United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 155 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JULY 20, 2009 No. 109

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 20, 2009.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DONNA F. EDWARDS 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.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DRIEHAUS) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

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

Lord God, when You speak Your word, true servants stop and listen attentively. Open our receptivity with renewed faith. Practiced in public speaking and surrounded by debate, all too often it becomes difficult for us to truly listen to one another. In a world that prides itself on accelerated information and sophisticated communications systems, the art of asking the deeper questions is often lost in noisy chatter.

Lord, help all of us to be better skilled in honest dialogue and more patient in building consensus. No one of us holds onto the whole truth. But with Your help, we can admit our limitations and share what we have. That will prove to be enough—to offer clarity and promise—enough to move forward just a bit, both 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.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. LUJÁN 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.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Washington, DC, July 20, 2009.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on July 20, 2009, at 11:26 a.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 3114

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk.

SILENCING AMERICAN VOICES IN THE APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as we enter the fourth week of the appropriations process, I stand before you once again, angry and frustrated that the Democratic leaders continue to silence the voices of the American people by refusing to allow this body to debate legislation in an open and transparent way. As the American people

Printed on recycled paper.

know by now, Democratic leaders have limited the time of debate and the number of amendments to spending bills that the minority could bring up. This is an unprecedented practice that has not been done by either Republican or Democratic majorities in recent memory.

Mr. Speaker, this is completely outrageous. The opposition party and the American people deserve an opportunity to examine and criticize the majority's policies, and then we deserve the opportunity to offer alternatives when we disagree.

But what Speaker PELOSI is doing now not only goes against the practices of this House; it also goes against everything she promised the American people when Democrats took control of the House in 2006. Mr. Speaker, this Congress is passing nonstimulus stimulus packages, cap-and-trade boondoggles, and now we're silencing the voices of the American people.

I ask, when is enough enough? It has to change.

OPPOSING JOB-KILLING CAP-AND-TRADE LEGISLATION

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

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the floor my constituents' opposition to the cap-and-trade bill recently passed in the House. At a time when this country faces the possibility of a double-digit unemployment rate, a tax that will lead to fewer jobs, force Americans to pay more energy costs and raise the price of every manufactured good is unthinkable.

My constituents, as well as I, wonder how we will afford the predicted $1,200 to $3,100 increase in annual energy costs. Take, for example, one senior citizen in my district who lives on a fixed income and is no longer able to work. Already living at a bare-bones level, he cannot afford a $3,100 increase in his expenses. My constituent will not find himself alone in such a predicament. If cap-and-trade were to become law, it would amount to the largest tax hike in United States history; and in our current economic climate, it would leave many Americans pinching pennies simply to turn on the lights.

No one is opposed to clean air and water, but there are other methods of protecting our environment that support the best interests of our citizens. Instead of legislation that would deepen our economic troubles, Congress should prioritize legislation that will protect jobs, create jobs, and stimulate the economy.

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 after 6:30 p.m. today.

CELEBRATING 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF APOLLO 11 MOON LANDING

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 607) celebrating the Fortieth Anniversary of the Apollo 11 Moon Landing.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 607

Whereas the Apollo program was designed to achieve the goal established by President Kennedy by sending a crew of three astronauts to the Moon and returning them safely to the Earth;

Whereas the Apollo program built on the knowledge and experience gained from the Mercury and Gemini human space flight programs, as well as from precursor robotic lunar exploration activities;

Whereas the crew of Apollo 11 consisted of Neil Armstrong, Mission Commander, Buzz Aldrin, Lunar Module Pilot, and Michael Collins, Command Module Pilot;

Whereas the crew of Apollo 11 launched into space aboard a Saturn V rocket on July 16, 1969, on a 4-day trip to the Moon;

Whereas, on July 20, 1969, Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin successfully piloted the Eagle Lunar Module to the surface of the Moon;

Whereas, on July 20, 1969, when Neil Armstrong took his first step on the Moon, he became the first person to walk on the surface of another celestial body;

Whereas the Apollo 11 Moon landing was the culmination of the efforts of tens of thousands of scientists, engineers, and other dedicated individuals and organizations;

Whereas the Apollo 11 Moon landing was experienced by millions of people all around the world by means of radio and television broadcasts;

Whereas the Apollo 11 astronauts left a plaque on the lunar surface that stated: ''We came in peace for all mankind'';

Whereas the successful Apollo 11 Moon landing was one of the most significant events of the 20th century and inspired a generation to strive towards great accomplishments in space and on Earth; and

Whereas the Apollo 11 achievement continues to inspire Americans as we prepare for future human journeys back to the Moon and other destinations in the solar system: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) celebrates the 40th Anniversary of the Apollo 11 lunar landing;

(2) honors the brave crew of the Apollo 11 mission—Neil Armstrong, ''Buzz'' Aldrin, and Michael Collins; and

(3) commends all those individuals and organizations who contributed to such a historic achievement that continues to be an inspiration to the Nation and the world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H. Res. 607, the resolution now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise in strong support of House Resolution 607 which was introduced by Ranking Member HALL, with Chairman GORDON, Chairwoman GIFFORDS, and Space and Aeronautics Subcommittee Ranking Member OLSON as original cosponsors. I want to thank Mr. HALL and the others for their initiative in introducing this resolution.

The Apollo 11 Moon landing was one of the most significant events of the 20th century. It is only fitting that we celebrate it today as we mark the 40th anniversary of that historic event. That successful landing was a culmination of 8 years of sustained hard work and dedication by countless engineers, scientists, technicians and others to meet the audacious challenge laid down by President John Kennedy in 1961 at a time when it looked as though the Soviet Union had an insurmountable lead in the space race. It took the efforts of many to make Apollo a success, and they all can take pride in what they accomplished.

What had seemed only a lofty centuries-old goal of humanity a mere decade earlier became a wonderful reality when Mission Commander Neil Armstrong proudly announced on July 20, 1969, ''Houston, Tranquility Base here. The Eagle has landed.''

Mr. Speaker, the inspiration and hard work that undergirded the successful Apollo 11 mission also laid the foundation for a host of technologies on which today's society depends. Apollo also stimulated as well as enthused generations of engineers and scientists who have contributed so much to our Nation's well-being in the ensuing decades.

In short, the Apollo program continues to deliver benefits to our country even today. Yet the legacy of Apollo is also the example of the brave astronauts who carried out those risky, challenging missions. Let us all honor the unforgettable accomplishments of the crew of Apollo 11: Mission Commander Neil Armstrong, Lunar Module Pilot Buzz Aldrin, and Command Module Pilot Michael Collins, who participated in the first expedition to set foot on another celestial body. Their cool bravery and professionalism captured the imagination of the American people, and they remain genuine national heroes 40 years after they returned home from the Moon.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would again like to recognize and thank Ranking Member HALL for introducing this resolution along with Chairman

BART GORDON, Chairwoman GABRIELLE GIFFORDS, and subcommittee Ranking Member OLSON. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 607 which honors and commemorates the 40th anniversary of the Apollo 11 Moon landing. This event marked an extraordinary achievement in the history of mankind as we explored beyond the bounds of our own world and landed upon another.

On May 25, 1961, in a speech to Congress, I remember hearing President John F. Kennedy set the goal of landing Americans on the Moon and then returning them safely to Earth. The space program and NASA were in their infancies. This was an audacious goal; but the point was not about accomplishing what was easy but that which was very difficult, that which was extremely hard.

Kennedy knew that inspiring our Nation to rise to this challenge would serve to organize and measure the very best of American capabilities. The Apollo program expanded on the knowledge and experience gained from the Mercury and Gemini human space flight programs as well as from precursor robotic and lunar exploration activities. Prior to Apollo 11, four Apollo missions were sent into space and around the Moon to gather data.

On July 16, 1969, the Apollo 11 crew, consisting of Mission Commander Neil Armstrong, Lunar Module Pilot Buzz Aldrin, and Command Module Pilot Michael Collins, launched from the Kennedy Space Center, Florida, atop a Saturn 5 rocket that would carry them beyond the pull of Earth's gravity on their historic 4-day trip to the Moon. As they left the Earth, they did not know whether they would ever return. They were intrepid explorers, the Columbuses and Magellans of our generation, risking their lives to explore the unknown for all of us.

On July 20, 1969, after traveling 240,000 miles through space, the Apollo 11 crew successfully landed the Lunar Module Eagle on the Moon in the Sea of Tranquility. During that momentous event, millions of people in America and around the world watched in awe as Neil Armstrong took his famous first step and became the first person to walk on the surface of another celestial body.

□ 1415

The Apollo 11 Moon landing was the culmination of years' worth of experience, and the combined efforts of tens of thousands of engineers, scientists and other devoted individuals and organizations that were committed to accomplishing the task that had been set upon them 8 years earlier.

The very successful landing was one of the most significant and important events in the 20th century. It inspired an entire generation to strive toward great accomplishments in space, as well as on Earth. It resulted in the greatest increases in science and engineering enrollments at all of our colleges and universities. It continues to inspire new generations as we prepare to journey back to the Moon and beyond, to other destinations in our solar system.

Today as we celebrate the Apollo 11 mission and reflect on the future of our space program, we should reexamine the lessons learned from Apollo. America's economic, educational and technological strength can benefit from a clear, challenging and inspirational goal for human space exploration. It will take national leadership at all levels, and we need to adequately fund the endeavor. If we succeed, we will continue to lead the world in science and engineering enrollments at our colleges and in our universities, and our technology and industry will continue to be the envy of the world.

As President Kennedy knew, the difficult challenges of space exploration serve to organize and measure our abilities, but they also lead to unanticipated spinoffs in areas such as health care, materials science and microcomputing that can be harnessed for other pressing national needs. On this anniversary of the Apollo 11 mission, I hope we heed the lessons of the past and push forward into the future.

I urge Members to fully support our Nation's space program. And I urge them to support House Resolution 607 celebrating and commemorating the 40th anniversary of this extraordinary achievement.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 607. I want to thank Mr. HALL for his initiative in introducing this legislation, and I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of it.

Today, July 20th, we celebrate the fortieth anniversary of one of our nation's greatest achievements—humanity's first steps on another world. It was an amazing event, and I am proud that Americans were the first to take those steps.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us today honors the efforts and accomplishments of Neil Armstrong, Buzz Aldrin, and Michael Collins in successfully carrying out the Apollo 11 mission. It also recognizes the many other dedicated individuals who worked so hard to turn President Kennedy's challenge into a reality.

The success of the Apollo 11 mission, carried out in full view of the rest of the world, was a clear demonstration of both the technological capabilities of the United States of America and the willingness of our citizens to strive to accomplish great undertakings.

Yet the Apollo program was as much about the journey as it was about the ultimate destination. Thus, the investments we made in our space program in the 1960s helped inspire a generation to seek to pursue careers in science and engineering. It led to a flowering of innovation, and it helped spawn a panoply of new technologies, materials, and processes that have delivered benefits to all of our citizens over the past forty years.

That is the legacy of Apollo as much as Armstrong's and Aldrin's footprints on the Moon. As we contemplate future journeys back to the Moon as well as to other destinations in the solar system, Apollo 11 is a compelling reminder of what this country is capable of when we decide to take on a challenging task.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that we are today remembering the brave crew of Apollo 11 as well as all the other individuals and organizations who made their expedition possible. I hope that we can draw continued inspiration from their example as we embark on a new chapter in space exploration in the years and decades ahead.

Ms. GIFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res 607, a resolution to honor the 40th anniversary of the Apollo 11 Moon landing. As you know, it was 40 years ago today that the citizens of planet Earth received a message from one of their own beamed all the way back from the surface of the Moon. That message was the historic signal that humanity had at long last set foot on another world. What an amazing accomplishment! Or as Apollo 11 Mission Commander Neil Armstrong said: "That's one small step for a man, one giant leap for mankind."

At that time, the American people could still remember the impact created by the Soviet Union's successful launch of Sputnik in 1957, which led to the Space Race with the USSR. Our nation indeed took a "giant leap" when, 12 years later, two American astronauts successfully landed the Eagle Lunar Module on the Sea of Tranquility, walked upon the lunar surface, and then returned safely to Earth.

Not only had this achievement demonstrated America's technological preeminence in the eyes of the world, it also inspired generations of engineers and scientists. Indeed, it can be argued that one of the most lasting benefits of the Apollo program was the flood of innovation and inspiration that it unleashed. It is not an overstatement to say that we remain today the beneficiaries of the restless energy and hard work that culminated in the success of Apollo 11.

Thus I think it is incredibly important for us to pause to remember and honor the bravery and success of the crew of Apollo 11: Neil Armstrong, Buzz Aldrin, and Michael Collins. In addition, we should also remember and honor all of the countless individuals and organizations who labored long and hard to make Apollo 11 possible. Yet I think that the best way to honor their accomplishment is to make our own commitment to a challenging and robust program of human and robotic exploration of the solar system. It is time for America to take the next steps in space—we cannot simply rest on our laurels, no matter how hard-won.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I would like to thank Ranking Member HALL for introducing this resolution. I am proud to be an original cosponsor, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a poetic tribute penned by Albert Carey Caswell in honor of the Apollo 11 astronauts and the fortieth anniversary of the landing of a man on the moon. I asked that this be placed in the RECORD in honor of all of those dedicated and most heroic Americans who have over the years in the space program made it all possible, as Mars looms next.

FORTY YEARS AGO THIS DAY . . .

Forty years ago this day . . .
Three brave hearts hurdling through outer space . . .

To walk upon the moon . . .
A moonlit sky . . .
As upon her are placed all eyes . . .
All in wonder, all in such grace and awe . . .
As throughout time such dreams were made . . .
But, since the very dawn . . .
To walk on the moon, this rhyme . . .
For as long as woman and mankind . . .
Have looked up upon these Sea of Skies . . .
To find . . .
To find that enchanting moon, all in time . . .
This dream has grown . . .
To walk upon the Moon . . .
Lover's all in embrace . . .
On starlite nights, up there their souls are placed . . .
Such thoughts of fancy, all in hearts have raced . . .
To walk upon the Moon . . .
As a dream as old as time, has swooned . . .
As it was but forty years ago this day . . .
As three lone men, three lone souls led the way . . .
Hurdling through outer space, all out there own their own . . .
As to the moon they would go . . .
But riding on the very edge of death . . .
As their most heroic of all hearts would crest . . .
All in that historic quest, to walk upon the Moon . . .
While, upon crude primitive machines of mankind their fine lives were pledged . . .
''One step for man, one giant leap for mankind'' as said . . .
Walking On The Moon!
As generation after generation . . .
But, dreamed of solving this equation . . .
Of walking on the Moon . . .
Until, a bright star named Kennedy . . .
Into a future this torch he'd seed . . .
To walk upon the Moon to succeed . . .
As launch by launch . . . mission by mission . . .
As was set a trajectory, a course of action all in his vision . . .
By all of those, who now so lie in such soft cold quiet graves . . .
All so we could be here . . .
Walking on the Moon . . .
To them we say, God Bless you all!
And to all of those families who've lived without . . .
We pray with such thanks and gratitude, no doubt . . .
For your loved ones sacrifice, this world has blessed . . .
As those final moments passed . . .
Which now lie etched, all in our hearts to last . . .
For we will long remember, these true pioneers of space . . .
Early explorers, who would not wait
As into grave danger their fine lives they placed . . .
Armstrong, Aldrin, and Collins who stood fast . . .
Walking on the Moon . . .
For all great explorers have so met that test . . .
With a journey begun . . .
A star lite night . . .
As two lovers gaze up in sight . . .
Up upon those skies so bright . . .
But, where dreams are made . . .
For as long as courageous quests live on . . .
All carried in hearts of men and women of faith so strong . . .
They such magnificent dreams will live on . . .
Can but Mars be far behind?
Forty Years Ago This Day!

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 607 to celebrate the 40th Anniversary of the Apollo 11 Mission which put the first humans on the moon.

On July 20, 1969, mankind took the greatest step in exploration the world had ever known when Neil Armstrong stepped off the ladder of the lunar spacecraft and onto the dusty, cold surface of the moon. So much more than a few steps, the first walk on the moon symbolized the hopes and dreams of our nation during the difficult period of the Cold War, and together, Americans watched as a new chapter began in the history of our nation and the world.

The first moon landing is especially relevant today as we continue to unlock the many scientific mysteries of our planet and our universe. When we look back on the achievements of yesterday, it is important to remember the significance of setting goals for the future and researching for the achievements of tomorrow. Truly, we have benefitted immensely from the technological advancements that were developed forty years ago, and it is my hope that we will build on this tradition of research and scientific knowledge.

Today, on the 40th anniversary of the first moon landing, we remember this event and the sense of curiosity and awe the world felt when history was made and Neil Armstrong took that famous first ''small step for a man,'' and ''giant leap for mankind.''

I urge my colleagues to join me in commemorating the first moon landing, and to support initiatives such as the Science, Technology, Education, and Mathematics (STEM) initiatives so that the future may hold the promise seen that mid-July night, when a small step became the greatest mankind has ever known.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to cosponsor H. Res. 607, which commemorates the fortieth anniversary of the Apollo 11 moon landing. Apollo 11's successful mission was certainly ''a giant step for mankind,'' that should be a source of pride for all Americans.

One of my favorite quotes regarding the moon landing was penned by philosopher Ayn Rand in 1969: ''Think of what was required to achieve that mission: think of the unpitying effort; the merciless discipline; the courage; the responsibility of relying on one's judgment; the days, nights and years of unswerving dedication to a goal; the tension of the unbroken maintenance of a full, clear mental focus; and the honesty. It took the highest, sustained acts of virtue to create in reality what had only been dreamt of for millennia.''

