will only exacerbate the challenges related to retaining our uniquely skilled workforce, many of whom are already working on both shuttle and exploration.

So we must recognize that the investments in NASA have large multiplier effects, contributing $100 billion to our economy last year and employing nearly 300,000 people in 41 States.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your consideration.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), the ranking member on the Science and Technology Committee.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, at this time of economic turmoil and of growing international technological competitiveness, it seems to me that America should be funding those things that advance our capabilities and that increase our standing in the world.

As ranking member of the House Science and Technology Committee, I've always felt that NASA has done more to advance America's technological leadership than any other Federal agency, and this bill presently reduces NASA's funding in human spaceflight at a very critical time.

The House Appropriations' reduction of $670 million in exploration systems represents a reduction of 17 percent from the President's FY 2010 budget request. With NASA on a path to retire the space shuttle after only eight more flights, America needs to rapidly develop the next generation of spacecraft. The $670 million reduction would have prevented NASA from completing the Constellation system before March 2015. In fact, because this reduction would occur in the peak design year when staffing is at its highest, NASA estimates that the work stoppages, inefficiencies and loss of key skills and capabilities would delay the Constellation program by as much as 2 years from that time.

Moreover, the cut in exploration funding would increase costs by as much as $8 billion to the program, and it would reduce the Constellation workforce by more than 20 percent in 2010, or by approximately 4,000 contractors, mostly from the existing workforce.

During this gap in human spaceflight capability, America must buy seats from the Russians to get to the International Space Station and fulfill our obligations to our international partners.

I am really encouraged that Chairman MOLLOHAN, though, and Ranking Member FRANK WOLF are working to mitigate this loss. I am grateful to them, and I thank them both for the colloquy.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. GRIFFITH).

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Chairman, I rise to enter into a 2-minute colloquy with the chairman.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for allowing me.

I rise from Alabama's 5th District, the birthplace of NASA and of the space program. I, too, am concerned, but I appreciate very much the hard work the chairman and Ranking Member WOLF have entered into in trying to preserve the NASA budget. However, the decrease in funding is of some concern to us.

The Aries 1 and the Aries 5 will represent what the Saturn was to us 50 years ago with spaceflight and in putting a man on the Moon. This is not just a matter of jobs; it's a matter of international security and of national pride. I believe, after the Augustine Commission is done, we'll find that the NASA program is underfunded and that the funding will return to a level that will put us on the Moon in 2020 and that will return us to manned spaceflight in 2015.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Let me just say that I appreciate my colleague's comments this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, let me first note that the bill before the House today does not actually cut human spaceflight programs in fiscal year 2010. Rather, the bill level funds ongoing activities until such time as the Augustine Commission completes its review and the Obama administration commits to the next generation of human spaceflight. In fact, the total in the bill before the House today provides an increase of over $420 million over the fiscal year 2009-enacted level across all NASA activities and programs.

We're talking only about the human spaceflight program here. I believe that the Augustine panel is well-positioned to make an informed review of planned U.S. human spaceflight activities and alternatives to ensure that the Nation is undertaking efforts that are safe, innovative, affordable, and sustainable in the years following the completion of space shuttle manifests and its retirement.

When that panel provides its information, its informed judgment, to us and to our new President and when we have had an opportunity to embrace the Nation's next human spaceflight program and to budget accordingly, we look forward to moving forward.

The CHAIR. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. GRIFFITH. I appreciate those comments.

Mr. Chairman, we will certainly work hand in hand with the committee.

I will say one final thing, which is that the human spaceflight community—the scientists who are involved in that—is a culture, and that culture cannot be interrupted and put back together again as though it were a puzzle.

So I appreciate so much your efforts, and I appreciate the wording in this bill. Thank you for allowing me to enter into a colloquy with you.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I thank the gentleman with those assurances, too.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. POSEY), who represents Cape Canaveral, who worked on the Apollo, who helped put the first man on the Moon, and who is a strong advocate for NASA and for the space program. He has advocated and has talked to me over and over about this.

Mr. POSEY. Thank you, Congressman WOLF, for that kind introduction.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to take a brief moment and thank Chairman MOLLOHAN and Ranking Member WOLF for their bipartisan commitment to fully fund America's manned space program.

Of course, I want to thank Chairman OBEY and Ranking Member LEWIS for bringing this bill to the floor and for allowing this process to work like it is supposed to.

The security of our great Nation and of the world will be enhanced because of their efforts to provide our country and the world with vehicles for our future Christopher Columbuses, Magellans and Marco Polos.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona, Chairwoman GIFFORDS.

Ms. GIFFORDS. I rise for the purpose of a colloquy with the subcommittee chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I am deeply concerned about the reductions from the request recommended for the NASA Constellation program in this appropriations bill. As you know, this bill provides the same level of funding as in the year 2009, and it's almost $600 million less than what the President requested for 2010.

As the Chair of the Space and Aeronautics Subcommittee, I strongly believe that NASA should be given the funding needed to carry out one of the

most important missions, which is exploration. I am very concerned that the levels obtained in this bill will be viewed by the Augustine Human Spaceflight Review Panel as a lack of support for Constellation and for NASA's other human spaceflight programs, programs that have been strongly endorsed, as we've heard by the colloquies here on the floor, on a bipartisan basis in last year's NASA Authorization Act of 2008.

So Chairman MOLLOHAN, is it your view that the Augustine panel should not interpret the House's action today as any weakening of congressional support for the Nation's human spaceflight and exploration programs?

Mr. MOLLOHAN. That is absolutely correct.

The funding deferral does not signify any weakening of the committee's support for human spaceflight and exploration. I would also direct the attention of my colleague to the bill's accompanying report that states this very fact.

□ 1930

And if I could find it here quickly, I would read it for her.

Ms. GIFFORDS. Mr. Chairman, let me continue, and when you find that—

Mr. MOLLOHAN. And I did find it. At page 146 of that report, I would refer the gentlelady to read a pertinent part. ''Accordingly, after the work of the panel is complete''—that's the Augustine Panel—''the committee expects the administration will amend its fiscal year 2010 budget request to fund fully the plan advocated by the panel, and that the administration's subsequent budget request shall similarly include resources that fund fully the Nation's Human Space Flight Program.'' That's in our report. And I am pleased to reaffirm that here tonight with the gentlelady with this colloquy and with the others that we've had colloquy.

Ms. GIFFORDS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

In addition, do you agree that it's imperative that the President—

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I yield the gentlelady 1 additional minute.

Ms. GIFFORDS.—and Congress provide the appropriate resources that we can avoid cost increases and further delays in the initial operating capabilities of our Nation's next generation of human space flight architecture?

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Yes, I do. And I stated as much at the subcommittee markup of this legislation. Again, I would turn my colleague's attention to the accompanying report where these sentiments are also expressed.

Ms. GIFFORDS. And finally, do you agree with me that the Augustine Panel should not be bound by arbitrary OMB budgetary projections as it develops its best advice to the President and Congress on the future conduct of the Nation's Human Space Flight Program?

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I believe that the Augustine Panel is well positioned to make an informed review of planned U.S. human space flight activities and alternatives to ensure that the Nation is undertaking efforts that are safe, innovative, affordable and sustainable in the years following the completion of the space station manifest and retirement. And when that panel provides its informed judgment to us and the President and we are able to evaluate it, our new President and our authorizers will have a chance to look at it and act on it, our new President—and we—will have an opportunity to move forward together on our Nation's future human space flight program and budget accordingly.

Ms. GIFFORDS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As we've heard tonight, not only is manned spaceflight strongly bipartisan, but it truly represents the best that our civilization has ever achieved.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. The gentlelady, among these other colleagues, is a champion of the program. Thank you.

The CHAIR. Both sides have 8½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. I rise to engage in a colloquy with you, Mr. Chairman, regarding the Commerce, Justice, Science and related agencies programs.

Mr. Chairman, as a long-time advocate for prevention of violence against women, I know that Federal funding is really essential to ensuring that victims of violence, especially in rural or underserved areas, have access to lifesaving programs and resources. There are several programs that assist victims of domestic violence in need of funding, including programs aimed at curtailing abuse in public and assisted housing, establishing privacy for victims, and providing outreach to underserved populations.

According to the National Network to End Domestic Violence, poverty and lack of education contribute to the economic dependency that keeps many women dependent on their abusers for financial support. Especially in these challenging economic times, though, as you recognize, domestic violence doesn't discriminate on the basis of race, ethnicity, economic status, or party identification.

In 2005, Mr. Chairman, there were 34 domestic violence-related homicides in your home State of West Virginia. And in my State of Maryland, in my congressional district, in fact, in just 1 year, from July 1, 2007 until June 30, 2008, there were 11 domestic violence-related homicides just outside of the District of Columbia in Prince George's and Montgomery County, totaling 16 domestic violence homicides in my congressional district in that short time.

Our communities need this increased funding in order to save lives, and financial support for the programs really is a matter of life and death. And so, Chairman MOLLOHAN, I appreciate the funding increase already provided in the bill, and I urge you to maintain this funding and to possibly increase it because of the need.

Ending domestic violence really requires, as you know, a collective commitment for law enforcement, prosecution, training, outreach, education, and of course shelters and programs as you have provided for in this legislation. And so I would appreciate increased funding for these programs as we work together in the future.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Let me first commend the gentlelady for her good work in this area in the short time she has been in the United States Congress and for her input into our subcommittee, which has certainly influenced our markup of the bill in this important area.

I thank the gentlelady for her comments. And I appreciate her support and commitment to programs funded through the Office of Violence Against Women.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I want to thank my friend from Virginia for his leadership on this issue and his attempts to promote fiscal responsibility and raise some significant concerns just in general about this piece of legislation.

The fact of the matter is that the rule that was adopted by this House to consider this bill in fact waives rules that are supposed to keep us fiscally responsible. So it waives rules that say that you have to have appropriate information about earmarks, and it waives rules to say that the PAYGO rule, that things have to be paid for, that we're not going to drive the Nation further into debt and deficit with the adoption of this.

Now, waiving a rule means that you don't follow it. And we don't follow it to such a huge degree in the area of earmarks that I have here the list of earmarks. And they go on, Mr. Chairman, for page after page after page after page in what I think is probably about six font. So it's pretty small. And there are thousands of them, literally thousands.

The question becomes whether or not anybody in Washington is listening to the concerns of the American people. And their concern that I hear every weekend when I go home and every day when I talk to my constituents and folks from around this land is that they don't believe that Washington is being fiscally responsible. They see bailout after bailout, they see expenditure after expenditure, they see bill after bill of more money going out the door and not money coming in, more things being done to depress the economy than to improve the economy.

And so, Mr. Chairman, it is with great concern that I believe we are launching into this appropriation season, having started the process by setting the precedent that thousands and thousands of earmarks are appropriate and that we are not going to worry about whether or not we pay for the bill itself.

So I think that we all ought to listen to our constituents and take pause and think about the issues with which we're dealing here and attempt to be more responsible with the hard-earned taxpayer money.

I thank my good friend from Virginia.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK).

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, before coming to Congress, I was a prosecutor in Coconino County, home to five Native American tribes. Many people do not realize that for many classes of serious crimes committed on tribal land, prosecution can only be initiated by the Federal Government.

Today, I represent 11 federally recognized tribes in my congressional district. I hear frequently from these communities who have seen major crimes going unprosecuted because the Federal Government is not providing enough help. This is why I have advocated for more Federal support for tribal law enforcement. These areas have always been vastly underserved by the government, and it is time we begin closing the gap.

Therefore, I am very happy to see that this bill directs $6 million to hire new assistant U.S. Attorneys who will be devoted to handling cases coming from tribal areas. This should provide dozens more prosecutors and will result in a huge increase in prosecuting major crimes in Native American communities all across the country.

Increasing the number of prosecutions will also reduce the level of narcotics flowing through many Southwestern tribal lands, providing an important step in closing a jurisdictional loophole that cartels have been using to their advantage.

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

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I rise in support of the bill, but to encourage the committee and this Congress moving forward to better address the issue of gaps in our missing persons database system. On August 24, a 31-year-old resident of my district, Billy Smolinsky, went missing. Sadly, foul play is suspected. And to this day, his parents, Janice and Bill, still don't know what happened to their son. What they found out, when they tried to go online to find databases that helped identify remains that had been found and missing adults, was that there is no central repository of information, and the databases that do exist don't communicate with each other. In fact, up until 2 years ago, there wasn't even a database that was open to the public, there were only databases that were available to private law enforcement.

Today, we have the Name Us database, which is available to individuals and families who are looking to try and find this kind of information, and yet it doesn't have enough information. The private databases that are run by the FBI don't communicate with these public databases.

And so I come to the floor this evening simply to encourage my colleagues in appropriations bills going forward to make sure that we look to appropriating funds to allow for this kind of transfer of information to make sure that families like the Smolinskys all across this country have access to the best and most accurate information possible to try to press their cases going forward.

I understand that there are legitimate privacy concerns regarding what kind of information the FBI might share with this public database, but I think that we can solve those problems and create a much more comprehensive public database for families going forward. I look forward to that conversation in coming appropriations bills.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, would the Chair be kind enough to let both sides know how much time they have remaining, respectively?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from West Virginia has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Virginia has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate Chairman MOLLOHAN and his staff for their hard work on H.R. 2847.

I feel it is necessary, however, to highlight what I feel is an egregious error on the part of the U.S. Census Bureau, the misrepresentation of data collected in the lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender community.

Last month, I, along with 51 of my colleagues, sent a letter to the Director of Office of Management and Budget, Peter Orszag, expressing concern over the U.S. Census Bureau's intention to continue altering data of same-sex married couples in the reporting of the 2010 census.

With same-sex marriage now legal in Connecticut, Massachusetts, Iowa, Vermont, New Hampshire, and Maine, it is crucial to accurately represent the collection of data for same-sex married couples. Currently, if same-sex married couples in these States list themselves as married, the U.S. Census Bureau will go back and manually alter the data.

The U.S. Census Bureau was created to collect data and provide the American public with accurate reporting on the population, not to collect data and then alter it based on political decisions. I hope the Obama administration will reconsider this policy and direct the Department of Commerce to provide the American public with an accurate representation of LGBT families in the U.S. census.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the distinguished chairman and I thank the ranking member for their collaboration on this appropriation. This is a very difficult challenge dealing with issues of commerce, science and justice.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the debate going forward dealing with the President's mark in the NASA space exploration, which was $400 million more than the House mark, and would only offer my support for the continuing statements that have been made on the floor of the House, hoping that we will have an opportunity to reimburse those dollars to be able to provide for space exploration, particularly as relates to the Constellation, the CEV vehicle, and to be able to achieve the goals that we need to achieve with respect to the international space station.

1945

I would hope that the Augustine report would not be impacted by this particular mark. And I know that there has been a lot of hard work. I obviously intended to offer an amendment. I will look forward to discussing this further with the chairman as we move forward into this section so that we'll have an opportunity to discuss possibly my amendment and the idea of working to lay a mark, if you will, for the idea that space exploration, the international space station, all are linked together, and it is valuable for this Nation that we continue to be on the cutting edge of science and provide the support we need for human space flight.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, in closing, as we look at this bill, I know there is going to be a series of amendments at different times, and I think a lot of the amendments that will be offered will be from Members who are very sincerely concerned about the economic crisis that our country faces. There was an article today in Reuters. Let me read it to the Members here. It says:

''New York Reuters: Technical analyst Robert Prechter on Monday said he sees the United States losing its top AAA credit rating by the end of 2010, as he stuck by a deeply bearish outlook on the U.S. economy and stock market.

''Prechter, known for predicting the 1987 stock market crash, joins a growing group of market heavyweights in forecasting the United States will lose its top credit rating as the government

issues trillions of dollars in debt to fund efforts to bail out the economy.

''Fears about the long-term vulnerability of the prized U.S. credit rating came to the fore after Standard & Poor's in May lowered its outlook on Britain, threatening the U.K.'s top AAA rating. That move raised fears that the United States could face a similar risk, with the hefty amounts of government debt issued in both countries to pay for financial rescues causing budget deficits to swell.''

So as Members offer these, I would just say there are some things there that are important in the country. We have got to get control of spending. But in other areas, our country is facing a crisis—in the area of science. Last year China and India graduated 700,000 engineers, and we only graduated 70,000, and 40 percent of our engineers are foreign students who are returning to their country.

And, lastly, in the space program, we have 95,000 engineers working on the space program. But China has 200,000. And unless we do some fairly dramatic things, our factories will close and we will lose the edge in science and engineering. So we need to gain control of the entitlement spending, and I hope to be able to offer an amendment to the Financial Services bill. I'm going to offer an amendment that sets up a bipartisan commission to put every spending program on the table, every spending program in the government on the table, and give that bipartisan commission an opportunity to then go around the country holding public hearings, but to send a proposal up to Congress and require the Congress to vote on it.

So I understand the frustration of many of the Members when they see this Congress failing to address the fundamental issues of spending in the Congress. And we also have the trustee's report showing that the Social Security system is beginning to go bankrupt faster, the Medicare system is going to go bankrupt faster, and young people have no confidence and believe that the Social Security system is not sound.

We have a moral obligation to deal with that, and I hope that Congress will.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time in general debate. Let me again reiterate my appreciation to the committee, subcommittee, and ranking member in marking up this bill. And we look to proceeding through amendments at this time.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chair, thank you, Chairman MOLLOHAN and Ranking Member WOLF, for the opportunity to offer remarks on the fiscal year 2010 Commerce, Justice and Science Appropriations bill. I appreciate your hard work and dedication bringing this important funding legislation to the floor.

As Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Research and Science Education and as a member of the House Committee on Science and Technology, I work with my colleagues to support and strengthen several agencies of great importance to our nation's technological innovation capacity. The core of that capacity depends on basic scientific research, and a vigorous research base is crucial to our national economic security. Coupled with that research base is research in education supported by the National Science Foundation (NSF).