Rand's words not only apply to the Apollo 11 mission but to all of the work of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA). As a representative of the Gulf Coast of Texas, which is home to many of NASA's most significant triumphs, I have had the opportunity to meet many NASA employees. I have always been impressed by their professionalism and dedication to their mission.

In conclusion, I urge my colleagues to join me in celebrating the fortieth anniversary of the Apollo 11 mission to the moon by supporting H. Res. 607.

Ms. KOSMAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 607, a resolution recognizing and honoring the three American heroes of the Apollo 11 mission, as well as the tens of thousands of engineers, scientists, and support personnel whose efforts were essential to the mission's success and the American qualities of ingenuity, exceptionalism, and creativity that drove their achievements.

In this very chamber, President Kennedy asked for every scientist, engineer, serviceman, technician, contractor, and civil servant to give their personal pledge that this nation will move forward, with the full speed of freedom, in the exciting adventure of space. When he made this request of our nation it was on a scale equaled only by two other feats in the history of the world; the digging of the Panama Canal and The Manhattan Project.

Just as we honor those that made the Apollo program a success, this occasion should be a time to recognize the rich history and tradition of aeronautical innovation in our nation's past and recommit ourselves to continuing this spirit of adventure and innovation that made our nation what it is today. From the Wright Brothers and Charles Lindbergh to Robert Goddard and Von Braun's Saturn V; from Alan Sheppard and John Glenn to Neil Armstrong, ''Buzz'' Aldrin, and Michael Collins, Americans have broken technological barriers and risked their lives in the quest to push the boundaries of gravity, human endurance, and space.

By dedicating themselves to pushing the boundaries of discovery at great personal risk, the three men of Apollo 11, along with the thousands of men and woman who supported them on the ground, cemented our nation's leadership in science and technology and paved the way for future accomplishments in space. It is only fitting as our nation plans to return to the moon that we honor their great accomplishments today.

I would also like to remind my colleagues and all Americans that our achievements in space have led to numerous advancements on Earth. Many discoveries and innovations, including water filtration, improvements in solar energy, and advanced flight simulation training, improve our everyday lives, and it is vital that we strongly support our human spaceflight program so that we can continue to inspire, invent, and achieve over the next 40 years and beyond.

I thank my friend Mr. HALL, a great supporter of NASA, for introducing this resolution and urge my colleagues to join us in honoring this historic occasion.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 607.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

AUTHORIZING NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH PARKS

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill

(H.R. 2729) to authorize the designation of National Environmental Research Parks by the Secretary of Energy, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2729

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

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The National Environmental Research Parks are unique outdoor laboratories that provide opportunities for environmental studies on protected lands around Department of Energy facilities.

(2) In 1972, the Atomic Energy Commission established its first official environmental research park at the Savannah River site in South Carolina.

(3) In 1976, the Department of Energy defined the mission for the research parks in accordance with the recommendations of the multiagency review team for environmental research activities at the Savannah River site.

(4) The mission of the research parks is to—

(A) conduct research and education activities to assess and document environmental effects associated with energy and weapons use;

(B) explore methods for eliminating or minimizing adverse effects of energy development and nuclear materials on the environment;

(C) train people in ecological and environmental sciences; and

(D) educate the public.

(5) The National Environmental Research Parks are located within six major ecological regions of the United States, covering more than half of the Nation.

(6) The parks are especially valuable research sites because within their borders they provide secure settings for scientists to conduct long-term research on a broad range of subjects including—

(A) plant succession;

(B) biomass production;

(C) population ecology;

(D) radioecology;

(E) ecological restoration; and

(F) thermal effects on freshwater ecosystems.

(7) The parks maintain several long-term data sets that are available nowhere else in the United States or in the world on amphibian populations, bird populations, and soil moisture and plant water stress. These data sets are uniquely valuable for the detection of long-term shifts in climate.

(8) The maintenance of these parks by the Department of Energy is consistent with statutory obligations to promote sound environmental stewardship of Federal lands and to safeguard sites containing cultural and archeological resources.

(9) Public education and outreach activities carried out on these sites provide unique learning opportunities, promote a stronger connection between these Federal facilities and the surrounding communities, and enhance public confidence that the Department of Energy is fulfilling its environmental stewardship responsibilities.

SEC. 2. NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH PARKS.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The Secretary of Energy shall designate the six National Environmental Research Parks located on Department of Energy sites as protected outdoor research reserves for the purposes of conducting long-term environmental research on the impacts of human activities on the natural environment. The six National Environmental Research Parks shall include—

(1) the Savannah River National Environmental Research Park;

(2) the Idaho National Environmental Research Park;

(3) the Los Alamos National Environmental Research Park;

(4) the Fermi Lab National Environmental Research Park;

(5) the Oak Ridge National Environmental Research Park; and

(6) the Nevada National Environmental Research Park.

(b) PURPOSES.—Each site shall support—

(1) environmental research and monitoring activities to characterize and monitor present and future site conditions, and serve as control areas for comparison with environmental impacts of Department of Energy land management, energy technology development, remediation, and other site activities outside the National Environmental Research Park areas. Areas of research and monitoring on the sites may include—

(A) ecology of the site and the region;

(B) population biology and ecology;

(C) radioecology;

(D) effects of climate variability and change on ecosystems;

(E) ecosystem science;

(F) pollution fate and transport research;

(G) surface and groundwater modeling; and

(H) environmental impacts of development and use of energy generation technologies, including renewable energy technologies; and

(2) public education and outreach activities consistent with subsection (d).

(c) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT.—To ensure the independence of the research, monitoring, public education, and outreach activities conducted on each site, the Secretary shall enter into a cooperative agreement with a university, community college, or consortium of institutions of higher education with expertise in ecology and environmental science of the region in which the National Environmental Research Park is located.

(d) ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION AND OUTREACH.—Each site shall support an outreach program to inform the public of the diverse ecological activities conducted at the park and to educate students at various levels in environmental science. Program activities may include—

(1) on-site and in-classroom education programs for elementary and secondary students;

(2) presentations to school, civic, and professional groups;

(3) exhibits at local and regional events;

(4) development of educational projects and materials for students at all levels;

(5) undergraduate and community college internships and graduate research opportunities; and

(6) regularly scheduled public tours.

(e) COORDINATION.—The Secretary of Energy shall designate a National Environmental Research Park Coordinator within the Department of Energy Office of Science. The Coordinator shall—

(1) coordinate research activities among the National Environmental Research Parks as appropriate;

(2) ensure that information on best practices for research, education, and outreach activities is shared among the sites; and

(3) serve as liaison to other Federal agencies to facilitate collaborative work at the Parks.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Energy, acting through the Director of the Office of Science, for carrying out this section $30,000,000, including $5,000,000 for each National Environmental Research Park, for each of the fiscal years 2010 through 2014.

SEC. 3. SAVINGS.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to limit the activities that the Federal Government may carry out or authorize on a site on which a National Environmental Research Park is located.

SEC. 4. SUMMER INSTITUTES PROGRAM.

The National Environmental Research Parks may be utilized to provide educational opportunities through the Summer Institutes program authorized in section 3185 of the Department of Energy Science Education Enhancement Act (42 U.S.C. 7381n).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2729, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased that today the House will consider H.R. 2729, a bill that will formally authorize the National Environmental Research Parks at Department of Energy sites across the country, including one in my district at Los Alamos National Laboratory. Los Alamos National Laboratory includes a landscape of canyons, mesas and mountains, and the Rio Grande, providing a diverse range of ecosystems to explore.

The Los Alamos Park conducts ongoing environmental studies on everything from containment transport to woodland productivity to long-term climate change effects on the land. These parks have been a critical resource to the national and the global environmental research community for decades, yet they have never had a clearly defined source of support in the department before. This bill finally addresses this issue and provides important guidance for research, development, education and outreach on the parks.

H.R. 2729 was developed through a collaborative process that took into account comments and concerns from each of the DOE sites, as well as helpful input and amendments from both minority and majority Members. I'm happy to present a bill with bipartisan cosponsorship, and I look forward to working with our Senate colleagues to send this to the President's desk as soon as possible.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 2729 to authorize the designation of National Environmental Research Parks by the Secretary of Energy, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2729, introduced by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN), authorizes six existing parks that are located within major eco-regions of the United States. These eco-regions cover more than half of the Nation. In some cases the research parks are the only ecological sanctuaries in the entire region. The parks provide secure settings for scientists to conduct research on a broad range of subjects, such as plant succession, biomass production, environmental behavior of radionuclides, cost and effectiveness of revegetation of disturbed lands, and thermal effects on freshwater ecosystems. The parks also provide rich environments for training researchers and introducing the public to ecological sciences.

The parks have been around in concept since 1969 and in reality, actually, since 1972, when the Atomic Energy Commission, the predecessor to the Department of Energy, established its first research park at the Savannah River site in South Carolina.

Under this bill, the Parks will continue to serve their intended purpose, but will now be able to do so under their own authorization.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. LUJÁN for his work on this bill, and also the work of his staff.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the nuclear weapons production program at Hanford played a critical role in our nation's defense for decades—securing victories in World War II and the Cold War. Today, the 586–square-mile Hanford Site, which is located in the congressional district that I represent and in the community that I've called home for over 50 years, is undergoing the largest and most complex nuclear waste cleanup effort in the world.

While nuclear cleanup will continue at Hanford for decades, the local community is already looking towards life post-cleanup and is actively engaged in discussing its future and economy once this massive undertaking is completed. Clearly, the possible beneficial use of portions of land on this massive site to diversify the economy and ensure a robust post-cleanup future are options that must be open and available. As just one possible example, consideration is being given by the Department of Energy and local communities to proposals to use a piece of Hanford lands for an Energy Park. Other ideas on how to use these suitable lands include nuclear activities such as medical isotope production and uranium enrichment for fuel rod production that would power nuclear energy reactors.

At a time when decisions about future uses of lands on the Hanford Site have yet to be made, it is critical that this Congress and the federal government maintain flexibility in order to keep all options on the table—and not enact legislation that could complicate or prohibit future activities, thereby preempting the very conversations that are underway today.

Mr. Speaker, as originally introduced, H.R. 2729 would have designated the Hanford Site and surrounding lands as a permanent protected National Environmental Research Park, or NERP.

While I believe it appropriate for portions of the Hanford Site to conduct activities consistent with the NERP mission, I have very serious concerns about rushing through permanent decisions on Hanford lands via legislation that was introduced last month with zero input from either the Tri-Cities community or their elected Representative.

That's why I have been working with the Science Committee on trying to identify and agree on ways to modify and improve the bill to fully protect the unique and complex Hanford site. My overriding goal in pursuing modifications was to avoid serious unintended consequences that could very well result from H.R. 2729, including the creation of yet another overlapping land use management authority at Hanford and the permanent lockdown of future land use decisions.

I have made several suggestions to the Committee including language to: (1) enable the Secretary of Energy to modify the boundaries of the NERP, (2) exclude privately-owned lands and state lands, (3) ensure that nothing in the bill will restrict, limit or condition the ability of the Department to lease, convey or transfer lands, (4) ensure that no new land use or regulatory authority is created, (5) clearly state that this new law could not be used to launch lawsuits, and (6) to make certain that the NERP authorization is aimed at the intent of facilitating long-term research and promoting education outreach, rather than the establishment of a restrictive land use designation that could block or stifle future decisions. I support the stated intent of this legislation's authors and proponents to encourage research and education, but I fear that the language of the bill as written could be interpreted to cause real harm to the future of Hanford and the local community.

I very much appreciate the consideration of Ranking Member HALL, and the willingness of Chairman GORDON, Subcommittee Chairman BAIRD and Representative LUJÁN to listen and discuss my concerns over the past week. In the end, clarifying language that I felt was necessary to protect the interests of those I was elected to represent was not agreeable to the Committee, and they instead chose to remove Hanford from the bill altogether.

While I believe we all would have preferred an outcome that was acceptable to all Members, which did not prove possible in the past week, and the removal of Hanford from the bill is an appropriate course of action.

It took many years for the federal government to produce the massive volumes of nuclear waste at Hanford, and it will take many more years to complete the cleanup of these wastes. There is absolutely no reason to rush through legislation that could make cleanup at Hanford more difficult or take away the flexibility to make decisions on the future of the Site and the surrounding communities.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2729, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PROVIDING FOR NATURAL GAS VEHICLE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1622) to provide for a program of research, development, and demonstration on natural gas vehicles, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1622

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

SECTION 1. NATURAL GAS VEHICLE RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Energy shall conduct a 5-year program of natural gas vehicle research, development, and demonstration. The Secretary shall coordinate with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, as necessary.

(b) PURPOSE.—The program under this section shall focus on—

(1) the continued improvement and development of new, cleaner, more efficient light-duty, medium-duty, and heavy-duty natural gas vehicle engines;

(2) the integration of those engines into light-duty, medium-duty, and heavy-duty natural gas vehicles for onroad and offroad applications;

(3) expanding product availability by ensuring that technologies researched and developed assist engines and vehicles in meeting Federal and State requirements and standards;

(4) the demonstration and proper operation and use of the vehicles described in paragraph (2) under all operating conditions;

(5) the development and improvement of nationally recognized codes and standards for the continued safe operation of natural gas vehicles and their components;

(6) improvement in the reliability and efficiency of natural gas fueling station infrastructure;

(7) the certification of natural gas fueling station infrastructure to nationally recognized and industry safety standards;

(8) the improvement in the reliability and efficiency of onboard natural gas fuel storage systems;

(9) the development of new natural gas fuel storage materials;

(10) the certification of onboard natural gas fuel storage systems to nationally recognized and industry safety standards;

(11) the use of natural gas engines in hybrid vehicles; and

(12) researching and developing technologies and processes so as to improve and streamline the process by which natural gas conversion systems meet Federal and State requirements and standards.

(c) COOPERATION AND COORDINATION WITH INDUSTRY.—In developing and carrying out the program under this section, the Secretary shall coordinate with the natural gas vehicle industry to ensure cooperation between the public and the private sector.

(d) CONDUCT OF PROGRAM.—The program under this section shall be conducted in accordance with sections 3001 and 3002 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992.

(e) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall provide a report to Congress on the implementation of this section.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary $30,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2010 through 2014 to carry out this section.

(g) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term ''natural gas'' means compressed natural gas, liquefied natural gas, biomethane, and mixtures of hydrogen and methane or natural gas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 1622, the bill now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN).

There was no objection.

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

H.R. 1622 was introduced by Mr. SULLIVAN of Oklahoma and cosponsored by myself, my friends from Texas, Mr. HALL and Mr. GREEN, my colleague from Oklahoma (Mr. BOREN) and a number of other Members that recognize the potential of natural gas as an alternative transportation fuel.

This bill reauthorizes the Department of Energy's research, development and demonstration program in natural gas powered vehicles and related infrastructure. The vehicle fleet of the future will include a diverse range of fuels and vehicle technologies.

Since it is both cleaner than petroleum and domestically available, natural gas will play an important role in a more sustainable transportation sector. Moreover, the estimated domestic reserves continue to grow, indicating that natural gas could play a long-term role in helping to alleviate our dependence on foreign oil.

I support H.R. 1622 and urge its passage.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1622 to provide for a program of research, development and demonstration on natural gas vehicles. I thank my good friend, Congressman JOHN SULLIVAN from Oklahoma, for introducing this bill, and I'm very proud to be a cosponsor.

H.R. 1622 authorizes the U.S. Department of Energy to fund natural gas vehicle research, development and demonstration needs on natural gas vehicles to make them even cleaner, even more efficient, and ease their widespread integration into our current transportation system.

Approximately 98 percent of the natural gas we use in America comes from the United States and Canada, and the Energy Information Agency forecasts that, by 2030, over 98 percent of the natural gas used in America will come from the U.S. alone. Because of recent advancements in technology, the economically recoverable U.S. natural gas resource base has nearly doubled in just the last few years. A recent study concludes that we now have 118 years of natural gas resources right here in America. Doesn't it makes sense that we should be using this abundant, domestic resource to help fuel our transportation needs?

Renewable natural gas can also be produced from any organic waste or energy crop such as switchgrass. It has been conservatively estimated that America could produce 1.2 quadrillion Btus of renewable natural gas, also called biomethane. That is the equivalent of 10 billion gallons of gasoline. And if making biomethane from cellulosic energy crops is considered, the potential is just almost limitless.

Natural gas is affordable, it has an existing distribution infrastructure, it is a proven vehicle fuel, and it is clean.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill that will help increase our energy independence by serving to increase the amount of vehicles on our roads that run on domestic natural gas.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. SULLIVAN).

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1622, my legislation to reauthorize the natural gas vehicles research, development, demonstration and deployment program within the Department of Energy for 5 years.

I would like to thank Ranking Member HALL and Chairman GORDON and also my colleague from Oklahoma, DAN BOREN, for bringing this important legislation to the floor today.

Natural gas is the bridge fuel for decreasing our dependence on foreign sources of oil and putting our Nation on a path to energy security. It is critical that we make a strong effort to incorporate more natural gas vehicles into our transportation fleet. There are more than 150,000 natural gas vehicles on the U.S. roads today and over 10 million world wide. Increased U.S. natural gas vehicle research, development, demonstration and deployment will only increase these numbers if we make the proper investments as my bill does.

Natural gas vehicles are an important part of our national transportation infrastructure. In 2008 alone, natural gas vehicles displaced almost 300 million gallons of petroleum in the United States. In fact, nearly one in five new transit buses on order today is specified to be natural gas powered, proof that we are moving in the right direction.

We also have a proven reserve of natural gas right here in the United States. We have enough known natural gas reserves to last more than a century. As a matter of fact, 98 percent of the natural gas we consume is produced right here in North America. Natural gas is American-made energy.