I am pleased that this legislation has essentially supported the President's overall requested budget for the National Science Foundation, an agency which has great significance to our federal research endeavors. However, I do have some concerns about the science, technology, engineering and math (collectively, STEM) education funding provided for the NSF within this year's spending bill.

In late April, the President announced ". . . a renewed commitment to education in mathematics and science, since we know that the progress and prosperity of future generations will depend on what we do now to educate the next generation." I support this commitment, but am troubled that somehow the education directorate budget at the NSF is not keeping pace with the budgets of the research directorates. While the overall research budget of the NSF will receive a 9 percent increase in this year's funding bill, the education budget will only increase by 2 percent.

Congress, economists, and scientists have consistently maintained that the NSF's research and educational missions must be treated as co-equal and core missions of the Foundation. Enhancing our research competitiveness in scientific fields while neglecting the educational component of such research will cripple our ability to succeed as an innovative nation.

I want to recognize that both the budgets for research and education at the National Science Foundation are increasing in this budget, and I greatly appreciate the work of the Committee in supporting both activities. I simply want to emphasize that both of these endeavors are equally critical to the competitiveness of our nation, and research and education should be treated as parallel—and equally worthy entities—at the National Science Foundation.

I look forward to working with you on the NSF research and education funding, and, again, thank you for your dedication to improving our nation's research enterprise.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chair, I would like to associate myself with the comments by Mr. CULBERSON and many others about NASA's Exploration budget and the Constellation programs. I believe it is very important to National Security and to many science related efforts for us to aggressively move forward with our own launch capability and exploration efforts.

While I value international cooperation, it is very important that we not have to depend on other nations for access to space. The Ares and Orion programs have made progress, and we should accelerate them.

I look forward to hearing the results of the Augustine Panel. It is important that Congress take decisive action with regard to funding Exploration in this Fiscal Year 2010 budget. I look forward to working with my friends and colleagues, Chairman MOLLOHAN and Ranking Member WOLF, in the coming weeks.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Chair, I thank the chair, and I'd like to thank the gentleman/gentlelady for yielding.

The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform has been conducting extensive oversight of the Cenusu Bureau and its preparations for the 2010 census. We have identified many things that are working, along with many areas that need remedial action. However, it is critical that if these problems are to be fixed in time for the start of the census less than one year away, the census needs sufficient funding.

This bill includes a cut of $206 million dollars to the Census Bureau at the worst possible time. I strongly oppose these cuts, and any amendments that would divert money from the census. The Census Bureau needs these funds in order to improve response rates in areas that have been undercounted for many years. To cut money now on preparation and outreach would do nothing but increase the costs to count nonrespondents next year.

And let me just say, I've heard a lot from my colleagues and my constituents on this issue. My district in Brooklyn and other urban areas in general have suffered from undercounts over the last few decades, and we do not want to see this happen again next year. The Bureau has promised to address the problems with undercounting in urban communities and other areas, but we cannot expect them to fix their problems in 2010 if we cut their funding here today.

This cut would be devastating to outreach and education efforts and very costly in the long run. The Bureau estimates that a one-percent decrease in the mail response rate will add between $80 and $90 million to the cost of the follow up operations.

I urge my colleagues to support full funding for the Census Bureau and oppose all amendments that would take funds from this effort to accurately count all Americans.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

No amendment to the bill may be offered except those received for printing in the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD designated for that purpose in a daily issue dated June 15, 2009, or earlier, and pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate. Each amendment may be offered only by the Member who submitted it to be printed, or his or her designee, and shall be considered read.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2847

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

That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

INTERNATIONAL TRADE ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONS AND ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses for international trade activities of the Department of Commerce provided for by law, and for engaging in trade promotional activities abroad, including expenses of grants and cooperative agreements for the purpose of promoting exports of United States firms, without regard to 44 U.S.C. 3702 and 3703; full medical coverage for dependent members of immediate families of employees stationed overseas and employees temporarily posted overseas; travel and transportation of employees of the International Trade Administration between two points abroad, without regard to 49 U.S.C. 40118; employment of Americans and aliens by contract for services; rental of space abroad for periods not exceeding 10 years, and expenses of alteration, repair, or improvement; purchase or construction of temporary demountable exhibition structures for use abroad; payment of tort claims, in the manner authorized in the first paragraph of 28 U.S.C. 2672 when such claims arise in foreign countries; not to exceed $327,000 for official representation expenses abroad; purchase of passenger motor vehicles for official use abroad, not to exceed $45,000 per vehicle; obtaining insurance on official motor vehicles; and rental of tie lines, $444,504,000, to remain available until September 30, 2011, of which $9,439,000 is to be derived from fees to be retained and used by the International Trade Administration, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302: *Provided*, That not less than $7,000,000 shall be for the Office of China Compliance, and not less than $4,400,000 shall be for the China Countervailing Duty Group: *Provided further*, That the provisions of the first sentence of section 105(f) and all of section 108(c) of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2455(f) and 2458(c)) shall apply in carrying out these activities without regard to section 5412 of the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988 (15 U.S.C. 4912); and that for the purpose of this Act, contributions under the provisions of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 shall include payment for assessments for services provided as part of these activities: Provided further, That negotiations shall be conducted within the World Trade Organization to recognize the right of members to distribute monies collected from antidumping and countervailing duties: Provided further, That negotiations shall be conducted within the World Trade Organization consistent with the negotiating objectives contained in the Trade Act of 2002, Public Law 107–210: *Provided further*, That within the amounts appropriated, $3,715,000 shall be used for the projects, and in the amounts, specified in the table titled ''Congressionally-designate items'' in the report of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives to accompany this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. MOLLOHAN

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. 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. 11 offered by Mr. MOLLOHAN:

Page 3, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $100,000)''.

Page 23, lines 18 and 19, after each dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $21,132,000)''.

Page 45, lines 1, 4, and 13, after each dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $78,768,000)''.

Page 47, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $100,000,000)''.

Page 48, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $100,000,000)''.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment. I'm offering this amendment on behalf of Mr. HONDA, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. CULBERSON, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. DREIER, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. MCCAUL, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, and Mr. MARSHALL.

This amendment would provide an additional $100 million, Mr. Chairman, for the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, restoring it to the fiscal year 2009 funding level of $400 million.

Mr. Chairman, the current administration and the predecessor administrations have in turn each year proposed elimination of the SCAAP program. And since our allocation is $200 million below the administration's request, it is difficult to restore moneys such as to the SCAAP program to $300 million in the subcommittee mark. When the administration requests zero and then you have to fill that hole, that makes a tremendous strain on the other accounts in the bill.

I opposed the SCAAP amendment during committee consideration of this bill largely because it would have unadvisedly used the Bureau of Census as an offset. We are in the final year, final months of preparing for a census that's just a year away, and this is not any time to take money away from the Census. We have overcome hurdles in the Census and challenges as a result of some mismanagement with regard to census preparation. We are on track now. And this is not the time, given this short period before we have to conduct the census, to take money away from the Census, so we opposed it.

However, I am aware that there is considerable support, as reflected by the number of our colleagues who want to be cosponsors on this amendment here today. There is tremendous broad-based support in the body for the SCAAP program. It is supported by many Members; so I offer this amendment in recognition of that support.

Mr. HONDA is a member of the subcommittee and a cosponsor of this amendment, and he has been particularly persuasive about the need to restore SCAAP funding to the level that this amendment would bring it to.

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

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support strongly the issue of SCAAP.

I come from the State of California, where the financial situation is very grave, and help in this manner would be tremendous for the State of California and I suspect for the other States that have these kinds of problems too.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of Mr. MOLLOHAN's amendment, of which I am a co-sponsor, to increase funds for the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program (SCAAP). I'm pleased that we were able to work in a bipartisan manner to increase SCAAP by $100 million, from $300 million to $400 million. Representatives LEWIS, HONDA, CALVERT, SCHIFF, EDWARDS, CULBERSON, LINDA SANCHEZ, MITCHELL, GARY MILLER, GIFFORDS, MCCAUL and KIRKPATRICK all provided valuable input and support to make this happen.

Securing our nation's borders is the responsibility of the federal government. Congress has consistently legislated that the federal government must either take criminal aliens into federal custody or reach an agreement to compensate state and local jurisdictions for their incarceration.

The cost of jailing criminal illegal immigrants has placed an enormous cost on all of our states and local governments. My state of California, in particular, shoulders the greatest burden of illegal immigration, and has received over $2.5 billion in SCAAP funds since the inception of the program, representing 42 percent of nationwide SCAAP awards.

Los Angeles County and San Bernardino County, which I represent, receive only a fraction of what they spend to jail criminal illegal immigrants. According to Los Angeles County Sheriff Lee Baca, incarcerating illegal aliens costs the County $100 million per year. And according to San Bernardino County Sheriff Rod Hoops, jailing illegal immigrants costs the County $24 million per year. Yet last year, Los Angeles and San Bernardino Counties only received $14 million and $2.3 million, respectively. In fact, since 2000, Los Angeles County has received $159 million in SCAAP funds and San Bernardino County has been awarded $6.7 million. In nine years, Los Angeles County was reimbursed an amount equal to what it spends on jailing criminal illegal immigrants in just a year and a half, while San Bernardino County received SCAAP funds equal to what it spends in less than half a year.

While the underlying bill provides $300 million for SCAAP, this is still $100 million less than we provided last year. At a time when our state and local governments are feeling the financial crunch, they should not be forced to continue to shoulder what is a federal responsibility. This amendment will add $100 million to SCAAP, restoring the program to its 2009 level of $400 million.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of our amendment to block the proposed 25 percent cut to the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, otherwise known as ''SCAAP''.

SCAAP was created in 1994 to reimburse states and localities for the arrest, incarceration and transportation of undocumented immigrants who commit crimes in our communities.

Immigration enforcement is supposed to be a federal responsibility, but as any Arizonan can tell you, the federal government has yet to meet them.

When State and local governments are forced to step-in and do the federal government's job, it is only fair that they be reimbursed.

Last year, the Arizona Department of Corrections received $12.8 million from the federal government to house 5,600 criminal illegal immigrants in our state prisons. That was only 10 percent of the $124 million Arizona spent to house illegal inmates that year.

Currently, Arizona's state prisons hold 6,100 illegal immigrants, nearly 15 percent of the total inmate population.

The Arizona Department of Corrections estimates that it will spend $128 million in 2009 to clothe, feed and provide medical care to illegal immigrant inmates.

Instead of boosting funding to help pay the actual expense imposed on states like Arizona, however, the Fiscal Year 2010 Commerce Justice Science Appropriations bill cut SCAAP funding by 25 percent.

This is just plain wrong.

That is why I am proud today to join with my colleagues, from both sides of the aisle, to offer this amendment to restore full funding for SCAAP.

If we are serious about immigration enforcement, we need to reimburse Arizona—and other states that bear brunt of our nation's broken immigration policy—for keeping criminal illegal immigrants behind bars.

I want to thank Chairman MOLLOHAN for his leadership on this issue, and his willingness to listen to so many of us from the southwest who know how critical this program is to our nation's immigration enforcement efforts. Mr. Chair.

I urge all my colleagues to vote for this amendment.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. SCHOCK

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. 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. 8 offered by Mr. SCHOCK:

Page 3, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $500,000)''.

Page 7, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $500,000)''.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of amendment No. 8, which seeks to transfer $500,000 from the Census salary and expenses to the International Trade Administration.

The intent of this amendment is to dedicate funding for the International Trade Administration to conduct a study on the economic impact, including the loss of U.S. jobs, due to the failure of this body to pass the Colombian Free Trade Agreement. My intent is to have the ITA submit this study to Congress no later than 60 days after the date of this enactment.

For more than a year now, Congress has left an agreement sitting in our collective ''in box'' which will result in more good-paying manufacturing jobs for all Americans. And I, for one, want to know the price of this neglect.

Now, I understand that not everybody in this body or this Chamber shares my view. I know there are those who believe that the Colombian Free Trade Agreement will, in essence, result in the loss of American jobs. And to these Members, I would say vote for my amendment. If you are right, my amendment will prove that and the study subsequently will prove that. Please have the confidence in your convictions that I have in mine and vote for this amendment, and we'll see which of the two sides is correct.

I recently had the opportunity to travel to Colombia and Panama with a number of both Republican and Democrat colleagues. During this trip, we met with President Uribe of Colombia. And the President detailed with great specificity the human rights and labor strides that his country has made over the last decade. Every question that my colleagues raised to President Uribe, he had an excellent answer. Every charge these Members made, Mr. Uribe described how his reforms had addressed the issues. Colombia has done her part, and now we in our country need to do our part to ensure our top democratic ally in the region remains a good one.

And while I found the President's answers remarkable, I was most impressed with the view of the Colombian people. The vast majority of the people in Colombia we met with support the free trade agreement, even though they already enjoy virtually duty-free access to the U.S. markets as a result of the Andean Trade Preferences Act. They support the trade agreement because it will mean not only a new relationship status with the United States, but they will also be able to buy even more American products, putting more dollars back in American pockets.

After our experience in Colombia, it was the overwhelming belief of the Members on that trip, both Republicans and Democrats, that they could see firsthand the benefits of a free trade agreement, truly highlighting the bipartisan support in this body for the pending free trade agreement.

□ 2000

The facts for a trade agreement speak for themselves. This free trade agreement will help make American companies more competitive globally, increase their profitability, allow them to hire new American workers and help stimulate the economy. Currently we enjoy a $2.7 billion trade surplus, including a manufacturing surplus with nations with which we have a signed free trade agreement. But for more than a year, the majority has disallowed this body to add Colombia to this list. America's two-way trade with Colombia reached $18 billion in 2007, making Colombia our fourth largest trading partner in Latin America. Since America's market is already open duty free for imports from Colombia, the U.S.-Colombia Free Trade Agreement will give American businesses, farmers, ranchers and workers similar access to this important market. The independent nonpartisan International Trade Commission has estimated that the Colombia Free Trade Agreement would increase U.S. exports by at least $1 billion. Since Colombia signed the trade agreement in 2006, U.S. products have been charged more than $2 billion in needless duties, money that could have been spent by companies near our country making the products and expanding infrastructure here in our country to hire more domestic workers.

In 2008 the United States had a trade surplus of $35 billion with countries with FTAs that were signed under the Trade Promotion Authority, the same authority that the Colombia Free Trade Agreement was signed under. This surplus was up over 61 percent just in 2007. Finally, Colombia is a model country for what we need to do by providing an open hand from America to emerging democracies around the world. This country's bipartisan approach with Colombia, taken 10 years ago when they were on the verge of becoming a terrorist state, was a comprehensive diplomatic approach, one of open trade market policy and has brought them back toward a democracy. And the strongest way to promote democracy is with that same kind hand and the benefits it brings, not through an isolationist policy.

Finally, I would be remiss if I did not mention that on January 1, 2010, Colombia will formally enter into free trade agreements with Europe and Canada. For these reasons and more, I urge passage of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to the amendment and would be willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. WOLF. I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. I rise in support of the amendment.

As the gentleman says, Colombia is a strong ally and a partner in this hemisphere; and I support the Congress acting to implement U.S.-Colombia Free Trade Agreement. The trade agreement that has been negotiated would bring important economic benefits to the U.S. and level the playing field between our countries. It would create jobs. The unemployment rate that just came out is 9.2 percent. Not to do this would border on being crazy. The gentleman's amendment would serve the ongoing debate by generating information about the economic impacts here in the U.S. of our failure to adopt the agreement. So I urge support of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend my friend from Illinois for offering this amendment and just to point out a couple items as it relates to these issues. The Census is slated in this bill to receive $7.1 billion. So I think that the gentleman from Illinois has picked an appropriate, responsible amount out of that $7.1 billion to be used for a study that ought to be performed to demonstrate the importance of what ought not really be called the Colombia Free Trade Agreement. It ought to be called the Colombia Fair Trade Agreement.

As the gentleman stated with great eloquence, the lack of enacting the Colombia FTA by this majority is actually harming American companies. That's right, Mr. Chairman. We're harming American jobs and American companies by not acting on something that both executive branches have already agreed to.

So this is a wise amendment, an appropriate amendment, an appropriate area of study that ought to be done. I wonder if the chairman of the subcommittee would be willing to respond to a question.

To my friend from West Virginia, I wonder, if this amendment passes, is my friend from West Virginia able to commit to doing all that he can to make certain that this amendment remains in the final work product as it comes through the conference process?

I will yield to my friend from West Virginia.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. We're willing to accept the amendment. What happens in conference is in the future, and I wouldn't be able to make any commitments with regard to that in any way.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, that really is where the rub is, is that there appears to be no significant resolve on the part of the majority party to actually determine what the level of harm is to the American economy and American businesses without adoption of the Colombia Fair Trade Agreement.

I appreciate my friend from West Virginia for agreeing to accept the amendment. But it is with little comfort because, as you heard, Mr. Chairman, there is little or no commitment to making certain that this stays in this bill as it moves through the process. As you know, Mr. Chairman, this is the first step in this appropriations process, and we're early in the amendment process. But it seems to me that this amendment is of significant import, and also significant knowledge would be gained from this study to give Members of this body appropriate information with which to be able to make decisions as they move forward and decide for themselves whether or not to push their leadership, the Speaker and the leadership on the Democrat side, to, in fact, adopt the Colombia Fair Trade Agreement.

So I want to commend my friend from Illinois for the work that he's done and for the important amendment that he brings to the floor. I urge support of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I have great respect for my colleague, Mr. MOLLOHAN, and undoubtedly he is going to be one of the conferees. I would like to ask him a question.

What I would like to know is, when you go to conference, you and I both know that there's a lot of give-and-take. And if you really feel strongly about an amendment, you fight for it. So I'd just like to ask you this question: Because the Colombia Free Trade Agreement is so important, will you use every bit of your fiber and being to fight for this in conference?

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. As the gentleman understands—the gentleman has been to conference before on bills.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Sure.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. And the gentleman understands that conferees come to the conference from many different directions and have many different attitudes. There are many different issues in the bill during conference. I will tell the gentleman that we take seriously our bill as it is fashioned, as we bring it to the floor, and as it is amended on the floor as we proceed to conference.