In addition to our vast supply, we already have a way to get natural gas to the consumer with over 1.5 million miles of natural gas pipeline distribution across the United States. Natural gas vehicles are also better for the environment. Greenhouse gas emissions from natural gas are 23 percent lower than diesel and 30 percent lower than gasoline. Natural gas vehicles also produce virtually no particulate matter or emissions.

To meet our Nation's energy needs, we must continue to develop alternative and renewable sources of energy. However, we can't shoot the horse we are on until we find a new horse. Natural gas is the bridge fuel for decreasing our dependence on foreign sources of oil and putting our Nation on a path to energy security.

I encourage passage of H.R. 1622 today.

□ 1430

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

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to Mr. OLSON, the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank my ranking member and friend from Texas for yielding me time to express my support for H. Res. 607, the 40th anniversary of the Apollo 11 Moon landing.

Like all members of my generation, I remember very well where I was when Neil Armstrong stepped out of the Eagle and into history. But today, as we look back, I offer this question: Where will we be when those next steps are taken on the Moon? For millions of Americans, those steps will be their first chance to witness history.

It is right and fitting that we take this time to honor the men and women of Apollo 11. And I say men and women, because although three brave men were willing to strap themselves on top of a Saturn V rocket, it took the support of thousands of men and women to make their success.

For some, there are questions about why even go back to the Moon? It's true we can't replace Apollo, but we should try. And I don't mean simply at NASA.

First, it boggles the mind that those Apollo journeys, which should have been the beginning of lunar exploration, were the end of them. Budget cuts forced the cancellation of Apollo 18, 19 and 20, and we've been endorsing those cuts ever since.

NASA is on a path to return to the Moon and on to Mars and beyond, but

we need the support, both here in Congress and among the general public, for these worthy goals. By exploring, we create jobs, we inspire our youth to go into math and science fields, and we ensure that the aerospace industry, which is currently American-centered and American-dominated, remains that way.

But the lessons of Apollo should not be limited to NASA. It has become cliche for politicians to reference Apollo when talking about our need to create domestic alternatives to solve our energy solutions.

Our Nation wants to rally around a worthy goal, to achieve great things. This is what Apollo showed us, and we should look to that in this Chamber as we debate the issues of the day that will impact the generations to come.

Apollo won't be replicated, because you can't replicate Neil Armstrong, Buzz Aldrin and Mike Collins. They've become icons in American culture, exhibiting those uniquely American traits: boldness, courageousness, excellence. They, as individuals, were the finest in their fields. But as a crew, and as an extension of the NASA family that made Apollo such a success, and as representatives of this great Nation that sent them forth through the heavens, they became heroes worthy of the praise that will be offered over the next few days.

May the example they set as individuals drive us personally. May the success of the lessons of the Apollo program guide us selectively, and may the knowledge of what they achieved as a Nation inspire us to do bold things going forward.

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

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the Congressman from Georgia, Dr. BROUN, the balance of our time.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as we discuss this bill about natural gas, I think we need to look much beyond that one issue. Republicans have introduced legislation called the American Energy Act. It's an all-of-the-above solution to our problems with dependence upon foreign oil, and, Mr. Speaker, we've got to stop that dependence upon foreign oil.

We're buying oil from countries that hate us, and they're utilizing our dollars to fight us, to kill our men and women in service. And the only way we are going to bring an end to that is to not only look to natural gas, but to look to nuclear energy, look to alternative sources of energy, look to things such as wind, solar, biomass. We need to find ways of having clean coal technology. I know a lot of people find that to be an oxymoron, but, in actuality, there is technology today that will lead to clean coal technology.

Mr. Speaker, we have to be good stewards of our environment. That tax-and-trade bill—some call it cap-and-trade. I call it tax-and-trade or cap-and-tax because it is about revenue—that's not going to do anything about our environment. All it's going to do is create more revenue for the Federal Government to pay for this ObamaCare plan that we are going to be debating in committees here in the House this week and possibly voting before we leave for the August break.

But, Mr. Speaker, America is suffering. We're suffering from high energy costs. Certainly, the gasoline prices have been lowered from $4, as it was not many months ago. Just recently I saw gas, as I drove to the airport this morning in Walnut Grove, Georgia, was $2.169, but that's still too high, and we're headed higher in the near future.

Mr. Speaker, it's extremely difficult for Georgia Power to get the permitting for the two new reactors that they want to put at plant Vogtle, just south of my district, just south of Augusta, Georgia. It's extremely difficult for people to do the research and development to look for alternative sources of fuel. Natural gas is being shut out as a means of powering our vehicles, powering many things that it could power.

Mr. Speaker, we need an all-of-the-above energy plan. I hope that the U.S. Senate will defeat the tax-and-trade bill that we passed here because it will be disastrous. It will raise the costs of all goods and services here in America. It will raise the cost of health care, medicines in the drug store, doctor bills, hospital bills. It will raise the cost of food. It will cost every single individual in this country more money, and I hope the American people will stand up and say ''no'' to the tax-and-trade bill that this House passed and that the Senate is considering, will consider this fall. I hope they'll stand up and say ''no'' to ObamaCare, which will increase the time it takes for people to get x rays and surgeries and the necessary medical evaluation and treatment that they need. Thus, people who have cancer will be denied the life-saving drugs that they so desperately need or the surgery that they need.

Mr. Speaker, we're heading down the wrong road in this country. This House is taking this country down the wrong road of higher deficits.

And I hear people on the other side blame President Bush for the deficits he's created, but President Bush's deficits are piker levels compared to the deficits that have been created by this Congress since this administration took over 6 months ago. This President has presented a budget that was passed by this House that will create more debt in the next 5 years than every President, including George Bush, from George W. Bush all the way back to George Washington, more deficit, more debt than has been created by every single President.

We cannot continue to spend our grandchildren's future. Our grandchildren are going to live at a lower standard of living than we do today because of this tremendous debt that we've created.

Mr. Speaker, it has to stop, and I hope the American people rise up and say ''no'' to ObamaCare. I hope they will stand up and say ''no'' to this tax-and-trade, tax-and-cap bill that the Senate's considering. I hope they will say ''no'' to a new stimulus package, nonstimulus bill that the President talks about that he wants to bring forward.

Mr. Speaker, we've got to stop spending the money of our children's future. It has to stop. It's outrageous, and the American people need to understand that they are the key to rising up and telling their Member of Congress in the House and the Senate ''no.'' ''No'' to cap-and-trade, ''no'' to ObamaCare, ''no'' to any more stimulus, ''no'' to any more Wall Street bailout, ''no'' to taking over any more financial institutions, ''no'' to spend, spend, spend.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot tax and spend our way to prosperity. It never has worked. It was tried during the Great Depression, and it didn't work then. It's not going to work today. We seem to have elitists that think that they can do it better, but socialism never has worked, never will work, and it's time for the American people to stand up and say ''no'' to it.

Mr. Speaker, we need to have natural gas as an alternative source of fuel for our automobiles and buses and trucks. We need to have all these energy sources. We need the American Energy Act passed into law. We need to cut taxes on small business and leave dollars in their pockets so that they can create jobs, so they can buy inventory, so we can get our economy back on track.

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans are charged by the Democratic folks on the other side of being the Party of No, but it's actually the Democratic Party that's been the Party of No. We are, as Republicans, the Party of K-N-O-W. We know how to stimulate the economy. We know how to lower the cost of health care. We know how to fix the problem that we have with energy.

And, Mr. Speaker, it's time for the American people to stand up and say ''no'' to this steamroller of socialism being driven by NANCY PELOSI and HARRY REID, fueled by Barack Obama, and say ''yes'' to the Republican alternatives that we desperately need, as a Nation, to fix the economy, to lower the cost of health care for all Americans, to get people back to work, and stop this killing jobs and killing our economy.

So the American people, Mr. Speaker, need to stand up and say ''no'' to the Democratic plan and ''yes'' to the Republican plan.

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

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Speaker, as we look to see how we can truly work together in the Chamber, I think that the legislation before us, H.R. 1622, directly addresses some of our concerns when it

comes to energy in our great Nation. H.R. 1622 is a bipartisan piece of legislation that looks to see how we can come together and work together to be able to alleviate our dependence on foreign oil.

And, Mr. Speaker, I certainly agree with my colleague that we have to look to diversity when it comes to energy, that we have to be good stewards of the environment, and that's why I stood up proudly to support the American Clean Energy and Security Act.

We talk about what we have to do to invest in our future, Mr. Speaker, and as we look out to future generations and how we as a Nation have to come together, how our leaders have to come together, how we have to work anywhere that we possibly can to be able to address these deep concerns, it's with honor that I come before you, Mr. Speaker, to be able to work on these issues as a new Member of Congress, as a Member of Congress that's ready to work, and as a Member of Congress that's ready to look at new ideas where we can come together.

H.R. 1622 is the continuation of a good idea on how we can continue to eliminate our dependence on foreign oil.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SALAZAR). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1622, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1445

SUPPORTING NATIONAL DAIRY MONTH

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 507) supporting the goals of National Dairy Month, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 507

Whereas, since 1939, June has been celebrated as National Dairy Month;

Whereas there are nearly 70,000 dairy farms throughout the United States, and approximately 99 percent of these farms are family owned;

Whereas the dairy industry in the United States produces more than 170 billion pounds of milk annually and contributes tens of billions of dollars to the economy;

Whereas dairy products are an important source of calcium and have been long recognized as an integral part of a healthy diet for both children and adults;

Whereas dairy farmers are significant contributors to efforts to preserve farmland and the rural character of communities across the country; and

Whereas the dairy industry has been challenged in recent months due to high production costs and low retail prices, which has forced many farms to close: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals of National Dairy Month;

(2) encourages States and local governments to observe National Dairy Month with appropriate activities and events that promote the dairy industry;

(3) recognizes the important role that the dairy industry has played in the economic and nutritional well being of Americans;

(4) commends dairy farmers for their continued hard work and commitment to the United States economy and to the preservation of open space; and

(5) encourages all Americans to show their continued support for the dairy industry and dairy farmers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is timely that the House considers this resolution, this very important resolution, in support of the goals of National Dairy Month today because our Nation's dairy farmers are providing healthy, nutritious milk and dairy products to millions of American families, even as the families of dairy farmers are facing very tough economic times, very challenging times, Mr. Speaker.

The U.S. dairy industry is an important contributor to our Nation's agriculture economy. The United States leads the world in cows' milk production, accounting for more than $284 million in farm receipts in 2007. Dairy farmers across the country are producing the milk and dairy products that we give to our children and to our grandchildren, knowing that they are getting the nutrients that they need for strong bones and for growing bodies.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, our Nation's dairy farmers are feeling the severe pain of very difficult and trying economic times that they're experiencing right now. We are committed to doing everything we possibly can to help our dairy farmers through this very challenging time as quickly as we can. Dairy prices remain at historically low levels, and many farmers cannot even get the credit that they need to stay in business. We must help our dairy farmers.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Livestock, Dairy, and Poultry and food security, I have scheduled the second in a series of three hearings this week to take a very thorough look at the difficult economic conditions facing the dairy industry and to look at the options that we have to help our Nation's dairy farmers. Help them we must, and help them we will to weather these financial difficulties until the economy can recover. We must get our dairy farmers back on their feet where they rightfully belong.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of this resolution that will, in some small way, give due recognition to the hard work and to the sacrifices of our Nation's dairy farmers. It will also highlight the importance of dairy products and healthy and balanced diets for the American people and for the people of the world.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I rise in support of H. Res. 507, a resolution supporting the goals of National Dairy Month, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, for the past 70 years, we have celebrated the month of June as National Dairy Month. While there have been some years during this time where dairymen have had cause for celebration, I think we would be hard pressed this year to find a dairyman who is in much of a mood for celebration.

As dairy prices started to rise in 2007, reaching record levels by June of last year, prices started to decline this past September and October, ultimately reaching a devastatingly low price by February. While there has been some slight rebounding in prices, dairymen across the country are still suffering from extremely low prices received in the marketplace and from extremely high prices for inputs, such as feed and fuel. In fact, while the average uniform price in the Northeast Federal milk marketing order for June of 2009 is $11.93 per hundredweight of milk, the USDA estimates that it costs dairymen in my home State of Pennsylvania $27.15 per hundredweight of milk just to produce it.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize that the adoption of this resolution is a bit late this year, but as we honor National Dairy Month for the 70th consecutive year, I ask all of my colleagues to consider the actions we take here in this Capitol Building and how these actions reflect on the small family farming businesses around the country.

Farmers do their best in keeping us well fed and in keeping us clothed and in keeping us housed, and we can, at the very least, consider the financial burdens that we place on these men and women when we contemplate legislation that would dramatically increase their costs of production.

I want to thank my good friend from Georgia for the hearing that he held last week and for the two hearings that we are going to conduct on behalf of the dairy industry. I really appreciate that. I know the dairy farmers of Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District appreciate that as well, and I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I now yield as much time as he may need to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman SCOTT for bringing this resolution, which I sponsored along with 70 other Members, and for bringing it to the floor. His leadership with the farm bill last year that extended the milk subsidy program, which was probably the number one priority of dairy farmers, was critical in terms of trying to keep farms afloat that are hanging on by a thread.

Also, he changed the system of the milk subsidy program to include input costs into the formula for the first time, which, again, is a critical benefit for folks going through a very challenging and difficult time, as the chairman described it and as Mr. THOMPSON described it.

Usually, Mr. Speaker, these types of resolutions—let's face it—are kind of fluffy. They're here to kind of put the spotlight on a product or on a segment of the economy. Everybody kind of gets up and does a little boosterism for, maybe, their regions of the country; a voice vote is taken, and it's probably forgotten pretty quickly. This year, there is an urgency surrounding the crisis that exists in dairy all across America that, I think, makes this resolution, which is an opportunity to put the spotlight on the challenges that dairy farmers are facing, important for all of us in the Congress and certainly for all of us in the country.

As has been said earlier, we have seen a collapse of dairy prices over the last year. Back in June 2008 when the farm bill passed, the price per hundredweight across America was, roughly, $20. Today, that has literally fallen in half. Exports have fallen by 57 percent, which many experts believe is one of the reasons prices have reached a level where sustainable economics exists for dairy farmers across the country. That export market, along with the world recession, has made it impossible for the normal market forces to keep prices at a level at which farms can sustain their overhead and their input costs.

In the Northeast, particularly in New England, we are seeing the effects of this drastic, dramatic collapse. Ten percent of farms in Connecticut, particularly in eastern Connecticut, which I represent, have gone out of business, and that number has been reflected in other parts of New England. The one thing about a dairy farm going out of business is it's not like an up-and-down cycle. When they go out, they go out for good, and you lose a characteristic of a State's look and its economy that you can never recover again.

That is why it is so important for Chairman SCOTT to be holding the hearings that he is holding with the Agriculture Committee, to make sure that we do everything we possibly can in this emergency right now to provide immediate support and relief. The ideas are out there in terms of whether or not we need an emergency boost to the milk subsidy program and in terms of whether or not we need to have the Department of Agriculture use its administrative powers to raise the base price for dairy.

It is imperative, again, that we pass this resolution, but that we also do everything we can as a Congress to keep the pressure on. Recently, I was home in Connecticut, and I and Congresswoman DELAURO, the chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture in Appropriations, met with a number of farms, Greenbacker Farms, Cushman Farms. These are farms that go back literally to the colonial days of our country which are now facing a death spiral in terms of having to borrow to pay operating costs just to keep the bills paid and their workforces going to work every day and with paychecks.

If we do not intervene, we are going to lose a part of our economy that we can really never recover again. There is a bumper sticker out there that some of you may have seen and that some of you may have on your cars, like I do on my car, which says, ''No farms, no food.''

At some point, we, as a Nation, have to recognize that if we do not come up with agriculture policies that allow for sustainable farms in our country, then we are going to lose, not just those wonderful families and parts of our economy, but also critical parts of our food supply. You only have to look at recent events, in terms of the damage that has been done to American citizens from unsafe food imported into this country, to know the stakes could not be higher.

So I applaud the chairman for bringing out this committee. I appreciate the bipartisan support for this resolution. Obviously, it's a resolution which deserves our support, but we need to follow up on it with real acts and with real action by the Congress to make sure that we deal with this emergency crisis that exists here today. I hope the strong support that we're going to see around this resolution will be reflected in those efforts.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Connecticut just spoke. He has been putting in a tremendous amount of energy in coming before our committee and in giving us expert testimony as he did last week.

I just want to commend you, Mr. COURTNEY, on what you are doing. Your constituents are certainly prouder than ever. I join with you in making sure that we adequately respond to the pressing needs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to another distinguished gentleman, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) as much time as he may consume. He is one of my colleagues who also came before our committee and who has been putting in tireless hours on this great, great crisis in our dairy industry that we are facing.

Mr. WELCH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Mr. THOMPSON. It is a pleasure to work with you on this important legislation, on this important resolution.

Mr. Speaker, as my friend and colleague from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) said, our dairy farms face a crisis they've never ever seen. The crisis they face is not of their own making. Farmers have to live with the uncertainty of nature. They have to live with the uncertainty of a collapse of an export market. That's what happened when there was the melamine scare in China. They have to live with the uncertainty of an economy where prices in the purchasing of cheese in secondary, non-fluid milk products have come down with the recession. Yet the importance of our having local agricultural activities in all of our districts has never been more important.

People want and need local agriculture. In my State, it's dairy. That's the backbone of our agricultural industry. In your State, it may be wheat; it may be potatoes. In States across the country where there is local agriculture, it serves not just the needs of our farmers who make a very good, a very decent and a very honest living from working the land; it serves the health needs of our citizens.

It serves the environmental needs of our countryside. The farmers are the custodians of our landscape. That's certainly true in Vermont, which is to the benefit of all of us. It is certainly to the benefit of our tourism industry.

Mr. Speaker, the crisis that the farmers face right now, particularly in dairy, where there's that disparity between what it costs them to produce milk and what they're being paid, is not survivable unless we do two things:

One, provide short-term relief. We must find a way to increase the milk support payments on a temporary basis to help them get through the fall. If we fail to do that, they will fail themselves, and that would be a tragedy, because these farms, once gone, are gone forever and, with it, the environmental values, the land values, and the benefit to all of us to have local food production.

The average distance of farm to table for food products that we eat is about 1,500 miles. Think about the energy consumption that we're wasting and what we can preserve if we keep production local.

The second thing we have to do is what we have known since the era of the Depression, and that is we have to have stable pricing and adjustments so that farmers can weather the ups and downs in the cycle over which they have no control.

Now, I want to remind folks of something Mr. COURTNEY said when we were before Mr. SCOTT's committee. We bailed out the financial industry with

billions and billions of dollars, and the reason was that they were too big to fail. It was not because they had been responsible and had done everything within their power to avoid the catastrophe. In fact, they caused the catastrophe.

□ 1500

Yet because they were too big to fail, in order to mitigate the impact on innocent people, the taxpayers came to the rescue.

Now, is it the case that with our farmers, they are too small to matter? What kind of Congress is it if that's the verdict that we come to when it comes to our farmers who, through no fault of their own—unlike Wall Street—who through no fault of their own find themselves in a real jam.

Mr. Speaker, we have to take extraordinary action because this is an extraordinary time, and it's deserved because these are extraordinary people. This resolution is allowing us to focus attention where it needs to be on some of the best people among us in this country—and that's our dairy farmers, the folks would work the land, day in and day out, year in and year out, generation to generation.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as we close out on this bill, I just cannot think of more appropriate words at this time than those words that were said by one of our great Founders. It might be very appropriate now as we look at the crisis facing the dairy industry. That Founder was Alexander Hamilton, Mr. Speaker. And Alexander Hamilton said these words: that the greatness of our Nation and the Federal Government of our Nation shines at its brightest at our moment of crisis.

Well, this is a crisis, Mr. Speaker. It is a very special, unique crisis that is facing a very special and beloved industry—ice cream, milk, our cheeses, our butters—our dairy farmers. All across this country from the Atlantic coast to the Pacific Ocean, from Texas to Vermont and Connecticut, there is no industry that represents the grandeur and the greatness of America as our dairy industry. And it is time for this Federal Government to do precisely what Alexander Hamilton spoke of when he said, At the time of crisis is when our Nation shines at its most brilliant. Let this Nation, let this Federal Government shine on the dairy industry now.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 507, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution just considered.

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

There was no objection.

RECOGNIZING ESTABLISHMENT OF HUNTERS FOR THE HUNGRY

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 270) recognizing the establishment of Hunters for the Hungry programs across the United States and the contributions of those programs efforts to decrease hunger and help feed those in need.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 270

Whereas Hunters for the Hungry programs are cooperative efforts among hunters, sportsmen's associations, meat processors, State meat inspectors, and hunger relief organizations to help feed those in need;

Whereas during the past three years Hunters for the Hungry programs have brought hundreds of thousands of pounds of venison to homeless shelters, soup kitchens, and food banks;

Whereas each year donations have multiplied as Hunters for the Hungry programs continue to feed those in need; and

Whereas 45 States have a Hunters for the Hungry program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the cooperative efforts of hunters, sportsmen's associations, meat processors, State meat inspectors, and hunger relief organizations to establish Hunters for the Hungry programs across the United States; and

(2) recognizes the contributions of Hunters for the Hungry programs to efforts to decrease hunger and help feed those in need.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I come before the House today to encourage the passage of House Resolution 270, which recognizes the establishment of Hunters for the Hungry programs across the United States and recognizing the contributions these programs make to decrease hunger and help feed those in need.

Hunters for the Hungry is a unique and innovative program that addresses hunger in communities nationwide. All across this country, hunters can donate their game and their fowl to Hunters for the Hungry, which processes the meat and provides it to food banks and other feeding programs. This cooperative effort between hunters, processors, and the hunger community is an innovative example of how groups can work together toward a single, worthy goal: working to make sure that no American goes hungry.

When the House Agriculture Committee considered this resolution in the 110th Congress, it received unanimous support; and I strongly encourage the passage of this resolution.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 270, which recognizes the collaborative efforts of hunters, sportsmen's associations, meat processors, State meat inspectors, and hunger relief organizations to establish Hunters for the Hungry programs across the United States. Such programs have brought hundreds of thousands of pounds for venison to homeless shelters, soup kitchens and food banks.

Since 1991, Pennsylvania's Hunters Sharing the Harvest program has provided hundreds of thousands of meals to needy Pennsylvanians. Last year, the program coordinated the delivery of nearly 200,000 meals that included venison.

Americans are generous people, and many individuals work through private organizations to donate food to help needy families. Given our economic climate, more and more people are turning to soup kitchens and food banks for food assistance, and that is where programs like Hunters for the Hungry make a valuable contribution and difference.

Great strides are being made to provide nutritious, high-quality venison to those experiencing hunger in our communities. I commend the generosity of America's hunters and all who participate in the Hunters for the Hungry program. The contributions of these individuals are a step in the right direction in the fight against hunger, and I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 270.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. I again thank the chairman for bringing this resolution out.

There is probably not a more difficult and challenging enterprise to operate today than running a food bank. We're obviously in a time where our economy is extremely weak. The demand for food bank help is up and the ability of people to provide donations for food bank services are down.

In Connecticut, over 350,000 people were served in the last year by our food banks—a number that is way higher than the prior year. And as was recently reported in the New London Day, the largest paper in southeastern Connecticut, while there was a growing need for food assistance in 2008 and 2009, traditional donations are way down. There is only one area where we have seen an increase, and that is in the area of wild game that was donated by hunters who are part of this program which is being given accolades with this resolution.

In my district, hunters and constituents like Warren Speh and Bob Jean have donated more than 10,000 pounds of deer meat that was hunted at Bluff Point State Park in Groton alone as part of an effort to manage the deer population and also donated that food to the local food bank in the New London area. So they are a perfect example of what this program is about.

Again, I strongly support this resolution's effort to put the spotlight on the great work that these people are doing and urge adoption by the full membership.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I recognize my good friend from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) for such time as he may consume.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank one of our newest and hardworking members of the Republican Conference, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, for generously yielding me time on this resolution today.

As a member of the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus and author of this resolution, I rise in strong support of House Resolution 270, a resolution recognizing the contribution made by Hunters for the Hungry programs across this country.

I would like to thank Chairman PETERSON, Ranking Member LUCAS, my colleague from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT) and all of my colleagues on the Agriculture Committee for bringing this resolution to the floor today in a bipartisan manner.

I also want to thank the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus, especially co-chairs DAN BOREN and PAUL RYAN, for their support. This bipartisan organization, comprised of close to 300 Members of the House and the Senate, focuses on protecting the interests of our Nation's sportsmen. Mr. Speaker, as a proud Member of this caucus, I know that it works diligently for our sportsmen who have historically shaped the character and the quality of America's cultural heritage, natural resources, and our economic vitality.

I first introduced the Hunters for the Hungry resolution in the 108th Congress back in 2003, as well as in each subsequent Congress, to bring attention to an often overlooked group—our Nation's hunters—who feed thousands of homeless and hungry people each year. The purpose of this resolution is to praise the work of Hunters for the Hungry programs across our country. These programs provide a unique way in which to address our Nation's hunger problem.

Although these organizations are called by different names in the 45 States where they are located, Hunters for the Hungry organizations show the humanitarian and the kind-hearted spirit of our Nation's hunting community. These programs are volunteer and cooperative efforts among hunters, sportsmen's associations, meat processors, State meat inspectors and hunger relief organizations. Over the past 3 years, these programs have brought hundreds of thousands of pounds of excess venison to homeless shelters, to soup kitchens, and food banks. Each year, donations have multiplied, and many programs now cannot even cover the costs of processing, of packaging and storing, and distributing the abundant supply of donated venison.

Hunters for the Hungry organizations serve as a great example of how our Nation can address issues like hunger without government intervention. These organizations receive no Federal funding. They operate from donations and volunteer services. We must raise the awareness of these organizations so that they can have the resources and the volunteers to serve America's underprivileged.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that in my home State of Georgia, over 28,000 pounds of venison was donated as a result of this program just last year, raising the overall total in the State to over 200,000 pounds since this program was initiated back in 1993. I commend the kind-hearted hunters of my State, along with those across the country, who donate their time and their money for those people in need.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution so the House can show its gratitude to these selfless hunters across the country to honor their great community service.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I also would like to take a moment to extend my commendations to my distinguished friend from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) for this very worthy, worthy resolution. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize for 2 minutes my distinguished friend and colleague from the great State of Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) who has a sterling reputation for working to make sure that no American goes to bed hungry in our country.

□ 1515

Mr. MCGOVERN. I want to thank my friend for yielding and for his leadership on these and so many other important issues.

I wanted to rise as well in support of the resolution by my colleague from Georgia, Mr. GINGREY. I think it's an important resolution, and I think the Hunters for the Hungry organization deserve praise for their work trying to respond to a real need in this country, and that is the issue of people who are food insecure or are hungry.

This is a problem that is getting worse in the United States of America, I am sad to say, and this is an issue that we need to talk more about on this House floor. And I appreciate and I support the efforts of hunters and a whole bunch of other volunteer organizations across the country in their efforts to respond to this crisis, and we need to do everything we can to congratulate them, express our appreciation and urge them to do more.

I would also add that I think we have a moral imperative to do more as a country and as a government to respond to this need. There are more than 36 million Americans who are food insecure or hungry. Every one of us should be ashamed of that fact, and we need to respond to this crisis, and we need to do more than we are doing now.

I'm the co-chair of the House Hunger Caucus, and we are urging all Members of Congress to take only 1 hour, at least 1 hour, out of their busy schedules during the August recess and visit a hunger relief organization, visit a food pantry, visit a food bank, and see firsthand what is happening. And what people are going to see, what my colleagues will see is not only the incredible work that is going on to help respond to this crisis, but the fact is that these food banks and these food pantries are chock full. They're at capacity. They cannot respond to the need that they are faced with.

And so as we debate other legislation down the road, I hope we will keep these people in mind, but I did want to rise to congratulate and to thank my friend Mr. GINGREY for his leadership on this issue. I think it is important that we do what we can to acknowledge the good work of people who are in the forefront of fighting on behalf of people who are food insecure and hungry, and I want to thank him.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to Dr. BROUN.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I started my political activism by being the government affairs vice president for Safari Club International, and the Safari Club has been very much engaged in trying to feed the hungry through a program called Hunters for the Hungry, and it's something that's absolutely critical for us to promote this type of idea. I congratulate my colleague, dear friend from Georgia, Dr. GINGREY, for bringing this legislation to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, hunters all over this country are willing to provide some of their deer and elk meat to feed the hungry, and I think it's a proper role for us as Members of Congress to promote this type of philosophy, of letting the private sector take care of the poor, the widows and fatherless as biblically we're charged to do. In fact, I believe very firmly that the private sector can provide for the needs of those disadvantaged in this country a whole lot better than government can.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to rise and speak for a minute in behalf of this bill. I fully support it. I congratulate Dr. GINGREY for bringing this important legislation, and I congratulate my other colleague from Georgia for speaking in favor of the bill and look forward to its passage and look forward to promoting other kinds of ideas, Mr. Speaker, where we can stimulate the private sector, provide for those things that are desperately needed by those that are disadvantaged around this country. They really need some help. They need some help in feeding themselves. They need some help in providing jobs, and the private sector's the best way to do that. We over and over on our side introduce legislation that would stimulate the economy, would create jobs, instead of robbing our grandchildren of their future as we see going on here in this Congress.

So, Mr. Speaker, I do rise in support of this bill, and I hope that we will pass it unanimously once it comes for a vote.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as has been mentioned by each of our speakers, we certainly applaud the Hunters for the Hungry program for the great job that they're doing, but this should serve as also a wake-up call and a challenge to more Americans, more organizations where, as the gentleman from Massachusetts pointed out with his statistics, there's so much more that we must do to reach that goal, that we have no American, no American child, no one in this country going to bed hungry at night for we are the wealthiest country in the world.

And so the Hunters for the Hungry program and H. Res. 270 presents not only an opportunity to celebrate the Hunters for the Hungry program but to accept the challenge for us to do more to make sure no American goes to bed hungry.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank my colleagues for certainly supporting this legislation. It truly fulfills the spirit that builds and makes America great, where neighbors assist neighbors.

I don't believe I have any additional speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 270.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution just considered.

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

There was no objection.

RECOGNIZING 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOOD AND NUTRITION SERVICE

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 164) recognizing the 40th anniversary of the Food and Nutrition Service of the Department of Agriculture.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 164

Whereas the Food and Nutrition Service of the Department of Agriculture has been promoting sound nutrition and fighting hunger in the United States since 1969;

Whereas the Food and Nutrition Service works with State and local governments, nonprofit organizations, and faith-based organizations to provide food and nutritional support to over 36,000,000 people in the United States who live in households that face food insecurity on a daily basis;

Whereas the Food and Nutrition Service supports schools in the United States by providing children with nutritious breakfasts and lunches and promotes wellness policies to ensure that children have a healthy start in life; and

Whereas the nutrition programs of the Food and Nutrition Service reach 1 in 5 citizens of the United States on a daily basis: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—

(1) recognizes the valuable historic and continued contribution of the Food and Nutrition Service and its employees to the citizens of the United States;

(2) commends the efforts of States, territories, local governments, and nonprofit charitable and faith-based organizations to end hunger and provide nutritious food to citizens of the United States;

(3) encourages the continued efforts to educate the citizens of the United States about the importance of eating nutritiously and living a healthy lifestyle; and

(4) recognizes and reaffirms the commitment of the United States to end hunger in the United States and continue to lead the world in ending global hunger.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to pay tribute to the outstanding and important work of the USDA's Food and Nutrition Service on the occasion of its 40th anniversary by supporting H. Con. Res. 164.

Mr. Speaker, since 1969, FNS has fulfilled its mission by providing children and needy families with better access to food and a more healthful diet through its food assistance programs and comprehensive nutrition education efforts.

In this time of great economic recession, the employees of FNS have demonstrated their extraordinary commitment to public service by ably serving a record number of Americans in need through the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. In recent months, nearly 35 million people have found it necessary to make use of this safety net program.

In addition, FNS serves specific sectors of our population by providing school meals; funding and commodities for food banks and soup kitchens; and specialized programs for Native Americans, the elderly, infant and children, and pregnant women.

For their exemplary efforts on behalf of Americans in need, I congratulate the employees of the Food and Nutrition Service of the United States Agriculture Department and encourage the speedy passage of H. Con. Res. 164.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 164 and yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 164 recognizes the 40th anniversary of the Food and Nutrition Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The mission of the Food and Nutrition Service is to provide children and low-income families better access to food and a more healthful diet through its food assistance programs and comprehensive nutrition education efforts.

FNS administers the most important Federal nutrition programs, such as the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, formerly known as the Food Stamp Program; the School Lunch and School Breakfast Programs; the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children, known as the WIC program; the Emergency Food Assistance Program, which provides various commodities to our Nation's food banks; as well as other child and adult care food programs.

FNS is better able to serve our Nation's hungry because of the bounty of America's farmers and ranchers. FNS is able to use surplus commodities in their various feeding programs, thus ensuring those in need receive foods produced by the American farmer and rancher.

Many people do not realize that funding for domestic food assistance programs represents two-thirds of the USDA's budget. For fiscal year 2009, the enacted omnibus appropriations measure included $76.2 billion for the programs administered by FNS. With the economy continuing to struggle, FNS has seen a record enrollment of

33.8 million food stamp participants. Clearly, the Food and Nutrition Service, in working cooperatively with the States, has a large and important role in serving those in need.

And again, I want to recognize the 40th anniversary of USDA's Food and Nutrition Service and ask my colleagues to support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, now it is with great pleasure that I'd like to yield 6 minutes to the cochairman of the Congressional Hunger Caucus and an outstanding leader in this Congress, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentleman, my colleague from Georgia, for yielding me the time and for his kind words, and I also want to thank Majority Leader STENY HOYER and Chairman COLLIN PETERSON and their staff for quickly scheduling this bipartisan resolution for consideration today.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution honors the USDA's Food and Nutrition Service for 40 years of fighting hunger in the United States. There are more than 36 million food insecure or hungry people living in America today. The Food and Nutrition Service, or FNS, is the lifeline for the hungry in our country.

The mission of FNS is to provide children and needy families better access to food and a more healthful diet through its food assistance programs and comprehensive nutrition education efforts. FNS does this by administering the Food Stamp, now called SNAP, program and child nutrition programs that include the school and summer meal programs. Without these programs and without the dedicated staff at FNS, millions of people in this country would be facing hunger and malnutrition.

Their work and dedication should be commended, and I am pleased to be the lead sponsor of this resolution honoring the 40th anniversary of the Food and Nutrition Service. I am also pleased that my good friend and colleague, the gentlelady from Missouri, JO ANN EMERSON, is a cosponsor of this resolution. Unfortunately, my good friend could not be here for this debate, but she is a strong supporter of FNS.

Mr. Speaker, over the past 2 years we have seen a major expansion in our Nation's antihunger programs. SNAP has been expanded twice: first, in the farm bill, which expanded both the eligibility and the purchasing power of the program; and second, in the Recovery Act, where the SNAP program benefits were accelerated to stimulate the economy and help families better afford food during this economic downturn.

This year, we expect to see the reauthorization of the Child Nutrition Programs: WIC, the school breakfast lunch, child care, afterschool, and summer meal programs. And FNS is in the forefront of these programs.