Beyond that, the gentleman clearly understands that conferences are about process and that there's give-and-take in the Congress. All of the attitudes expressed in conference must be taken into consideration, and there is nothing about this amendment that precludes our not seriously supporting it in conference. But the gentleman is asking for something that the gentleman knows in the process cannot be guaranteed, and that is, I guarantee that we're going to do something in conference. I hope that's satisfactory. If it's not, it's the best I can do for the gentleman.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Let me just say that we've been fighting this issue for a long, long time. One of the biggest problems that we've had is drugs coming into the United States from Central and South America. And President Uribe of Colombia has been one of our best friends and allies down there. He has stabilized that country, and one of the things that he really needs is a Free Trade Agreement to help further stabilize his country. I think it's extremely important that Mr. MOLLOHAN, or whoever else is on the conference committee, realize the gravity of this situation. And Mr. MOLLOHAN well knows that when you go to conference, and you're sitting across the table from your Democrat counterparts, if you are willing to really hang tough on an amendment, many times you can get that accepted, especially when you start compromising on other issues that may be in the bill. So I asked the question of Mr. MOLLOHAN, will you fight for this in conference, and he reluctantly skirted the issue just a little bit.

So since this amendment has been accepted by Mr. MOLLOHAN, it seems to me that it should be pretty well guaranteed that he is going to do everything he can to keep it in the bill when it goes to conference committee. And if that is not the case, then, you know, this might appear to be—I would never accuse my colleague of being insincere—but it might appear to be a facade. So if you accept this, Mr. MOLLOHAN, I would just like to ask you one more time: Will you do everything you can to keep this in the bill?

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Will you answer the question? Will you do everything you can to keep it in the bill?

Mr. MOLLOHAN. We will approach the conference, my colleague from Indiana, exactly the way I described to you. We will consider every issue that is in the bill as it comes out of the House of Representatives seriously as we approach conference. If it's accepted, it will be in the conference report. You have the ranking minority member. He is going to be a part of the conference. The other members of the committee are going to be a part of the conference, and we will treat this issue just as seriously as we treat all issues. We will support it in conference, and it will be a part of the process of the conference as it moves forward. I hope that is satisfactory to the gentleman.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for his answer. I will just end by saying, I really hope this stays in the bill. I can't think of anything that's more important as far as stabilizing Central and South America than free trade agreements. We've been fighting for a free trade agreement with Panama and Colombia for a long, long time; and if we're going to make sure that we slow down the illegal immigration that's coming from Central and South America, we've got to do things to stabilize that entire region, not only from a drug standpoint, but also from the illegal immigration standpoint. So I really hope that my colleague—and I'm sure Mr. WOLF will—I really hope my colleagues will do everything they can to make sure that this stays in the piece of legislation.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHOCK).

The amendment was agreed to.

MOTION TO RISE

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIR. The question is on the motion to rise.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Point of order.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman from Illinois was on his feet

prior to the gentleman asking that the Committee do rise.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from West Virginia was the Member who sought recognition, and he had a motion preferential to an amendment.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the Chair.

The CHAIR. The question is on the motion to rise.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 179, noes 124, not voting 136, as follows:

[Roll No. 350]

AYES—179

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Bright
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cuellar
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeLauro
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Driehaus
Ellison
Ellsworth
Engel
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Giffords
Gonzalez
Grayson
Green, Al
Griffith
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Hodes
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kildee
Kilroy
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Marshall
Massa
McCarthy (NY)
McGovern
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Nye
Obey
Ortiz
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sablan
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Shuler
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spratt
Tauscher
Taylor
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Welch
Wilson (OH)
Yarmuth

NOES—124

Akin
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Boehner
Boozman
Boustany
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dreier
Ehlers
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Graves
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Herger
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Lummis
McCarthy (CA)
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Murphy, Tim
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paulsen
Pence
Platts
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Rehberg
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stearns
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Wu

NOT VOTING—136

Aderholt
Alexander
Baird
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bilirakis
Blunt
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Cao
Carney
Christensen
Clay
Conyers
Costello
Crenshaw
Crowley
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (IL)
DeGette
Diaz-Balart, L.
Dicks
Dingell
Doyle
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Eshoo
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hare
Harman
Hensarling
Higgins
Hill
Hinojosa
Holden
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Maffei
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (MA)
Matheson
Matsui
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McHugh
Meeks (NY)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Olson
Olver
Pallone
Paul
Peterson
Petri
Pierluisi
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Radanovich
Rangel
Reichert
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Rothman (NJ)
Royce
Ruppersberger
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shadegg
Sherman
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NJ)
Souder
Space
Speier
Stark
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Tierney
Velázquez
Wamp
Waxman
Weiner
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Woolsey
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

□ 2101

Messrs. AKIN and PLATTS, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, and Messrs. MCKEON and TERRY changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Messrs. LIPINSKI, DOGGETT and MINNICK changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the motion to rise was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. TAUSCHER) having assumed the chair, Mr. ALTMIRE, 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. 2847) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, and Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. CANTOR. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland, the majority leader, for the purpose of inquiring about the schedule for the rest of the evening.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First, I want the Members to understand the context in which we find ourselves. I have indicated—and I have had discussions with Mr. BOEHNER, with Mr. CANTOR and with Mr. LEWIS with reference to the appropriations bills—that none of us likes the omnibus appropriations bills.

In order to pass appropriations bills individually, you have to take appropriately significant time, but if you take so much time that you can't possibly get them done, then you are left at the end of the day with an omnibus appropriations bill which nobody likes.

In discussions with Mr. BOEHNER, with Mr. CANTOR and with Mr. LEWIS, Mr. OBEY and I have tried to come to an agreement on time constraints. There was a discussion on the floor during the course of the rule between Mr. OBEY and Mr. LEWIS with respect to time constraints, and at that point in time, that was not possible.

Subsequent to that, there were further discussions between Mr. OBEY and Mr. LEWIS in which there seemed to be some progress, perhaps, that was possible. As a result, we proceeded with the preprinting requirement that, I know, some people felt was an unnecessary constraint, but it is, after all, the opportunity to give notice to Members of what amendments can be anticipated; but I know that I've discussed it on your side of the aisle, and you felt that was an imposition. We felt it was an open rule because the amendments were not specified.

Notwithstanding that disagreement, there were 127 total amendments. One amendment just now was offered by Mr. SCHOCK, my good friend. He and I have a good relationship. We've traveled together, and I think he is a good Member. We accepted. Notwithstanding that, it took 20 minutes of debate and was going to be subject to a vote.

Now, if you multiply, say, 25 minutes—and we had a 15-minute vote. If

you multiply that by 127, you come to a pretty high number, making it impossible for us to complete, in my view, the appropriations process by the end of July. If we don't complete it by the end of July, frankly, we won't have the opportunity to conference with the Senate and, therefore, will not be able to complete the process in a timely fashion. I don't know whether that's the objective of some, but it is certainly not my objective.

As a result—I was not here—Mr. OBEY felt it necessary for us to go to the Rules Committee for the purposes of constraining time. In a body of 435 people in which everybody has an opportunity to do 5 minutes and to then, perhaps, even get yielded some additional time from somebody else who takes 5 minutes, it would be impossible to complete 10 amendments, much less 127 amendments, in a time frame that we agreed to in a unanimous consent request in 2006 and in 2005.

In fact, on this bill, the average number of amendments that were offered when you were in the majority was 30, the average number. There was a high of 46. In 2004, 16 amendments were offered—10 Republicans and 6 Democrats. In other words, for your bill, you offered more amendments to your bill than we offered to your bill. We would like to proceed in a fashion that is reasonable and that provides for opportunities for amendments to be offered, but we also believe that it is our responsibility to ensure that the appropriations process is completed.

So, when Mr. OBEY asked that the Committee rise, it was, at that point in time, the intention to go to the Rules Committee to provide for amendments in order, not all 127 amendments—I can't predict how many amendments. There are a lot of duplications in that—and to provide for, however, time constraints within which we can do our business. We do not think that's unreasonable, and we certainly don't think it's unfair.

I will tell you that, in 2007, we proceeded for 10 bills without time constraints. From our perspective, we thought we had an agreement that we would use the same time that we gave to you in 2006 when you were in the majority and were controlling. We gave this to Mr. LEWIS. Notwithstanding that, we believe we went at least 53 hours overtime. That is 53 hours longer than the unanimous consent constraints that we gave to you when you were in the majority and we were in the minority. As you know, the last two bills were very contentious because we did, in fact, pursue them under a rule.

I want to say to the Members, particularly who are new, that, while appropriations bills have historically been open, they have historically not taken—as a matter of fact, some of the biggest bills have taken some of the shortest times—the Labor-Health bill and the Defense bill. I've served on the Appropriations Committee from 1983 until I became majority leader 2½ years ago, so I'm fairly familiar with the procedures under which we operate.

So I tell my friend, the Republican whip, that the reason for rising was to give us the opportunity to go to the Rules Committee and to provide for, as I said, time constraints in which we can effectively complete this bill.

I want to say to the Members that we did not expect to have votes. We had votes. Your side believed that we ought to have votes, so we had a vote to rise, but we have made efforts to try to reach agreement to provide a process in which we can complete the appropriations bills.

Very frankly, we think that, in years past, there have been a lot of amendments that have been offered, not for the purpose of the substance of the amendment but for the purpose of simply delaying the ability to get our work done. We've been in the minority ourselves. We understand the frustration that exists; but my responsibility as the majority leader and as the manager of this floor is to provide for the completion of our appropriations process one at a time so that we can consider them on their merits and then, hopefully, pass them individually and have them signed. It would be my hope to have them signed before the beginning of the fiscal year. That's our thought and plan.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, I would, first of all, respond to speak to the issue of the 127 amendments having been filed. I think that it's certainly a result of and, perhaps, due to the unintended consequences of imposing a preprinting requirement.

As the gentleman and I have discussed, many of our Members felt it necessary to prefile their amendments to preserve their right to proffer an amendment without necessarily having the intention of following through with offering that amendment. There are several amendments that are duplicative. There are many amendments that our Members have already said that they would not offer.

So I would say to the gentleman that it is hard for us on this side of the aisle to stand here and to accept the notion that somehow, 30 minutes into the debate and on page 2 of line 7 of the bill and while in discussion of the first Republican amendment, that was where you drew the line and decided that the tactics by us were going to be dilatory. It certainly seems to me, I would say to the gentleman, with all due respect, that there was some preconceived notion that this was the direction in which the majority was going to head regardless.

Furthermore, Madam Speaker, I will say to the gentleman—and the gentleman and I have spoken about this—it is our intention to practice some good faith and to ask the majority to engage with us, to allow our Members to come to the floor, to deliberate in the context of the only constitutional duty of this body, which is the expenditure of taxpayer dollars, and to allow our voice to be heard.

I hardly think, Madam Speaker, that the decision to close this process after 30 minutes, to close this process after just the first Republican amendment, is at all being made in good faith.

So I ask the gentleman again: What is the thinking of the majority here? The first appropriations bill. The first Republican amendment. How is it that we can expect a good-faith debate?

Our Members complied with your rule— unprecedented. The gentleman speaks to prior years and to the number of amendments that came up on this bill and on others. He knows as well as I that the preprinting requirement was not in place. This is the unintended consequence of a preprinting requirement, the 127 amendments. We have had that discussion. There will not be discussion and debate and votes asked for 127 amendments. So we stand here in good faith and want to engage with the Members on your side of the aisle.

So I ask the gentleman: What is it? What is the intention tonight—to go back to Rules? Our Members have already been told their amendments will be accepted. Now how should they proceed?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me reiterate what the gentleman knows to be the case. He and I have discussed this matter on at least three different occasions. They were, I think, friendly discussions. The gentleman indicated that he did not believe an agreement was possible on the time constraints. Mr. BOEHNER indicated that to me as well, so it's not as if we haven't had significant discussions about this. You also, in fairness, did indicate to me that the preprinting requirement would be something that your side would take umbrage at.

Mr. OBEY, I think correctly, said both sides like notice of actions that are to be taken on the floor. In fact, when we take notice, when we do less than 24 hours, you rightfully believe that's inappropriate. I agree with you on that, and we try to do that. Sometimes we don't make it.

□ 2115

But the fact is that this is not as if we haven't had some discussions over at least the last 2 months about this issue. And from my perspective—I don't want to speak for Mr. OBEY, who has spoken with Mr. LEWIS as well—but over the last 2 months I have seen nothing that indicated to me that time constraints would be agreeable to your side of the aisle, not from you, not from Mr. BOEHNER, not from anybody else, not from Mr. LEWIS, who on this floor just hours ago indicated that there would not be any time agreements possible.

So in that context, I am in a position where, if that's the case—and you may

well be correct that 127 wouldn't be offered, but very frankly, our experience in 2007—now, in 2008, the appropriation process was attenuated, as you know. It upset you and disappointed me that we didn't have bills. The reasons for that, obviously, dealt with mainly the Appropriations Committee fighting about energy, as you know. One can blame one another for that, but in any event, it didn't go forward. Nobody was pleased that we didn't consider the bills individually, and we ended up, as you well know, earlier this year doing an omnibus appropriation bill. We did omnibus appropriation bills frequently when you were in charge of the House, as well. Neither side liked that then or when we did it.

So I tell my friend, the intention is going to be to try to construct time frames—and we would be glad to have further discussions with you on those—which will allow for these 12 bills to be done in the time available to us between now and July 30. Because if we don't get them done, I guarantee you that when we get back in September, with 21 days left to go, we will not be able to conference these bills and get them done. That is a practical matter. For those of you who are new, I will tell you that. For those of who have been here, you understand that that's the case.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, I would respond, first of all, to the suggestion that the discussions that we've had, and others, over the last 2 months as to whether an agreement was possible, frankly, is unprecedented. Because in years past in the appropriations process, time agreements were arrived at once the number of amendments were known, and we worked out the agreements and debate ensued thereunder.

We did not know prior to the deadline and the cutoff of preprinting requirements as to how many amendments there would be. So we do know now how many amendments there would be. But again, Madam Speaker, I say what sticks with us, and not very well, is your decision to cut debate off on page 2, line 7 of the bill after the first Republican amendment. Madam Speaker, again, with all due respect, that does not speak in good faith about the majority's intention to allow us the opportunity to speak to the issues surrounding the expenditure of taxpayer dollars. That is not good faith.

We stand here in good faith, as the gentleman and I have discussed prior, and we want the opportunity to show you that we can conduct debate in good faith, deliberate on the people's business, and not be shut out summarily. And it is very hard, again, Madam Speaker, for us to accept that the majority had any intention of allowing debate if we shut it off after 30 minutes and the first Republican amendment.

So I say to the gentleman, we stand here and we ask you to allow us to proceed this evening, allow us to demonstrate good faith so that then the majority can then match that good faith and we can proceed in this House in normal course in the appropriations process.

I yield back the balance of my time.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 0250

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCGOVERN) at 2 o'clock and 50 minutes a.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2847, COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

Mr. PERLMUTTER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111–158) on the resolution (H. Res. 552) providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2847) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, and Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 2847.

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

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today (up until 4:00 p.m.) on account of his daughters' graduation.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 52 minutes a.m.), the House adjourned until today, Wednesday, June 17, 2009, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

2195. A letter from the Attorney, Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Red Bull Air Race, Detroit River, Detroit, MI [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0089] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2196. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Saftey Zone: F/V PATRIOT, Massachusetts Bay, MA [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0424] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2197. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Allegheny River Mile Marker 0.4 to Mile Marker 0.6, Pittsburgh, PA [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0016] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2198. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Saftey zone; Sea World June Fireworks; Mission Bay, San Diego, California [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0267] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2199. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Saftey zone; Sea World Fireworks Season Kickoff; Mission Bay, San Diego, California [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0279] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 4, 20029, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2200. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Ocean Beach Fourth of July Fireworks; Pacific Ocean, San Diego, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0122] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2201. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Big Bay Fourth of July Fireworks; San Diego Bay, San Diego, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0123] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2202. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Mission Bay Yacht Club Fourth of July Fireworks; Mission Bay, San Diego, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0124] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2203. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety zone; Sea World Memorial Day Fireworks; Mission Bay, San Diego, California [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0265] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2204. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety zone; Sea World 4th of July Fireworks Display; Mission Bay, San Diego, California [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0103] (RIN: 1625-