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased with the work FNS has done for the past 40 years, but this is also an opportunity to look to the future. And I'm encouraged by the new administration, the leadership of Secretary Vilsack and his team at USDA. They are exploring ways to fight hunger, and I'm looking forward to developing a strong working relationship with Secretary Vilsack.

And while I'm pleased that USDA and FNS have worked so hard at responsibly implementing the antihunger programs authorized in the farm bill and in the Recovery Act, I am very concerned that there hasn't been more done on President Obama's pledge to end childhood hunger in America by 2015.

□ 1530

I encourage the Secretary to use this 40th anniversary recognition to rededicate USDA not only to ending child hunger in the United States, but to start working with Members of Congress and other stakeholders on ways to improve the Federal antihunger programs.

I believe the Secretary should convene a Cabinet-level working group consisting not only of members of the administration but also congressional leaders in order to brainstorm on ways the administration and Congress can work together to combat hunger in our country. We need to show that the goal of ending child hunger by 2015 is something that this administration is committed to achieving.

I also encourage USDA and FNS to look into using their regulatory authority to make it easier for eligible families and individuals to sign up or be recertified for SNAP and other Federal antihunger programs.

In Massachusetts, we are seeing backlogs of new applications that last upwards of several weeks between submission of the application and approval or denial of that application. The issue is the increasing number of people who are becoming eligible for SNAP at the same time as current SNAP participants need to be recertified in order to continue participating in the program. The result is a backlog of cases for State administrators, causing lengthy delays that result in denial of food to hungry people.

Finally, I strongly encourage the White House to convene a conference on food and nutrition in order to bring together our Nation's leaders and stakeholders on hunger and nutrition. We need to put into place a strategy, a comprehensive strategy, to end all hunger in this country, and we need to do so while improving the availability of nutritious food. That will take Presidential leadership. I hope President Obama will convene this conference soon.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate FNS on 40 years of great work. Once again, I thank Chairman PETERSON for his willingness to move this resolution through the process quickly. I want to thank my friend, Mr. SCOTT, for all of his leadership.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. In closing, Mr. Speaker, I could not be more eloquent than my good friend from Massachusetts, Mr. MCGOVERN, our distinguished co-Chair of the Congressional Hunger Caucus, because he spoke so well. But one salient fact that shows the significance of the Food and Nutrition Services and the work of our United States Agriculture Department in this area is the fact that when we look at child nutrition, and specifically our School Lunch Program, it has been documented in all too many cases that all too often that meal, that one meal from our School Lunch Program is the most nutrient meal that all too many of our young people receive each day. That shows the value of what the Food and Nutrition Service is doing.

We certainly commend the resolution, commend the work of Mr. MCGOVERN of Massachusetts, and our United States Agriculture Department.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the concurrent resolution to recognize the 40th anniversary of the Food and Nutrition Service of the United States Department of Agriculture. The Food and Nutrition Service has administered the Nation's nutrition assistance programs since 1969 and is the lead agency in charge of supporting the fundamental nutritional needs of children, low-income individuals, families, and communities.

Mr. Speaker, in the United States no one should face hunger, especially children. Over the past forty years, the Food and Nutrition Service has been critical to ensuring that children have access to healthful foods and nutritious meals at school, in childcare settings, and during the summer months that support their ability to succeed in and out of the classroom. The services provided by the Food and Nutrition Service encourage good nutrition and well-being that are necessary to ensure a healthy future for the country.

Through its programs, FNS actively promotes individual health and well-being for a strong and productive workforce. Through coordination with State and local governments, community organizations, and many partners, the Food and Nutrition Service provides access to healthful food, nutrition services, and education to 1 in 5 individuals at risk of hunger in the United States each day.

The programs administered by the Food and Nutrition Service are designed to respond to fluctuations in the economy and work to ensure all eligible children, individuals, and households can access nutrition benefits when they need it the most. Together, these programs form the Nation's nutrition safety net. As families, communities, and the Nation face significant economic challenges, these programs play an increasingly important role in supporting good nutrition and reducing the risk of hunger.

As the Chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor with jurisdiction for many nutrition programs administered by the Food and Nutrition Service, the Committee on Education and Labor recognizes the critical food assistance and nutrition services that these programs provide to children and families. And,

we are committed to ensuring that these programs have a strong foundation, so that all eligible children and individuals can access high quality nutrition assistance with dignity and respect. I look forward to working with my colleagues on the committee on the reauthorization of the Child Nutrition Programs later this year to further strengthen the Nation's nutrition safety net and the services that these programs provide.

I commend the Food and Nutrition Service for 40 years of important service to the Nation and support the Agency's continued effort to promote food security through access to nutritious foods, to improve diet quality, and to educate individuals on the benefits of and strategies for living a healthy lifestyle.

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to speak here today on behalf of this resolution recognizing the 40th anniversary of the Food and Nutrition Service of the Department of Agriculture. When President Lincoln organized USDA he called it the "People's Department." That legacy is truly evident in the millions of Americans served each day by the Food and Nutrition Service.

Contending with hunger is a sad fact of life for 36 million food insecure Americans. The programs administered and implemented by the dedicated public servants at FNS, Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, WIC, the National School Lunch Program, TEFAP and the Commodity Supplemental Food Nutrition Program—just to name a few—provide the difference between hunger and adequate nutrition for these adults and, unfortunately, so many children.

However, these programs, vital to so many of our constituents, do not run on autopilot. For the past 40 years dedicated individuals at the Food Nutrition Service have worked to reach those in need, while protecting the integrity of the programs they administer. They have driven error rates down, while working to increase participation rates; FNS has proven to be able stewards of the programs they administer.

Mr. Speaker, forty years ago today man set foot on the moon. This was a dream for untold generations which this government made a priority and achieved. When we set this goal, the tools needed to achieve it did not exist—they had to be invented. Forty years ago the Food Nutrition Service was also formed, our nation's greatest tool in fighting hunger. I look forward to the day when we set our goals high again and provide the resources necessary to truly end hunger in the United States.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. 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 Georgia (Mr. SCOTT) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 164.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution just considered.

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

There was no objection.

RECOGNIZING BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 30) commending the Bureau of Labor Statistics on the occasion of its 125th anniversary.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

S. CON. RES. 30

Whereas the Act entitled "An Act to establish a Bureau of Labor", approved on June 27, 1884 (23 Stat. 60), established a bureau to "collect information upon the subject of labor, its relation to capital, the hours of labor, and the earnings of laboring men and women, and the means of promoting their material, social, intellectual, and moral prosperity";

Whereas the Bureau of Labor Statistics is the principal factfinding agency for the Federal Government in the broad field of labor economics and statistics, and in that role it collects, processes, analyzes, and disseminates essential statistical data to the public, Congress, other Federal agencies, State and local governments, business, and labor;

Whereas the Bureau of Labor Statistics has completed 125 years of service to government, business, labor, and the public by producing indispensable data and special studies on prices, employment and unemployment, productivity, wages and other compensation, economic growth, industrial relations, occupational safety and health, the use of time by the people of the United States, and the economic conditions of States and metropolitan areas;

Whereas many public programs and private transactions are dependent today on the quality of such statistics of the Bureau of Labor Statistics as the unemployment rate and the Consumer Price Index, which play essential roles in the allocation of Federal funds and the adjustment of pensions, welfare payments, private contracts, and other payments to offset the impact of inflation;

Whereas the Bureau of Labor Statistics pursues these responsibilities with absolute integrity and is known for being unfailingly responsive to the need for new types of information and indexes of change;

Whereas the Bureau of Labor Statistics has earned an international reputation as a leader in economic and social statistics;

Whereas the Bureau of Labor Statistics' Internet website, www.bls.gov, began operating in 1995 and meets the public need for timely and accurate information by providing an ever-expanding body of economic data and analysis available to an ever-growing group of online citizens; and

Whereas the Bureau of Labor Statistics has established the highest standards of professional competence and commitment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress commends the Bureau of Labor Statistics on the occasion of its 125th anniversary for the exemplary service its administrators and employees provide in collecting and disseminating vital information for the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlemen from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend and insert extraneous material on Senate Concurrent Resolution 30 into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 30, which commends the work of the Bureau of Labor Statistics as it celebrates its 125th anniversary.

Since its founding in 1884, the Bureau of Labor Statistics has served as the principal factfinding agency for the Federal Government for all matters in the fields of labor, economics, and statistics. In this capacity, it has collected, analyzed, and disseminated essential labor-related data to all levels of government, various Federal agencies, and the American public.

As an institution, the Bureau of Labor Statistics has evolved throughout its 125 years. Originally serving a broad fact-finding mandate, the Bureau has since developed into many specialized arms that study a multitude of labor issues, including wages and prices, the state of industrial relations, unemployment, demographic shifts, and workplace safety conditions.

The Bureau has stringent criteria for its data and analyses in order to ensure that it is not only accurate but relevant to society. As a result of rapidly changing economic conditions, the Bureau of Labor Statistics has developed a reputation for responsiveness, swiftly adjusting its measures and indices to provide citizens and policymakers of this Nation with high-quality statistical data.

In its commitment to disseminate this valuable information, the Bureau of Labor Statistics established a Web site in 1995. Since that time, a variety of data access tools have been developed, providing increased access to the statistical data it analyzes and develops. Today, the use of the Web site is over 1,000 times what it was when it began, with more than 20 million users in the months of this year alone.

The data and analyses provided by the Bureau are invaluable, contributing to policy development process as well as the allocation of Federal funds

and private payments. I commend the work of the Bureau's many economists, mathematical statisticians, information technology assistants, and administrative specialists as they celebrate an impressive 125-year legacy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in support of this important resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 30, commending the Bureau of Labor Statistics on its 125th anniversary.

In our current economic climate, there is a lot of discussion about economic data, what the data means for our recovery, and more importantly, how many of our fellow citizens are going back to work.

What is not talked about is the government agency that is responsible for gathering this data. For 125 years, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, BLS, has been charged with collecting and examining information related to our economic health. According to the BLS mission statement, the agency is the principal factfinding body for the Federal Government.

A survey of any economic analysis demonstrates that this information is widely used by academics, Federal and State governments, private companies, and news reporters. The agency has more than 2,000 economists in its headquarters and eight regional offices, gathering unemployment data, wage data, safety and health statistics, and a whole host of information to provide us with a clear picture of the state of the economy across this country. Congress relies on the statistics produced by the Bureau for a variety of programs and for guiding a myriad of policy decisions.

The Bureau examines payroll data and various demographics so that we have detailed information about employment by hours, by industry, and geographic areas. BLS also provides a snapshot of employee benefit plans or labor productivity.

When your children ask if they will ever use anything they learn in school in real life, you can point to the economists and statisticians at BLS as an example of putting math and science to work. When your children complain about how much time that they spend in school, you can tell them, according to the American Time Use Survey developed by BLS, 9 percent of the population is engaged in educational activities daily. I doubt if it brings them any comfort, though. That 9 percent spends, on average, 4.5 hours in class and 2.4 hours engaged in homework.

I rise today to commend the staff of the Bureau of Labor Statistics for 125 years of dedicated service and urge the passage of S. Con. Res. 30, commending their service to the Nation. I ask my colleagues to support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. I want to thank my friend from Pennsylvania for yielding me time, Mr. Speaker. As we're talking about the Bureau of Labor Statistics, it's an interesting period in our country's history because, just in the last few months since President Obama's taken office, our country has lost 2 million more jobs; 2 million more Americans are out of work, are part of those statistics. I think it's much more than statistics. It's policies by this administration that have caused those 2 million Americans to lose their jobs since January.

If you go back to the stimulus bill, that was the bill that was touted at stopping the bleeding. All of us on this side that opposed that bill, that opposed spending $800 billion of money that we don't have, said back then that that bill would actually make matters worse because it was adding mountains of debt to our children and grandchildren, but also it wasn't addressing the problems in our economy.

In fact, now we're seeing unemployment at 9.5 percent, approaching 10 percent, with 2 million more Americans having lost their jobs since President Obama took office. And what's this administration saying? Are they finally admitting that the stimulus was a failure? No. In fact, some in the White House are calling for another stimulus bill, more spending.

In fact, just last week at a convention of the AARP, Vice President JOE BIDEN said, ''We have to go spend money to keep from going bankrupt.'' Those are words the Vice President actually said just last week.

And so as this mountain of debt is piling up on the backs of our children and grandchildren, as the President is running car companies and running banks and running all of these other institutions—with over 30 czars, and it's not working—their own Vice President is saying they need to spend money to keep from going bankrupt.

These are ludicrous policies. We have got to go back to common sense. We've got to go back to fiscal discipline and start balancing our budget like every other State is dealing with their budgets, like American families are dealing with these tough economic times as they're pulling back and living within their own means. It's the Federal Government here in Washington that seems to be out of control on a spending frenzy.

Then, just a few weeks ago, they brought this cap-and-trade national energy tax, where they're literally proposing a policy that would run millions more American jobs out of this country to places like China and India, where they'll actually emit more carbon than we do here in America to do the same thing, while rising utility rates on every American family.

The President's own budget director said that the cap-and-trade energy tax would add another $1,200 a year to every American family's utility bills. So, as they're thinking about turning on their air conditioner in the summer, they're going to be thinking about whether or not they will pay these higher electricity rates.

These policies are helping lead to this rapid unemployment that is now approaching double digits. And the latest here we have in front of us in Congress is this debate over the President and Speaker PELOSI and others' proposal to have a government takeover of our health care system, where the estimates are that we would have hundreds of billions of dollars in new taxes, over $580 billion in new taxes on the backs of small businesses.

You would have $240 billion in fines in their approach on the backs of American families, including—get this. This is according to the Congressional Budget Office. In the President's takeover, proposal to take over the health care system by the government, they have $29 million in penalties against people who are uninsured. It's in the bill.

They have the ability for this health care czar—a health care czar that would literally be able to tell Americans whether or not they can see a doctor and which doctor they can see. It actually gives the authority to this bureaucrat in Washington to disqualify a company's entire health benefits plan.

□ 1545

So if you like the health care you have, the health care czar in their bill allows the health care czar to take your health care benefits away.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. SCALISE. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

If you look at these policies—and the American people out there across the country are looking at these policies, and that's a good thing because as they look at these policies, and they hear the leadership here in Washington, the people running Congress, saying they need to ram these policies through before the next 2 weeks are over, I think people are figuring it out. They're saying, Wait a minute.

Many Members who actually voted for that cap-and-trade energy tax didn't even read the bill because they dropped 300 pages of amendments down the day of the vote. And we know they're going to try to do the same thing again on this government takeover of health care, and people are sick and tired of it. People are finally saying, Enough is enough; control spending and these czars; stop running car companies; stop running banks; and, surely, don't try to have some government bureaucrat take over our health care system.

So hopefully we won't add millions more Americans to these statistics that we're talking about today by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 12½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Connecticut has 18 minutes remaining.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield as much time as he may consume to Dr. BROUN of Georgia.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I thank my friend from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for yielding some time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell you and the American people a labor statistic that just came out from CBO last week in testimony before the U.S. House. The CBO director said that the ObamaCare Washington bureaucrat-run socialized medicine health care bill that's being considered here in the U.S. House is going to cost Americans 750,000 jobs. I think it is a minimum that 750,000 jobs are going to be lost. We keep hearing various figures in ObamaCare of the cost of $1 trillion, $1.5 trillion, $2 trillion. The CBO has not released off-budget figures. We're just getting a paltry amount of those off-budget figures.

This is going to be extremely, extremely costly to the American people. The CBO last week also said that this is not going to lower the cost of health care delivery. Mr. Speaker, I am a medical doctor. I have practiced medicine for over 3½ decades. What's fixing to happen to the American people, Mr. Speaker—and you need to understand that the ObamaCare bill is going to insert a Washington bureaucrat between them and their doctors. This Washington bureaucrat is going to make decisions for them. It's not going to be made by the patient or the patient's family, not by the doctor, but by a Washington bureaucrat who is going to ration their care.

That Washington bureaucrat is going to tell all patients in this country, whether in private insurance or public insurance, whether they can have a procedure, such as a surgery, that's very needed. This Washington bureaucrat is going to tell the American people, the patients, whether they can have an MRI that's desperately needed to evaluate a cough, a pain in their chest, pain in their knee, pain in their low back.

A Washington bureaucrat is going to make those decisions, Mr. Speaker; and I hope the American people are listening today so that they can understand what's going to happen if we have ObamaCare. The Bureau of Labor Statistics is going to give us more and more bleak news if this goes into law about how people's incomes are going to go down, literally go down because the health care commissioner, or health czar, as Mr. SCALISE was talking about, is going to dictate their health care policy plan to them, even if it's privately paid for, privately administered.

There are not going to be any more private insurance plans because the health care commissioner is going to dictate all the plans in this country, every single one of them. We hear over and over, if you like your private health insurance plan, keep it. But, Mr. Speaker, not one single person in this country, unless they're extremely wealthy—and I mean extremely wealthy—is going to be able to keep their private health care plan. The reason for that is because most people are dependent upon their employer to provide their health insurance. But a government bureaucrat is going to tell every single employer in this country what kind of health care plan, what kind of limits, what kind of coverage, what doctor, everything that plan offers.

So the plan that they have today is going to be obsolete. It's not going to be available anymore. What's even more unfortunate is every single employee, worker that does not accept the government-mandated plan is going to be fined by the Federal Government, fined for not accepting a government-mandated plan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that's not freedom. That's socialism. We, in this Congress, are going to dictate to employers, employees, to those that are buying their own insurance what kind of health care insurance they have; and it's going to be disastrous. The cost is going to skyrocket. The CBO has already said it's going to cost millions of others jobs. People are going to have long waiting times to get the surgery that they need, MRIs, and maybe even plain x rays.

Mr. Speaker, folks in Canada and Great Britain are coming to this country now to get health care because we have the best health care in the world. We're not going to have anyplace to go because our quality of health care is going to be destroyed by the ObamaCare plan. Mr. Speaker, the American people need to understand where we're headed. I hope the American people will rise up and tell their Members of Congress in the House and the Senate ''no'' to ObamaCare.

Republicans are offering many alternatives that will literally lower the cost of health insurance, literally lower the cost of medicines in the drugstore, literally empower the doctor-patient relationship into how health care decisions are made, and will stop the government from dictating things. Mr. Speaker, practicing medicine, I've seen how government intrusion into my practices has increased the cost to my patients.

Two good examples: Congress passed the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act, HIPAA. That act has cost the health care industry billions of dollars and has not paid for the first aspirin to treat the headaches it has created, and it was totally unneeded legislation. Congress passed CLIA, the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Act. It ran up the cost of just simple labs that I used to do in my office to extraordinarily higher costs to patients, thus increasing the cost of the insurance to every person.

We are being offered an expansion of Medicare or an expansion of Medicaid. We already see tremendous problems in both of those programs. Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare is going to expand those; and we're going to have more fraud, more abuse, more waste, higher costs because of government intrusion into the health care system. Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare is going to put the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics into overtime, providing more statistics, more job losses, lower wages, more people out of work and higher costs for all goods and services in this country. They're going to give us data in the future of a poor economy.

Stealing our grandchildren's future has to stop, and I hope the American people will stand up and say ''no'' to the cap-and-tax or tax-and-trade bill that's in the Senate and ObamaCare.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I don't have any additional speakers, so I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, again, the resolution which we're focused on is about celebrating 125 years of great work by the people from the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Obviously the discussion, because the rules of our House permit it, sort of went off into different areas. I would like to just quickly note two things: number one, the Bureau of Labor Statistics would demonstrate or would show that we've had serious job losses over the last 6 months; but it would also show that in the final quarter of 2008, the GDP of this country dropped by 6 percent, the biggest drop since the Great Depression. Obviously, it was the policies which preceded that downturn that have created the situation and the environment that we're in right now.

Given the fact, as the Bureau would show, we have exhausted almost every tool in the monetary toolbox in terms of lowering interest rates, it was critical for our country to step in and use fiscal policy as a way of turning this country around. And if we look at the bipartisan Governors conference, which met this past weekend, Republican and Democratic Governors all acknowledged that the fiscal relief that came through Medicaid payment boosts, through increases in education spending through the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund, through increased funding in title I and special education literally made the difference of whether dozens of States were able to balance their budgets in this critical downturn.

Go ask a Realtor in this country whether or not the stimulus bill, which

provides a first-time home buyer tax credit, has, in fact, revived the real estate market, because they will tell you a resounding ''yes.'' I know in my district we saw a 4 percent increase in home sales; and every single Realtor that was interviewed—in the reporting, again, that came out from the government on that increase in sales—attributed the stimulus package and the first-time home buyer tax credit for the fact that we are seeing that turnaround.

Now as we see the infrastructure dollars filter their way through the bidding process, which every State must conduct for surface transportation projects, we are going to see an uptick in construction and building trades from the stimulus package.

The other brief mention and the second point I want to make is, again, I respect Dr. BROUN for his profession and many of the doctors that serve in the House of Representatives. But as we listen to some of the hysterical statements about the health care reform initiative, I would point out that the American Medical Association, the largest trade group which represents doctors all across this country, came out foursquare in support of the House health care reform bill.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COURTNEY. I will not yield because I sat and listened to representations about that plan which are inaccurate in terms of what it's going to do, in terms of patient choice, but certainly, and more importantly, in how providers are going to be treated. Because the AMA and the American College of Surgeons came out loud and clear in support of this measure and for good reason, because they know that we have a system which is in desperate need of reform.

In conclusion, regarding this resolution before us, when we make choices, both as policymakers in the legislative branch and the executive branch, the key is that we need good data. We need to see where we're going as a Nation, and the people who work at the Bureau of Labor Statistics provide decision-makers and policymakers that opportunity with the great work that they do. I think it's wonderful that on a bipartisan basis we're able to come together, celebrate and recognize the great work that they do.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETERS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 30.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1600

RECOGNIZING CONTRIBUTIONS OF JOHN WILLIAM HEISMAN TO FOOTBALL

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 123) recognizing the historical and national significance of the many contributions of John William Heisman to the sport of football.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 123

Whereas, born in 1869, John W. Heisman was an early and influential developer of the game of football, one of America's most beloved sports;

Whereas Heisman learned the game of football playing for Titusville High School in the 1880s and began his long career as a player, coach, writer, and great innovator of the sport;

Whereas Heisman played college football for Brown University and the University of Pennsylvania;

Whereas his coaching career lasted from 1892–1927 and took Heisman to many institutions including: Oberlin College, Auburn, Clemson, Georgia Tech, Washington and Jefferson, Rice University, and his alma mater, the University of Pennsylvania;

Whereas, after coaching, Heisman continued his involvement with the sport as a well-known author and publisher of sports periodicals;

Whereas, as head coach of Georgia Tech's football club, his team saw an incredible 33 back-to-back wins, while going 37–4–2 in his final five years as coach;

Whereas Heisman coached Georgia Tech to an incredible 222–0 win over Tennessee's Cumberland College, the highest scoring football game on record;

Whereas Heisman is credited with inventing the forward pass, which is widely considered to be his greatest contribution to the sport;

Whereas he introduced games consisting of four quarters, invented the center snap, and created plays that were precursors to the T and I formations;

Whereas, as director of the New York Downtown Athletic Club (DAC), Heisman and DAC established an annual award for the best college player in the Eastern U.S., which subsequently became national in scope in 1935;

Whereas the award was renamed the Heisman Memorial Trophy after he passed away in 1936; and

Whereas John Heisman was elected into the College Football Hall of Fame in 1954: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—

(1) recognizes the significance, the importance, and many contributions John Heisman had on its development of one of America's most beloved sports—football;

(2) praises Heisman's efforts in helping to establish the most valuable player award for college football, which eventually would be named for him; and

(3) acknowledges Heisman's innovative and influential coaching techniques and strategies, as well as his legendary leadership on and off of the football field.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on House Concurrent Resolution 123 into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the resolution filed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) to recognize the significance of John Heisman and his tremendous influence on American football.

Born in Cleveland, Ohio, in 1869, John Heisman grew up and learned the game of football at Titusville High School. He began his collegiate football career at Brown University. However, he completed his playing years as a lineman at the University of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Heisman began his illustrious coaching career at Oberlin College after he graduated from the University of Pennsylvania. He then went on to coach at Akron, Auburn, Clemson, Georgia Tech, the University of Pennsylvania, Washington and Jefferson, and Rice University. With his stern and innovative coaching style, he posted a 71 percent lifetime winning percentage. Most notably, he won 33 straight games when he coached the Georgia Tech Yellow Jackets. To this day, it is still one of the longest winning streaks in college football history. While coaching the Yellow Jackets, he led his team to a 222–0 victory over the defenseless Tennessee Cumberland College.

Heisman's football inventions revolutionized the game. He instituted the game divisions broken up into quarters, the center snap, and the T and I backfield formations. Most impressively, he established the forward pass. Without his contributions, American football would not be the same game that we experience today.

Late in his life, Heisman became the first athletic director of New York's Downtown Athletic Club. In 1933, John Heisman helped to organize the first Touchdown Club of New York, and in 1935 he inaugurated the first Downtown Athletic Club trophy for the best college football player east of the Mississippi. Two months after his death on October 3, 1936, the trophy was renamed the ''Heisman Memorial Trophy'' in his honor. The Heisman Trophy is now one of the most prestigious athletic awards in the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, once again, I want to express my support for House Concurrent Resolution 123 and thank Representative THOMPSON for bringing this resolution forward.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 123, recognizing the historic and national significance of the many contributions of John William Heisman to the sport of football.

John William Heisman was one of the single most influential individuals in the sport of football, the most watched sport in the United States. John Heisman was born in Cleveland, Ohio, on October 23, 1869. He began his football career at Titusville High School. He was introduced to football through the Titusville Rockets and continued at Brown University and the University of Pennsylvania, where he received his law degree in 1892.

He served as the head coach for a total of eight university football teams, including 16 years at Georgia Tech and 3 years at the University of Pennsylvania. He coached Georgia Tech in the most one-sided football game ever played—with a final score of 222–0—and led them in a 33-game winning streak. Of the 271 games John Heisman coached, in only 68 of those games did the opponents finish the game with a win. He retired in 1927 and passed away in 1936.

John Heisman's influence on football is undeniable but the history of football itself began before John Heisman's birth. American football was started sometime in the mid-19th century and was a divergence from the game of rugby. College students in the late 19th century took the lead in turning the evolving game of football into an organized support. In 1920 the American Professional Football Association was formed and 2 years later became the National Football League. The game of football has continued to evolve from that time to today with the influence of various coaches, rule makers and organization heads.

John William Heisman's influence on the game of football helped to make the game what it is today. His inventions include the four-quarter game, the ''hike,'' the center snap and the forward pass. In addition, he created many innovative plays that led to some of the basic formations used in today's games.

John William Heisman was a nationally recognized collegiate coach and an influential innovator. In the time before and after his death, his accomplishments were recognized by many nationwide. John Heisman had several articles published in magazines such as ''American Liberty'' and was the football editor of the ''Sporting Goods Journal.'' He served as the director of the Downtown Athletic Club in Manhattan, and in 1935 helped to create the award that would later be renamed the ''Heisman Memorial Trophy.''

John Heisman's accomplishments and contributions to the sport of football are many in number. His ideas and coaching helped to create the game that has become so imbedded in the culture of our Nation. I ask my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back my time.

Mr. COURTNEY. We have no further speakers. Again, I salute Mr. THOMPSON for bringing this resolution forward, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 123.

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. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. 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.

INSTRUCTING MANAGERS IN THE IMPEACHMENT OF JUDGE KENT TO ADVISE THE SENATE THAT THE HOUSE DOES NOT DESIRE FURTHER TO URGE THE ARTICLES OF IMPEACHMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to send to the desk a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:.

H. RES. 661

Resolved, That the managers on the part of the House of Representatives in the impeachment proceedings now pending in the Senate against Samuel B. Kent, formerly judge of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, are instructed to appear before the Senate, sitting as a court of impeachment for those proceedings, and advise the Senate that, because Samuel B. Kent is no longer a civil officer of the United States, the House of Representatives does not desire further to urge the articles of impeachment hitherto filed in the Senate against Samuel B. Kent.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A CHILD IS MISSING ALERT AND RECOVERY CENTER ACT

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1933) to direct the Attorney General to make an annual grant to the A Child Is Missing Alert and Recovery Center to assist law enforcement agencies in the rapid recovery of missing children, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1933

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 ''A Child Is Missing Alert and Recovery Center Act''.

SEC. 2. DIRECTING THE ATTORNEY GENERAL TO MAKE ANNUAL GRANTS TO A CHILD IS MISSING ALERT AND RECOVERY CENTER TO ASSIST LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES IN RECOVERING MISSING CHILDREN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General, acting through the Administrator of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, shall annually make a grant to the A Child Is Missing Alert and Recovery Center.

(b) SPECIFIED USE OF FUNDS FOR RECOVERY ACTIVITIES, REGIONAL CENTERS, EDUCATION, AND INFORMATION SHARING.—A Child Is Missing Alert and Recovery Center shall use the funds made available under this Act—

(1) to operate and expand the A Child Is Missing Alert and Recovery Center to provide services to Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies to promote the quick recovery of a missing child in response to a request from such agencies for assistance by utilizing rapid alert telephone calls, text messaging, and satellite mapping technology;

(2) to maintain and expand technologies and techniques to ensure the highest level of performance of such services;

(3) to establish and maintain regional centers to provide both centralized and on-site training and to distribute information to Federal, State, and local law enforcement agency officials about how to best utilize the services provided by the A Child Is Missing Alert and Recovery Center;

(4) to share appropriate information with the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, the AMBER Alert Coordinator, the Silver Alert Coordinator, and appropriate Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies; and

(5) to assist the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, the AMBER Alert Coordinator, the Silver Alert Coordinator, and appropriate Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies with education programs.

SEC. 3. DEFINITION OF MISSING CHILD.

For purposes of this Act, the term ''missing child'' means an individual whose whereabouts are unknown to a Federal, State, or local law enforcement agency.

SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

For grants under section 2, there are authorized to be appropriated to the Attorney General $5,000,000 for each fiscal year from fiscal year 2010 through fiscal year 2015.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I ask unanimous consent that all Members

have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself so much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1933, the A Child is Missing Alert and Recovery Center Act helps address the terrifying experience of when a family member or friend ''goes missing.''

Under current law, there are programs such as AMBER Alert to help missing children who are abducted or victims of foul play. But these programs do not extend to situations where a child or elderly person becomes missing in other, more innocent ways.

H.R. 1933 fills this gap by authorizing money for annual grants to the A Child is Missing Alert and Recovery Center. This national nonprofit program provides assistance to local law enforcement throughout the country in all situations of missing persons, not only those involving criminal activity.

Mr. Speaker, the center helps when a small child fails to come home after school or a grandmother suffering from Alzheimer's disease walks out of her home in the middle of the night. When the terrifying event of a missing person is reported to the police, the responding police officer can call the center, which operates 365 days a year, 24 hours a day.

Based on information from the call, the center quickly prepares a recorded message that includes a description of the missing person, along with the location where the person was last seen. And within minutes, the center sends this recording to thousands of phones within a radius of the last known location.

This activity can save lives, as well as conserve critically needed enforcement resources that would otherwise be spent in extended searches for missing persons. The bill before us today will make a significant contribution to the protection of children and vulnerable adults throughout the United States.

I thank the sponsor of this bill, my good friend, RON KLEIN of Florida, for his leadership on this important legislative issue.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, every 40 seconds a child goes missing in this country, over 2,100 every day of each year. At least 800,000 children are reported missing each year, and another 500,000 go missing without ever being reported.

The AMBER Alert system is activated when there is evidence that a missing child has been abducted and the police have sufficient information about the abductor or the vehicle to warrant use of that system, the AMBER Alert system. But without evidence of an abduction, law enforcement cannot issue an AMBER Alert. This is where A Child is Missing steps in.

A Child is Missing assists police in the first crucial hours of searches for missing children, elderly and the disabled. The first 6 hours after an alert are the most crucial in finding someone who is missing.

To date, more than 12 million calls have been made to the A Child is Missing system, resulting in over 8,000 missing person cases nationwide. These efforts have led to the recovery of 530 missing persons since the inception of this wonderful program.

This technology is particularly useful in rural communities with small police forces assigned to patrol large geographic areas. These law enforcement agencies often lack the manpower to launch a full-scale search for a missing child. A Child is Missing compensates for this reduced manpower by notifying thousands of area residents within minutes that a child has gone missing in their community. The A Child is Missing system can launch 1,000 calls in 60 seconds to residences and businesses in the area where the child was last seen.

Law enforcement officials around the country have successfully used this system to quickly distribute valuable information about the child while launching full-scale searches in a matter of minutes. Over 2,000 of the Nation's law enforcement agencies currently use this alert system.

H.R. 1933, the A Child is Missing Alert and Recovery Center Act, expands the availability of a system that helps locate a child as soon as he or she goes missing, often before the AMBER Alert can even take effect.

The bill authorizes $5 million for fiscal years 2010 through 2015 for grants to increase the use of this alert system. This simple system can mean the difference between life and death for a child and give peace of mind to so many parents whose children go missing every day.

Children are the greatest natural resources that we have in this country, and this legislation deals with the health of our kids. There is nothing that scares a parent or even a child more than for a child to be missing and fearful of not ever being recovered.

As founder and cochair of the Victims' Rights Caucus, I would like to thank Mr. KLEIN for his leadership in this issue.

I urge all my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. I yield to the gentlelady from Florida, the ranking member on the Foreign Affairs Committee (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) as much time as she wishes to use.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me the time.

I congratulate our Florida colleague, Congressman RON KLEIN, for the foresight of proposing this legislation, and I hope that our colleagues will join us in adopting this.

I rise today in support of Mr. KLEIN's bill, H.R. 1933, A Child is Missing Alert and Recovery Center Act. God forbid that parents would be forced to suffer the horror of their child going missing or even worse, hear the news that their child has been abducted. As parents, that possibility is a fear that we have known since our children are born. And certainly we must do everything in our power to avoid tragedy.

When it does strike, we must be organized, we must be coordinated, and we must be ready to respond. This bill does precisely that. Grants distributed to Federal, State and local law enforcement agencies through this act will aid in the recovery of so many children who are reported missing each and every year. Let us make sure that every parent is secure in the knowledge that local and national law enforcement agencies are prepared to coordinate an effective response to any missing child.

As a brand new grandmother—just 4 days ago, our first grandchild, Morgan Elizabeth Lehtinen was born, I know that this is a problem and a shock to every parent and every new grandparent, the possibilities of the dangers out in the world.

□ 1615

But when we pass this bill, we will know that our law enforcement agencies are ready to coordinate with other State and local and Federal agencies to make sure that we have a rapid response and one that is coordinated.

So I thank my good friend from Florida, RON KLEIN, for its introduction. I thank the gentleman from Texas for the time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how many more speakers my colleague on the other side would present?

Mr. POE of Texas. I know of no other speakers, other than to close.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. With that being the case, Mr. Speaker, I will close when my friend, Judge POE closes.

And by the way, before I do that, I would like to extend my humble congratulations to the Congresswoman for the birth of her first grandchild. That's great.

Mr. POE of Texas. This legislation is important. As has been stated by the ranking member, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, whose granddaughter was born, happened to be born on her birthday, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN's birthday.

Most of us have kids. I have seven grandkids, and the worst thing that could ever happen was for one of those kids to disappear.