AA00) received June 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2205. A letter from the Attorney, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulation for Marine Events; Temporary Change of Dates for Recurring Marine Events in the Fifth Coast Guard District [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0106] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received June 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2206. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special local Regulations for Marine Events; Patuxent River, Patuxent River, MD [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0107] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received June 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2207. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Coronado Fourth of July Fireworks; San Diego Bay, San Diego, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0120] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2208. A letter from the Attorney, Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone: Ocean City Air Show, Atlantic Ocean, Ocean City, MD [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0064] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2209. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Marine Events Regattas; Annual Marine Events in the Eighth Coast Guard District [Docket No.: USCG-2008-0386] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received June 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2210. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Sturgeon Bay Ship Canal, Sturgeon Bay, WI [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0385] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received June 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2211. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — International Air Pollution Prevention (IAPP) Certificates [Docket No.: USCG-2008-1014] (RIN: 1625-AB31) received June 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2212. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Underwater Object, Massachusetts Bay, MA [Docket No.: USCG-2008-1272] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2213. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; ESL Air and Water Show, Lake Ontario, Ontario Beach Park, Rochester, NY [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0343] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2214. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; June and July Northwest Harbor Safety Zone; Northwest Harbor, San Clemente Island, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0330] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2215. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Paradise Point Fourth of July Fireworks; Mission Bay, San Diego, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0125] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2216. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety zone; Sea World May Fireworks; Mission Bay, San Diego, California [Docket No. USCG-2009-0266] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2217. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety zone; Copper Canyon Clean up; Lake Havasu, Arizona [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0242] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2218. A letter from the Attorney, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Use of Force Training Flights, San Pablo Bay, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0300] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2219. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A380-841, -842, and -861 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0433; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-003-AD; Amendment 39-15902; AD 2009-10-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2220. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Related Consideration in the Design and Operation of Transport Category Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2006-26722; Amendment Nos. 25-127] (RIN: 2120-A166) received June 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2221. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747-400 and 747-400D Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0135; Directorate Identifier 2008-NM-170-AD; Amendment 39-15901; AD 2009-10-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2222. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drug Enforcement Assistance; OMB Approval of Information Collection [Docket No.: FAA-2006-26714; Amdt. Nos. 47-28, 61-118, 63-36, and 65-51] (RIN: 2120-AI43) received June 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2223. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drug and Alcohol Testing Program [Docket No.: FAA-2008-0937; Amendment Nos. 61-122, 63-37, 65-53, 91-307, 120-0, 121-343, 135-117] (RIN: 2120-AJ37) received June 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2224. A letter from the Trial Attorney, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendments Updating the Address for the Federal Railroad Administration and Reflecting the Migration to the Federal Docket Management System [Docket No.: FRA-2008-0128] (RIN: 2130-AB99) received June 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2225. A letter from the Trial Attorney, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hours of Service of Railroad Employees; Amended Recordkeeping and Reporting Regulations [Docket No.: 2006-26176, Notice No. 1] (RIN: 2130-AB85) received June 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2226. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Rushville, NE [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0120; Airspace Docket No. 09-ACE-2] received June 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2227. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Fulton, MO [Docket No.: FAA-2008-1230; Airspace Docket No. 08-ACE-1] received June 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2228. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Diamond Aircraft Industries GmbH Model DA 40 and DA 40 F Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0240; Directorate Identifier 2009-CE-015-AD; Amendment 39-15899; AD 2009-10-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2229. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30665 Amdt. No 3320] received June 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2230. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30666; Amdt. No. 3321] received June 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2231. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model CL-600-2B19 (Regional Jet Series 100 and 440) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0428; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-053-AD; Amendment 39-15900; AD 2009-10-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2232. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Refugio, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0241; Airspace Docket No. 09-ASW-6] received June 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2233. A letter from the Trail Attorney, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Miscellaneous Revisions to the Procedures for Handling Petitions for Emergency Waiver of Safety Regulations and the Procedures for Disqualifying Individuals from Performing Safety-

Sensitive Functions [Docket No.: FRA-2009-0006; Notice No. 1] (RIN: 2130-AC02) received June 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2234. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; 328 Support Services GmbH Dornier Model 328-100 and -300 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0419; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-050-AD; Amendment 39-15898; AD 2009-10-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2235. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; BAE Systems (Operations) Limited (Jetstream) Model 4101 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2008-1214; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-259-AD; Amendment 39-15897; AD 2009-10-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2236. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney (PW) JT9D-7R4 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2006-23742; Directorate Identifier 2005-NE-53-AD; Amendment 39-15896; AD 2009-10-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2237. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30662; Amdt. No. 480] received June 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2238. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Robinson R-22/R-44 Special Training and Experience Requirements [Docket No.: FAA-2002-13744; Amendment No. SFAR 73-2] (RIN: 2120-AJ27) received June 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2239. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Communication and Area Navigation Equipment (RNAV) Operations in Remote Locations and Mountainous Terrain [Docket No.: FAA-2002-14002; Amendment Nos. 91-306 and 135-110 (RIN: 2120-AJ46) received June 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2240. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30668; Amdt. No. 3323] received June 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2241. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30667 Amdt. No 3222] received June 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2242. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's report on the Preliminary Damage Assessment information on FEMA-1832-DR, pursuant to Public Law 110-329, section 539; jointly to the Committees on Homeland Security, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Appropriations.

2243. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's report on the Preliminary Damage Assessment information on FEMA-1829-DR, pursuant to Public Law 110-329, section 539; jointly to the Committees on Homeland Security, Appropriations, and Transportation and Infrastructure.

2244. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's report on the Preliminary Damage Assessment information on FEMA-1830-DR, pursuant to Public Law 110-329, section 539; jointly to the Committees on Homeland Security, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calender, as follows:

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2892. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes (Rept. 111–157). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Filed on June 17 (legislative day of June 16), 2009]

Ms. SLAUGHTER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 552. Resolution providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2847) making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and Justice, and Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes (Rept. 111–158). 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. SLAUGHTER (for herself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ARCURI, Ms. BERKLEY, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MASSA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PLATTS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. WEXLER, and Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN):

H.R. 2882. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to direct certain coeducational elementary and secondary schools to make available information on equality in school athletic programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. FILNER, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO):

H.R. 2883. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for security at wastewater treatment works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. PIERLUISI, and Mr. SABLAN):

H.R. 2884. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that electricity produced in certain possessions of the United States and other areas is eligible for the credit for electricity produced from certain renewable resources; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. PIERLUISI, and Mr. SABLAN):

H.R. 2885. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the credit for electricity produced from certain renewable resources and the investment energy credit to include ocean thermal energy conversion projects; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. PIERLUISI, and Mr. SABLAN):

H.R. 2886. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide the nonbusiness energy property and residential energy efficient property tax incentives to residents of certain possessions of the Unites States and other areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Alabama (for himself and Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky):

H.R. 2887. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an incentive to preserve affordable housing in multifamily housing units which are sold or exchanged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. WU, and Mr. SCHRADER):

H.R. 2888. A bill to provide for the designation of the Devil's Staircase Wilderness Area in the State of Oregon, to designate segments of Wasson and Franklin Creeks in the State of Oregon as wild or recreation rivers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. WU, and Mr. SCHRADER):

H.R. 2889. A bill to modify the boundary of the Oregon Caves National Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. WU):

H.R. 2890. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate certain river segments in Oregon as wild or scenic rivers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa (for himself and Mr. SPACE):

H.R. 2891. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish a Frontline Providers Loan Repayment Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HENSARLING, and Mrs. BIGGERT):

H.R. 2893. A bill to amend section 5318 of title 31, United States Code, to eliminate regulatory burdens imposed on insured depository institutions and money services businesses and enhance the availability of transaction accounts at depository institutions for such business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HOLT (for himself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. WEXLER, Mr.

CAPUANO, Mr. OBEY, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mrs. MALONEY, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. STARK, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. WALZ, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. FARR, Mr. OLVER, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. PERRIELLO, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. FILNER, Mr. SIRES, Mr. HONDA, Mr. WU, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BARROW, Mr. HIMES, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. MASSA, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. POLIS of Colorado, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LOBIONDO, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mrs. LOWEY):

H.R. 2894. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to require a voter-verified permanent paper ballot under title III of such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Science and Technology, 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. CARDOZA (for himself and Mr. LUJÁN):

H.R. 2895. A bill to amend the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 to promote energy independence and self-sufficiency by providing for the use of net metering by certain small electric energy generation systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, Financial Services, and Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. GARRETT of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. KANJORSKI, and Mr. BACHUS):

H.R. 2896. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to provide the same treatment for covered bonds as for other qualified financial contracts to which a depository institution is a party when such institution is in receivership or conservatorship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GUTIERREZ (for himself, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, and Ms. LEE of California):

H.R. 2897. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to return a sense of fairness and accountability to the deposit insurance premium assessment process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. HALVORSON:

H.R. 2898. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide support services for family caregivers of disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HERGER (for himself, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, and Mr. RADANOVICH):

H.R. 2899. A bill to address the public health and safety threat presented by the risk of catastrophic wildfire on Federal forestlands of the State of California by requiring the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to expedite forest management projects relating to hazardous fuels reduction, forest restoration, and forest health; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. KING of Iowa (for himself and Mr. MACK):

H.R. 2900. A bill to repeal the wage rate requirements commonly known as the Davis-Bacon Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LOBIONDO (for himself, Mr. COBLE, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Mr. MICA):

H.R. 2901. A bill to amend title 14, United States Code, to improve benefits for members of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Energy and Commerce, 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. MASSA (for himself, Mr. PERRIELLO, and Mr. HINCHEY):

H.R. 2902. A bill to authorize the Federal Trade Commission, in consultation with the Federal Communications Commission, to review volume usage service plans of major broadband Internet service providers to ensure that such plans are fairly based on cost; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MICHAUD:

H.R. 2903. A bill to establish an assistance program for the construction of digital TV translators to fill coverage gaps that are created from the transition from analog to digital signals; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MORAN of Kansas:

H.R. 2904. A bill to prohibit the Federal Government from holding ownership interests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MORAN of Kansas:

H.R. 2905. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the first-time homebuyer tax credit and to modify the credit by repealing the first-time homebuyer requirement and waiving recapture; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORAN of Virginia (for himself, Mr. TERRY, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. BERMAN):

H.R. 2906. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to specifically include problem and pathological gambling in programs of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration and to establish a national program to address the harmful consequences of problem gambling; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TIAHRT:

H.R. 2907. A bill to amend the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 to ensure that recipients of assistance under the Troubled Asset Relief Program repay such assistance only if they would remain well capitalized after such repayment; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PENCE:

H. Res. 548. A resolution providing for the election of certain minority members to a standing committee; considered and agreed to. considered and agreed to.

By Mr. PENCE:

H. Res. 549. A resolution expressing support for all Iranian citizens who struggle for freedom, human rights, civil liberties, and the protection of the rule of law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. BOOZMAN):

H. Res. 550. A resolution recognizing the ''Day of the African Child'' on June 16, 2009, devoted to the theme of child survival and to emphasize the importance of reducing maternal, newborn, and child deaths in Africa; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STUPAK:

H. Res. 551. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the interstate compact regarding water resources in the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River Basin approved by the Congress in Public Law 110-342 expressly prohibited the sale, diversion, or export of water from States in the Great Lakes Basin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

95. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the State Senate of Louisiana, relative to SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 51 memorializing the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to appropriate funds to be used for storm-proofing interior pump stations in St. Bernard and Plaquemines parishes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

96. Also, a memorial of the State Senate of Louisiana, relative to SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 15 memorializing the Congress of the United States to take such actions as are necessary to maintain the current incentives for the exploration and production of domestic oil and natural gas; jointly to the Committees on Natural Resources and Appropriations.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 22: Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 147: Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. SHULER.
H.R. 187: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
H.R. 213: Ms. JENKINS.
H.R. 240: Ms. JENKINS.
H.R. 270: Mr. BERRY and Ms. KILROY.
H.R. 293: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 294: Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 297: Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 329: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 333: Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. ELLSWORTH, and Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 362: Mr. CARNAHAN.
H.R. 406: Mr. ELLSWORTH and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 430: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 450: Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 483: Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 503: Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 513: Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.R. 537: Mr. PITTS.
H.R. 574: Mr. KINGSTON and Mr. REICHERT.

H.R. 690: Mr. BRADY of Texas.
H.R. 816: Mr. CARNAHAN.
H.R. 886: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 904: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 958: Mr. NADLER of New York and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.
H.R. 982: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 997: Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 1016: Mr. ETHERIDGE and Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 1021: Mr. CARNAHAN.
H.R. 1054: Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 1063: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, and Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 1064: Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HODES, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. POMEROY, and Mr. SNYDER.
H.R. 1066: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 1084: Mr. SPRATT, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. WEINER.
H.R. 1093: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. CARNAHAN, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 1147: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H.R. 1169: Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 1172: Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 1177: Mr. WAMP.
H.R. 1179: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 1188: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
H.R. 1190: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 1191: Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 1207: Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. ISSA, and Mr. GRIFFITH.
H.R. 1210: Mr. DENT.
H.R. 1211: Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 1242: Ms. FALLIN, Mr. LEE of New York, and Mr. RADANOVICH.
H.R. 1255: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. FARR, and Mr. SARBANES.
H.R. 1283: Mr. BECERRA.
H.R. 1313: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.
H.R. 1330: Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 1347: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1392: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Mr. NUNES.
H.R. 1396: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1407: Mr. PLATTS, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, and Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 1410: Ms. KAPTUR and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1415: Mr. WESTMORELAND and Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 1428: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PETRI, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 1454: Mr. LIPINSKI and Ms. CLARKE.
H.R. 1507: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 1526: Ms. DEGETTE and Ms. HIRONO.
H.R. 1528: Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 1530: Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 1531: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 1548: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. MORAN of Kansas.
H.R. 1551: Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 1585: Mr. CARNAHAN and Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN.
H.R. 1614: Mr. LUJÁN.
H.R. 1616: Ms. HIRONO.
H.R. 1643: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 1670: Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 1678: Mr. CARNAHAN.
H.R. 1685: Ms. SCHWARTZ.
H.R. 1708: Ms. WATERS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 1826: Mr. WU.
H.R. 1835: Mr. BARTON of Texas and Mr. MELANCON.
H.R. 1846: Mr. GRAYSON.
H.R. 1849: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 1868: Mr. FLEMING and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
H.R. 1873: Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 1884: Mr. KIRK, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. DRIEHAUS, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. MITCHELL, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CARNEY, and Ms. KOSMAS.
H.R. 1894: Mr. PITTS and Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 1898: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 1956: Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 1977: Mr. ROHRABACHER.
H.R. 1992: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 2014: Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee.
H.R. 2017: Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. PETERSON, and Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 2024: Mr. CARNAHAN.
H.R. 2047: Mr. GORDON of Tennessee.
H.R. 2061: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 2068: Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 2083: Mr. ADERHOLT.
H.R. 2085: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 2097: Mr. CRENSHAW and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 2102: Ms. WATERS and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 2125: Mr. PETRI.
H.R. 2129: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 2140: Mr. CARDOZA.
H.R. 2196: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 2213: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 2243: Mr. BOCCIERI and Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 2245: Mr. SKELTON, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mrs. MYRICK, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.
H.R. 2254: Mr. CARTER, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ARCURI, and Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 2270: Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 2275: Mr. DELAHUNT, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. WOLF, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ELLSWORTH, and Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 2296: Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. ADERHOLT.
H.R. 2303: Mrs. MALONEY and Mr. KIND.
H.R. 2329: Mr. HARE, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. CAO, and Mr. ALEXANDER.
H.R. 2360: Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 2373: Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. ARCURI, and Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2377: Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. GRAYSON, and Mr. BACA.
H.R. 2413: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 2443: Mr. NUNES.
H.R. 2452: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mrs. BONO Mack, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 2462: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 2480: Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 2492: Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. SABLAN.
H.R. 2493: Mr. TOWNS.
H.R. 2499: Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 2520: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 2537: Mr. MACK.
H.R. 2547: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.
H.R. 2554: Mr. TERRY and Mr. HODES.
H.R. 2558: Ms. SCHWARTZ.
H.R. 2561: Mr. GRIJALVA and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 2562: Mr. WHITFIELD.
H.R. 2596: Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 2607: Mr. ADERHOLT.
H.R. 2616: Mr. GRAYSON.
H.R. 2632: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 2648: Mr. CLAY, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 2695: Mr. NADLER of New York and Mr. CARNEY.
H.R. 2700: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. ACKERMAN.
H.R. 2709: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 2729: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mrs. BIGGERT.
H.R. 2743: Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. BOCCIERI, Mr. TIAHRT, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. WU, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, and Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 2746: Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. WEINER, Ms. WATERS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 2766: Mr. RUSH, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MASSA, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2777: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 2829: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 2831: Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 2835: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2842: Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. COLE.
H.R. 2846: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. LINDER, and Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 2861: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 2866: Mr. BURGESS.
H.J. Res. 47: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. CHILDERS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H. Con. Res. 117: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIFFITH, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. ROHRABACHER, and Ms. KOSMAS.
H. Res. 57: Mrs. HALVORSON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. ALTMIRE, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H. Res. 69: Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. WU, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H. Res. 111: Mr. HOEKSTRA.
H. Res. 349: Ms. JENKINS.
H. Res. 366: Mr. EHLERS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. PALLONE, and Ms. BERKLEY.
H. Res. 376: Mr. HARPER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. BONO Mack, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. PETERS.
H. Res. 397: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.
H. Res. 416: Mr. FATTAH.
H. Res. 441: Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. CAO, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. DRIEHAUS, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BOREN, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Ms. DELAURO.
H. Res. 443: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. STARK.
H. Res. 445: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. LEE of New York, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. BARTON of Texas, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H. Res. 476: Ms. NORTON, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H. Res. 480: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H. Res. 482: Mr. WATT and Mrs. MYRICK.
H. Res. 496: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H. Res. 507: Mr. KISSELL, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. PUTNAM.
H. Res. 519: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. DINGELL, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. ACKERMAN.
H. Res. 535: Mr. BACA and Ms. LEE of California.
H. Res. 536: Mr. GERLACH, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. GALLEGLY, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, and Mr. GORDON of Tennessee.
H. Res. 538: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. DICKS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. HALL of New York, and Ms. BERKLEY.
H. Res. 543: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. SIRES, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr.

WALZ, Mr. DRIEHAUS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. KOSMAS, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. WEINER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. BOYD, Mr. PETERS, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. BERRY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. TONKO, Ms. WATSON, Ms. SUTTON, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. HOLT, Mr. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

54. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Commission of the City of Miami, Florida, relative to Resolution: R-09-0091 URGING PRESIDENT BARACK OBAMA TO RESCIND THE EXECUTIVE ORDER OF FORMER PRESIDENT GEORGE W. BUSH THAT TOOK AWAY THE OVERSIGHT OF THE ISSUANCE OF H-2B SEASONAL VISAS FROM THE STATE OF FLORIDA'S AGENCY FOR WORKFORCE INNOVATION; REQUESTING THAT AN INVESTIGATION BE INITIATED REGARDING THE MISUSE OF THE SEASONAL VISA PROGRAM; REQUESTING A REDUCTION IN THE AMOUNT OF SEASONAL VISAS ISSUED; FURTHER DIRECTING THE CITY OF MIAMI'S LOBBYING TEAM TO WORK WITH BOTH THE FEDERAL AND STATE ELECTED OFFICIALS REGARDING THE REDUCTION OF THE H-2B SEASONAL VISA PROGRAM; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.