And we're judged, as a society, not by the way we treat the rich, the famous, the powerful, the all important. We're judged by the way we treat the innocent, and that includes kids and the elderly.

This legislation will help find those kids, the elderly, the disabled if they have the misfortune to disappear from home. And the amount of money being spent is almost nothing, considering how much money Congress has been spending lately, with $5 million. But that $5 million law enforcement can use to help find those kids.

So I would urge the adoption of this resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly agree with the comments of my good friend from Texas, Judge POE. And he knows from practical experience what it means to a family when their loved one goes missing and then there is a positive outcome. And he's also aware of those situations that do not end on a positive note.

I also have the same experience in life, but fortunately, it's not due to a personal experience. But I just can't imagine how traumatic it must be for a mother or a father to be waiting at the bus stop for their child to disembark, and then that child is not on that bus. I can imagine the horror of waking up one morning, and my dear grandmother, who is mentally declining, has apparently been able to open the door and exit. And these are things that none of us wish on anyone.

And this bill, H.R. 1933, will hopefully add to the positive results that we have as we look for our missing children and our missing adults and the elderly.

And so, Mr. Speaker, having emphasized that I fully support this bill, I will yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1933.

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. POE of Texas. 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.

KOREAN WAR VETERANS RECOGNITION ACT

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2632) to amend title 4, United States Code, to encourage the display of the flag of the United States on National Korean War Veterans Armistice Day.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2632

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 ''Korean War Veterans Recognition Act''.

SEC. 2. DISPLAY OF FLAG ON NATIONAL KOREAN WAR VETERANS ARMISTICE DAY.

Section 6(d) of title 4, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''National Korean War Veterans Armistice Day, July 27;'' after ''July 4;''.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2632, the Korean War Veterans Recognition Act, would amend the Flag Code to include Korean War Veterans Day among the times and occasions for display.

Section 6(d) of title IV, the United States Code, states that the flag should be displayed on all days, but singles out a number of days for special recognition. Among those days are the birthdays of President Washington, President Lincoln, Martin Luther King, Jr., and Armed Forces Day, Memorial Day, and Veterans Day, to name a few.

It is more than appropriate that we add to this list Korean War Veterans Day. Doing so will provide a fitting reminder for all of us to remember and to honor the men and women who served so honorably in the Korean war.

The Korean war has been referred to as America's ''forgotten war'' because it came on the heels of World War II and was later overshadowed by Vietnam, but although fighting between the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Republic of Korea lasted a mere 3 years, from June 1950 until July 1953, it was ferocious. At least 2.5 million people lost their lives.

The war brought the United States into battle with the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China. And with the Soviet Union having recently joined the United States in developing nuclear weapons, there was a very real concern that the war it might escalate into would be a nuclear conflict.

The Korean war cost more than 54,000 American lives in that 3-year period, almost as many as who died in the 16 years of the Vietnam war. In addition, more than 103,000 American soldiers were wounded in Korea.

It's more than fitting that this Nation remember and honor the service of our Korean war veterans, and this legislation will provide a poignant reminder of that service.

I especially want to commend my colleague, the gentleman from New York, the Honorable CHARLES RANGEL, for introducing this legislation. He is, himself, a veteran of the Korean conflict, having served in the Army from 1948 through 1952, and also the United States Civil War, which ended back in 1865. He served in that war as well.

And I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time. And I believe that my humor has gone over the heads of those who occupy the Chamber at this particular time.

Mr. POE of Texas. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I noticed that the gentleman from New York was a little concerned when he was informed that he served in the Civil War in 1865.

But be that as it may, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2632, the Korean War Veterans Recognition Act, amends the official Flag Code to add National Korean War Veterans Armistice Day, which is July 27, to the list of days on which the American flag should be displayed.

In 1950, the North Korean military, with the aid of the Chinese, crossed the 38th parallel and invaded South Korea. This act of Communist aggression was met by 22 countries who joined together to challenge one of the many threats that developed during the cold war challenge; a United Nations endeavor, but most of those troops were, of course, as always, from the United States.

Americans comprised the majority of that valiant force, and almost 2 million members of the U.S. military successfully drove back the North Korean forces in places such as Pork Chop Hill and the Pusan Perimeter. And during that war, 34,000 Americans never came home, 92,000 others were wounded.

Were it not for the immense bravery and sacrifice of the men and the women who served in Korea during those cold winters, even more of the world would have been denied prosperity and freedom behind the Iron Curtain.

In 1953, the Military Armistice Agreement halted the march of communism into South Korea. Today, as we once again confront a belligerent, nuclear-armed North Korea, once again backed by the Chinese, we owe it to the veterans of the Korean war and their families to honor their service by adding July 27, National Korean War Veterans Armistice Day, to the list of days in which the Flag Code encourages displaying the Stars and Stripes.

As a cosponsor of this resolution, I urge all my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 2632.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague and my mentor, Representative RANGEL, as much time as he may consume.

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

Mr. RANGEL. I want to thank Chairman CONYERS and Mr. SMITH for allowing this bill to come on the floor. I want to congratulate Chairman CONYERS and SAM JOHNSON, who served in the Korean war, for participating and making this become a reality, and ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, as well as DIANE WATSON and PETER KING.

In 1948, millions of young people throughout these United States joined the military. We, some of us were sent to Fort Dix in New Jersey, and from there we went to Fort Lewis, Washington, to join the Second Infantry Division, the only division, actually, that was trained all over the world in order to be the one combat-ready division.

Sometime in June of 1950, we were alerted that the North Koreans had invaded South Korea. Most of us didn't even know where Korea was, but we were prepared to fulfill our responsibility as infantry people.

□ 1630

The 24th and the 25th divisions were stationed in Japan, and they were immediately sent to South Korea. The truth was that the North Koreans had driven them to the tip of the peninsula to such an extent that, when we arrived in July, there was some question as to whether or not we could land; but we did in what they called the Pusan Perimeter. We fought from that perimeter to the 38th parallel. As most of you know, General MacArthur landed at Icheon, and we had completely surrounded the enemy as we knew it, and moved up far beyond North Korea until we reached the tip of that peninsula, which was the Yalu River, which separated South Korea and North Korea from China. It was then that the Chinese entered this war and completely surrounded us and the entire Eighth Army.

We lost so many, so many American lives. So many Americans were captured. So much pain was caused to so many families and to so many communities. Now there are only 2 million of these veterans who are left, and 1,000 of us die every day. Notwithstanding the fact that in my lifetime, for most of it, I've known nothing but wars and that this one is just referred to as the Forgotten War, it just appears to me that this is the most painful because so many veterans have never really received the accolades for the sacrifices that they have made. Their families have suffered so much.

So this is just a small way for America to be able to say that we don't know how many conflicts there will be for which we will have to call on our young people to defend our great Nation or the principles for which we stand, but I think this is the least that we can do to have our flag to commemorate this so-called armistice that took place on July 27 so that we will know that, in the hearts of all Americans, there were people who made these sacrifices and that America is thankful for it.

So, Mr. JOHNSON, I appreciate the fact that we have brought this to the floor. I do hope that the veterans who are left who fought in Korea and, more importantly, that their families and communities know that our Nation is saying thank you.

I rise today to speak on my bill, the Korean War Veterans Recognition Act. This bill is important not only to our nation's commitment to defending freedom across the world especially in these times of global conflict.

I would like to thank Chairman CONYERS and Ranking Member LAMAR SMITH of the Judiciary Committee for their work in getting this bill to the Floor today. I also want to thank the original cosponsors: Chairman CONYERS and SAM JOHNSON, who both served in the Korean War, and ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, DIANE WATSON, and PETER KING.

This straightforward bill honors the 6.8 million Americans who served during the Korean War period, and those who paid the ultimate sacrifice, by adding National Korean War Veterans Armistice Day, July 27th, to the list of dates on which our American flag should be especially displayed.

By recognizing the Armistice Day—the day on which the Korean War unofficially ended, ensuring South Korea's independence and democracy—this bill promotes an annual reminder of the sacrifices made by our military men and women during the war period, including the 54,246 U.S. deaths and more than 8,100 POW/MIAs in the three short years that the Korean War lasted.

Mr. POE of Texas. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN).

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I thank my friend, Judge POE, for yielding a couple of minutes to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to rise in absolute support of this bill. The Korean war has been called the Forgotten War. The Vietnam war is the war of forgotten veterans. I served in the Marine Corps. I actually had a commission in the Navy and, later on, in the Air Force. As one who believes in the Constitution as our Founding Fathers meant it when they wrote it, I know that national defense is the number one issue that this Congress should focus upon more so than anything else, and we ought to give—it is right to give; it is due to give—recognition to these brave men and women who were engaged in the conflict in Korea.

We signed an armistice with the Koreans, and technically, we're still at war there. We still have veterans who are missing in action from many wars. We still have veterans who are stationed all over this world in an effort to maintain freedom in America. So it's absolutely critical that we recognize our veterans, not only from the Korean war but from all wars, whether it's World War II, Korea, Vietnam, Desert Storm, Iraqi Freedom, or the war that's ongoing in Afghanistan.

I hope that America will pause and will thank the service men and women who have put on a uniform, who have given their time, their efforts, their limbs, their eyes, their lives to protect freedom in America.

So I congratulate the Members who have brought this very important legislation to the floor. I thank my friend Mr. RANGEL from New York for his service to the Nation. I thank all members of the military for serving this Nation. I very ardently support this.

I appreciate, Judge POE, your yielding me some time.

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

Mr. POE of Texas. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Korean war is an odd sort of name in that it was first never called a ''war.'' Back when men went to Korea, for some reason, somebody in the press decided to call it a ''conflict'' like it's a street fight or something, and because of that, I don't think that the Korean war veterans have received the recognition that they deserve.

This was a hard-fought, bloody, cold war where 34,000 Americans died and where 92,000 others were wounded. Because of history, those folks who served, and as my friend from Georgia has pointed out, we still have men and women in Korea who are protecting those borders between North and South Korea. Still, technically, those two countries are at war with each other because there was never a treaty; there was just an armistice.

We should give those people the recognition they rightfully deserve, because that was the first battle, the first war, where the free West met the Communist and was successful in defeating communism in Korea. We let people know we will fight wherever we need to go throughout the world to prevent communism from spreading. The men and women who served in Korea, who rightfully did that and who honorably did that, should be recognized.

I'm glad to see that we have finally built them a memorial on the Mall, the Korean War Veterans Memorial, a great tribute with the other memorials that we have, the World War II Memorial that we have and the Vietnam Memorial.

So this legislation is important. It's important that we, as Americans, remember our history and that we rise to a level where we understand that all of those veterans, that all of those men and women who served, deserve the rightful recognition for what they did for America when they were called to do so.

With that, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I would yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my dear colleagues, Chairman RANGEL and Judge POE out of Houston, Texas, and also my friend from Georgia, Dr. BROUN—or Bron. I call him ''Congressman,'' but we have a great relationship, and I enjoy his fellowship. I wish

to associate myself with the comments of all three of these gentlemen.

It's rather ironic that 56 years after the Korean War ended we are on the verge of, perhaps, another Korean war, and I don't think that the times could be more tense in South Korea than they are now. I had the opportunity to visit about 6 months ago, and the mood and the heavy feeling of impending war will remain heavily etched on my heart. I am hopeful that this administration can lead us and can lead the world out of this conflict.

This is just one of many, but I will tell you my personal experience as a young boy. I didn't get challenged too much, but whenever anyone did step to me, I would have to take defensive action. If I had my hands tied behind me, that would not be a fair fight, and if I had not been working out a little bit and if my muscles had not been in shape, I would not have been able to handle the conflict or deter it.

Mr. Speaker, I will report to you that I only had about 10 fights and lost only one, and I'll tell you that those were the things that helped me to ward off any future belligerence.

Certainly, in this country and in this world, we would be remiss as a Congress, as a legislative branch, if we did not prepare for the worst. With respect to our defense, it means that we have got to have a strong military and one that is well equipped to meet whatever the challenge may be. We cannot assume that there will not be another Cold War, because you could not assume, at the end of World War II, that the Chinese and the Russians would get together and gang up. I did not know that for sure, and then, boom, it happened.

Things are unexpected. It seems like, every 50 years, there is something big that happens, and we're at 56 years now. We simply cannot afford, as a Nation, to be caught without our defenses as tight as they can be. That means our firepower, our sea power, our power in outer space, our cyberspace, and our infantry. All of these aspects of our defense have to be up to par, so I am happy to serve on the Armed Services Committee where I can be a spokesperson and a proponent of making sure that this country remains strong.

I want to thank all of the veterans. My dad served in World War II, and today, he is 86 years old and is not doing too well, but I am proud of him serving his country, and I am proud of every other serviceman and -woman who has served this country. I look forward to a peaceful world; but if not, we have to do what we have to do.

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 Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2632.

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. POE of Texas. 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.

□ 1645

FRANK MELVILLE SUPPORTIVE HOUSING INVESTMENT ACT OF 2009

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1675) to amend section 811 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act to improve the program under such section for supportive housing for persons with disabilities.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1675

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; REFERENCES.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Frank Melville Supportive Housing Investment Act of 2009''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Except as otherwise expressly provided, wherever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, section 811 or any other provision of section 811, the reference shall be considered to be made to section 811 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 8013).

SEC. 2. TENANT-BASED RENTAL ASSISTANCE THROUGH CERTIFICATE FUND.

(a) TERMINATION OF MAINSTREAM TENANT-BASED RENTAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—Section 811 is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking the first subsection designation and all that follows through the end of subparagraph (B) of paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

''(b) AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary is authorized to provide assistance to private nonprofit organizations to expand the supply of supportive housing for persons with disabilities, which shall be provided as—

''(1) capital advances in accordance with subsection (d)(1); and

''(2) contracts for project rental assistance in accordance with subsection (d)(2).''; and

(B) by striking ''assistance under this paragraph'' and inserting ''Assistance under this subsection'';

(2) in subsection (d), by striking paragraph (4); and

(3) in subsection (l), by striking paragraph (1).

(b) RENEWAL THROUGH SECTION 8.—Section 811 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(p) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR SECTION 8 ASSISTANCE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated for tenant-based rental assistance under section 8(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)) for persons with disabilities in fiscal year 2010 the amount necessary to provide a number of incremental vouchers under such section that is equal to the number of vouchers provided in fiscal year 2009 under the tenant-based rental assistance program under subsection (d)(4) of this section (as in effect before the date of the enactment of the Frank Melville Supportive Housing Investment Act of 2009).

''(2) REQUIREMENTS UPON TURNOVER.—The Secretary shall develop and issue, to public housing agencies that receive voucher assistance made available under this subsection and to public housing agencies that received voucher assistance under section 8(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)) for non-elderly disabled families pursuant to appropriation Acts for fiscal years 1997 through 2002 or any other subsequent appropriations for incremental vouchers for non-elderly disabled families, guidance to ensure that, to the maximum extent possible, such vouchers continue to be provided upon turnover to qualified persons with disabilities or to qualified non-elderly disabled families, respectively.''.

SEC. 3. MODERNIZED CAPITAL ADVANCE PROGRAM.

(a) PROJECT RENTAL ASSISTANCE CONTRACTS.—Section 811 is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)(2)—

(A) by inserting ''(A) INITIAL PROJECT RENTAL ASSISTANCE CONTRACT.—'' after ''PROJECT RENTAL ASSISTANCE.—'';

(B) in the first sentence, by inserting after ''shall'' the following: ''comply with subsection (e)(2) and shall'';

(C) by striking ''annual contract amount'' each place such term appears and inserting ''amount provided under the contract for each year covered by the contract''; and

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

''(B) RENEWAL OF AND INCREASES IN CONTRACT AMOUNTS.—

''(i) EXPIRATION OF CONTRACT TERM.—Upon the expiration of each contract term, subject to the availability of amounts made available in appropriation Acts, the Secretary shall adjust the annual contract amount to provide for reasonable project costs, and any increases, including adequate reserves 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.

''(ii) EMERGENCY SITUATIONS.—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.''.

(2) in subsection (e)(2)—

(A) in the first sentence, by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', except that, in the case of the sponsor of a project assisted with any low-income housing tax credit pursuant to section 42 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 or with any tax-exempt housing bonds, the contract shall have an initial term of not less than 360 months and shall provide funding for a term of 60 months''; and

(B) by striking ''extend any expiring contract'' and insert ''upon expiration of a contract (or any renewed contract), renew such contract''.

(b) PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS.—Section 811 is amended—

(1) in subsection (e)—

(A) by striking the subsection heading and inserting the following: ''PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS'';

(B) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following new paragraph:

''(1) USE RESTRICTIONS.—

''(A) TERM.—Any project for which a capital advance is provided under subsection (d)(1) shall be operated for not less than 40 years as supportive housing for persons with disabilities, in accordance with the application for the project approved by the Secretary and shall, during such period, be made available for occupancy only by very low-income persons with disabilities.

''(B) CONVERSION.—If the owner of a project requests the use of the project for the direct

benefit of very low-income persons with disabilities and, pursuant to such request the Secretary determines that a project is no longer needed for use as supportive housing for persons with disabilities, the Secretary may approve the request and authorize the owner to convert the project to such use.''; and

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

''(3) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—No assistance received under this section (or any State or local government funds used to supplement such assistance) may be used to replace other State or local funds previously used, or designated for use, to assist persons with disabilities.

''(4) MULTIFAMILY PROJECTS.—

''(A) LIMITATION.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), of the total number of dwelling units in any multifamily housing project (including any condominium or cooperative housing project) containing any unit for which assistance is provided from a capital grant under subsection (d)(1) made after the date of the enactment of the Frank Melville Supportive Housing Investment Act of 2009, the aggregate number that are used for persons with disabilities, including supportive housing for persons with disabilities, or to which any occupancy preference for persons with disabilities applies, may not exceed 25 percent of such total.

''(B) EXCEPTION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply in the case of any project that is a group home or independent living facility.''; and

(2) in subsection (l), by striking paragraph (4).

(c) DELEGATED PROCESSING.—Subsection (g) of section 811 (42 U.S.C. 8013(g)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''SELECTION CRITERIA.—'' and inserting ''SELECTION CRITERIA AND PROCESSING.—(1) SELECTION CRITERIA.—'';

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), and (7) as subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), (D), (E), (G), and (H), respectively;

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) DELEGATED PROCESSING.—

''(A) In issuing a capital advance under subsection (d)(1) for any multifamily project (but not including any project that is a group home or independent living facility) for which financing for the purposes described in the last sentence of subsection (b) is provided by a combination of the capital advance 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) 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) 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) 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.''.

(d) LEVERAGING OTHER RESOURCES.—Paragraph (1) of section 811(g) (as so designated by subsection (c)(1) of this section) is amended by inserting after subparagraph (E) (as so redesignated by subsection (c)(2) of this section) the following new subparagraph:

''(F) the extent to which the per-unit cost of units to be assisted under this section will be supplemented with resources from other public and private sources;''.

(e) TENANT PROTECTIONS AND ELIGIBILITY FOR OCCUPANCY.—Section 811 is amended by striking subsection (i) and inserting the following new subsection:

''(i) ADMISSION AND OCCUPANCY.—

''(1) TENANT SELECTION.—

''(A) PROCEDURES.—An owner shall adopt written tenant selection procedures that are satisfactory to the Secretary as (i) consistent with the purpose of improving housing opportunities for very low-income persons with disabilities; and (ii) reasonably related to program eligibility and an applicant's ability to perform the obligations of the lease. Owners shall promptly notify in writing any rejected applicant of the grounds for any rejection.

''(B) REQUIREMENT FOR OCCUPANCY.—Occupancy in dwelling units provided assistance under this section shall be available only to persons with disabilities and households that include at least one person with a disability.

''(C) AVAILABILITY.—Except only as provided in subparagraph (D), occupancy in dwelling units in housing provided with assistance under this section shall be available to all persons with disabilities eligible for such occupancy without regard to the particular disability involved.

''(D) LIMITATION ON OCCUPANCY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the owner of housing developed under this section may, with the approval of the Secretary, limit occupancy within the housing to persons with disabilities who can benefit from the supportive services offered in connection with the housing.

''(2) TENANT PROTECTIONS.—

''(A) LEASE.—The lease between a tenant and an owner of housing assisted under this section shall be for not less than one year, and shall contain such terms and conditions as the Secretary shall determine to be appropriate.

''(B) TERMINATION OF TENANCY.—An owner may not terminate the tenancy or refuse to renew the lease of a tenant of a rental dwelling unit assisted under this section except—

''(i) for serious or repeated violation of the terms and conditions of the lease, for violation of applicable Federal, State, or local law, or for other good cause; and

''(ii) by providing the tenant, not less than 30 days before such termination or refusal to renew, with written notice specifying the grounds for such action.

''(C) VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION IN SERVICES.—A supportive service plan for housing assisted under this section shall permit each resident to take responsibility for choosing and acquiring their own services, to receive any supportive services made available directly or indirectly by the owner of such housing, or to not receive any supportive services.''.

(f) DEVELOPMENT COST LIMITATIONS.—Subsection (h) of section 811 is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking the paragraph heading and inserting ''GROUP HOMES'';

(B) in the first sentence, by striking ''various types and sizes'' and inserting ''group homes'';

(C) by striking subparagraph (E); and

(D) by redesignating subparagraphs (F) and (G) as subparagraphs (E) and (F), respectively;

(2) in paragraph (3), by inserting ''established pursuant to paragraph (1)'' after ''cost limitation''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(6) APPLICABILITY OF HOME PROGRAM COST LIMITATIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The provisions of section 212(e) of this Act and the cost limits established by the Secretary pursuant to such section with respect to the amount of funds under subtitle A of title II of this Act that may be invested on a per unit basis, shall apply to supportive housing assisted with a capital advance under subsection (d)(1) and the amount of funds under such subsection that may be invested on a per unit basis.

''(B) WAIVERS.—The Secretary shall provide for waiver of the cost limits applicable pursuant to subparagraph (A)—

''(i) in the cases in which the cost limits established pursuant to section 212(e) of this Act may be waived; and

''(ii) to provide for—

''(I) the cost of special design features to make the housing accessible to persons with disabilities;

''(II) the cost of special design features necessary to make individual dwelling units meet the special needs of persons with disabilities; and

''(III) the cost of providing the housing in a location that is accessible to public transportation and community organizations that provide supportive services to persons with disabilities.''.

(g) REPEAL OF AUTHORITY TO WAIVE SIZE LIMITATIONS.—Subsection (k) of section 811 is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking the second sentence; and

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking ''(or such higher number of persons'' and all that follows through ''subsection (h)(6))''.

(h) MINIMUM ALLOCATION FOR MULTIFAMILY PROJECTS.—Subsection (l) of section 811, as amended by the preceding provisions of this Act, is further amended by inserting before paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

''(1) MINIMUM ALLOCATION FOR MULTIFAMILY PROJECTS.—The Secretary shall establish a minimum percentage of the amount made available for each fiscal year for capital advances under subsection (d)(1) that shall be used for multifamily projects subject to subsection (e)(4).''.

SEC. 4. PROJECT RENTAL ASSISTANCE COMPETITIVE DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.

Section 811, as amended by the preceding provisions of this Act, is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (k) through (n) as subsections (l) through (o), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (j) the following new subsection:

''(k) PROJECT RENTAL ASSISTANCE-ONLY COMPETITIVE DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.—

''(1) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary shall carry out a demonstration program under this subsection to expand the supply of supportive

housing for non-elderly adults with disabilities, under which the Secretary shall make funds available for project rental assistance pursuant to paragraph (2) for eligible projects under paragraph (3). The Secretary shall provide for State housing finance agencies and other appropriate entities to apply to the Secretary for such project rental assistance funds, which shall be made available by such agencies and entities for dwelling units in eligible projects based upon criteria established by the Secretary for the demonstration program under this subsection. The Secretary may not require any State housing finance agency or other entity applying for project rental assistance funds under the demonstration program to identify in such application the eligible projects for which such funds will be used, and shall allow such agencies and applicants to subsequently identify such eligible projects pursuant to the making of commitments described in paragraph (3)(B).

''(2) PROJECT RENTAL ASSISTANCE.—

''(A) CONTRACT TERMS.—Project rental assistance under the demonstration program under this subsection shall be provided—

''(i) in accordance with subsection (d)(2); and

''(ii) under a contract having an initial term of not less than 180 months that provides funding for a term 60 months, which funding shall be renewed upon expiration, subject to the availability of sufficient amounts in appropriation Acts.

''(B) LIMITATION ON UNITS ASSISTED.—Of the total number of dwelling units in any multifamily housing project containing any unit for which project rental assistance under the demonstration program under this subsection is provided, the aggregate number that are provided such project rental assistance, that are used for supportive housing for persons with disabilities, or to which any occupancy preference for persons with disabilities applies, may not exceed 25 percent of such total.

''(C) PROHIBITION OF CAPITAL ADVANCES.—The Secretary may not provide a capital advance under subsection (d)(1) for any project for which assistance is provided under the demonstration program.

''(D) ELIGIBLE POPULATION.—Project rental assistance under the demonstration program under this subsection may be provided only for dwelling units for extremely low-income persons with disabilities and extremely low-income households that include at least one person with a disability.

''(3) ELIGIBLE PROJECTS.—An eligible project under this paragraph is a new or existing multifamily housing project for which—

''(A) the development costs are paid with resources from other public or private sources; and

''(B) a commitment has been made—

''(i) by the applicable State agency responsible for allocation of low-income housing tax credits under section 42 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, for an allocation of such credits;

''(ii) by the applicable participating jurisdiction that receives assistance under the HOME Investment Partnership Act, for assistance from such jurisdiction; or

''(iii) by any Federal agency or any State or local government, for funding for the project from funds from any other sources.

''(4) STATE AGENCY INVOLVEMENT.—Assistance under the demonstration may be provided only for projects for which the applicable State agency responsible for health and human services programs, and the applicable State agency designated to administer or supervise the administration of the State plan for medical assistance under title XIX of the Social Security Act, have entered into such agreements as the Secretary considers appropriate—

''(A) to identify the target populations to be served by the project;

''(B) to set forth methods for outreach and referral; and

''(C) to make available appropriate services for tenants of the project.

''(5) USE REQUIREMENTS.—In the case of any project for which project rental assistance is provided under the demonstration program under this subsection, the dwelling units assisted pursuant to paragraph (2) shall be operated for not less than 30 years as supportive housing for persons with disabilities, in accordance with the application for the project approved by the Secretary, and such dwelling units shall, during such period, be made available for occupancy only by persons and households described in paragraph (2)(D).

''(6) REPORT.—Upon the expiration of the 5-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of the Frank Melville Supportive Housing Investment Act of 2009, the Secretary shall submit to the Congress a report describing the demonstration program under this subsection, analyzing the effectiveness of the program, including the effectiveness of the program compared to the program for capital advances in accordance with subsection (d)(1) (as in effect pursuant to the amendments made by such Act), and making recommendations regarding future models for assistance under this section based upon the experiences under the program.''.

SEC. 5. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

Section 811 is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking ''provides'' and inserting ''makes available''; and

(ii) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

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

''(3) promotes and facilitates community integration for people with significant and long-term disabilities.'';

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''special'' and inserting ''housing and community-based services''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

''(A) make available voluntary supportive services that address the individual needs of persons with disabilities occupying such housing;''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking the comma and inserting a semicolon;

(3) in subsection (d)(1), by striking ''provided under'' and all that follows through ''shall bear'' and inserting ''provided pursuant to subsection (b)(1) shall bear'';

(4) in subsection (f)—

(A) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''receive'' and inserting ''be offered'';

(ii) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

''(C) evidence of the applicant's experience in—

''(i) providing such supportive services; or

''(ii) creating and managing structured partnerships with service providers for the delivery of appropriate community-based services;'';

(iii) in subparagraph (D), by striking ''such persons'' and all that follows through ''provision of such services'' and inserting ''tenants''; and

(iv) in subparagraph (E), by inserting ''other Federal, and'' before ''State''; and

(B) in paragraph (4), by striking ''special'' and inserting ''housing and community-based services'';

(5) in subsection (g), in paragraph (1) (as so redesignated by section 3(c)(1) of this Act)—

(A) in subparagraph (D) (as so redesignated by section 3(c)(2) of this Act), by striking ''the necessary supportive services will be provided'' and inserting ''appropriate supportive services will be made available''; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (E) (as so redesignated by section 3(c)(2) of this Act) and inserting the following:

''(E) the extent to which the location and design of the proposed project will facilitate the provision of community-based supportive services and address other basic needs of persons with disabilities, including access to appropriate and accessible transportation, access to community services agencies, public facilities, and shopping;'';

(6) in subsection (j)—

(A) by striking paragraph (4); and

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

(7) in subsection (l) (as so redesignated by section 4(1) of this Act)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting before the period at the end of the first sentence the following: '', which provides a separate bedroom for each tenant of the residence'';

(B) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

''(2)(A) The term 'person with disabilities' means a person who is 18 years of age or older and less than 62 years of age, who—

''(i) has a disability as defined in section 223 of the Social Security Act;

''(ii) is determined, pursuant to regulations issued by the Secretary, to have a physical, mental, or emotional impairment which—

''(I) is expected to be of long-continued and indefinite duration;

''(II) substantially impedes his or her ability to live independently; and

''(III) is of such a nature that such ability could be improved by more suitable housing conditions; or

''(iii) has a developmental disability as defined in section 102 of the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act of 2000.

''(B) Such term shall not exclude persons who have the disease of acquired immunodeficiency syndrome or any conditions arising from the etiologic agent for acquired immunodeficiency syndrome. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no individual shall be considered a person with disabilities, for purposes of eligibility for low-income housing under this title, solely on the basis of any drug or alcohol dependence. The Secretary shall consult with other appropriate Federal agencies to implement the preceding sentence.

''(C) The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to prevent abuses in determining, under the definitions contained in this paragraph, the eligibility of families and persons for admission to and occupancy of housing assisted under this section. Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this paragraph, the term 'person with disabilities' includes two or more persons with disabilities living together, one or more such persons living with another person who is determined (under regulations prescribed by the Secretary) to be important to their care or well-being, and the surviving member or members of any household described in subparagraph (A) who were living, in a unit assisted under this section, with the deceased member of the household at the time of his or her death.'';

(C) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following new paragraph:

''(3) The term 'supportive housing for persons with disabilities' means dwelling units that—

''(A) are designed to meet the permanent housing needs of very low-income persons with disabilities; and

''(B) are located in housing that make available supportive services that address the individual health, mental health, or other needs of such persons.'';

(D) in paragraph (5), by striking ''a project for''; and

(E) in paragraph (6)—

(i) by inserting after and below subparagraph (D) the matter to be inserted by the amendment made by section 841 of the American Homeownership and Economic Opportunity Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–569; 114 Stat. 3022); and

(ii) in the matter inserted by the amendment made by clause (i) of this subparagraph, by striking ''wholly owned and''; and

(8) in subsection (m) (as so redesignated by section 4(1) of this Act)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking ''subsection (c)(1)'' and inserting ''subsection (d)(1)''; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking ''subsection (c)(2)'' and inserting ''subsection (d)(2)''.

SEC. 6. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Subsection (n) of section 811 (as so redesignated by section 4(1) of this Act) is amended to read as follows:

''(n) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated for each of fiscal years 2010 through 2014 the following amounts:

''(1) CAPITAL ADVANCE/PRAC PROGRAM.—For providing assistance pursuant to subsection (b), such sums as may be necessary.

''(2) DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.—For carrying out the demonstration program under subsection (k), such sums as may be necessary to provide 2,500 incremental dwelling units under such program in each of fiscal years 2010 and 2011 and 5,000 incremental dwelling units under such program in each of fiscal years 2012, 2013, and 2014.''.

SEC. 7. NEW REGULATIONS AND PROGRAM GUIDANCE.

Not later than the expiration of the 180-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall issue new regulations and guidance for the program under section 811 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 8013) for supportive housing for persons with disabilities to carry out such program in accordance with the amendments made by this Act.

SEC. 8. GAO STUDY.

The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study of the supportive housing for persons with disabilities program under section 811 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 8013) to determine the adequacy and effectiveness of such program in assisting households of persons with disabilities. Such study shall determine—

(1) the total number of households assisted under such program;

(2) the extent to which households assisted under other programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development that provide rental assistance or rental housing would be eligible to receive assistance under such section 811 program; and

(3) the extent to which households described in paragraph (2) who are eligible for, but not receiving, assistance under such section 811 program are receiving supportive services from, or assisted by, the Department of Housing and Urban Development other than through the section 811 program (including under the Resident Opportunity and Self-Sufficiency program) or from other sources.

Upon the completion of the study required under this section, the Comptroller General shall submit a report to the Congress setting forth the findings and conclusions of the study.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. POSEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRAYSON. 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

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

I rise to bring H.R. 1675, the Frank Melville Supportive Housing Investment Act of 2009, up for consideration.

I am happy to support H.R. 1675 which would reauthorize and reform section 811 of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. In doing so, this bill will allow for Federal funds to be used to leverage additional funding to build more housing units for low-income, disabled individuals.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) and I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to control that time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Representative GRAYSON for his graciousness in allowing me to control the time on this bill.

As he mentioned, this bill is the Frank Melville Supportive Housing Investment Act of 2009. This bill is a reauthorization and improvement of our Nation's existing section 811 supportive housing program. This House passed a nearly identical bill last year. It unfortunately didn't get past the United States Senate. So we reintroduced it and hope to see it through the full extent of the process this year.

Before I talk a little bit about the underlying bill and the importance of the issue which it addresses, let me thank a few people. First, Chairman FRANK and Subcommittee Chairwoman WATERS have been instrumental over the last 7 years in helping us bring this very important bill to the floor, as well as Ranking Member CAPITO on the Republican side. But really the largest thanks is to my cosponsor in this legislation, Representative BIGGERT of Illinois. She has, for the full extent of her career, been a supporter of supportive housing, which I will describe as our Nation's most important housing program for individuals with physical and mental disabilities. I'm really honored to have been able to cosponsor this legislation with Representative BIGGERT and am very pleased that it's back before the House today.

Mr. Speaker, what is the 811 program? The 811 program is this Nation's supportive housing program that allows for Federal funds to be used to build supportive housing for individuals with physical and mental disabilities. It is a program which has meant a great deal to an unfortunately limited number of individuals that have benefited from it.

What is supportive housing? Supportive housing, very simply, is housing for individuals that have certain disabilities that allows them to live independently on their own leading full, productive lives in the communities with a small amount of community support around them. A unit of supportive housing, either on site or in the community, will have connected to it the job skills, the social work, the medication-adherence individuals and support services that are necessary for people that have complex physical or complex mental illness to be able to live on their own. These people can live in the community; they just need a little bit of help to do it.

The measure of this government, the measure of this Nation is how we treat those amongst us who, through no fault of their own, have been born with a certain illness—whether it be mental or physical—that doesn't give them the access to the apparatus of opportunity the rest of us have. Supportive housing, which gives that fundamental life building block—a roof over your head, a bed to sleep in at night—to those individuals is one of the most important things that we can do as a compassionate Nation.

The problem is that over the course of the last 5 to 10 years, the 811 program just has not been working. HUD tells us that there are 1.3 million individuals with disabilities in this country who are living in substandard housing. The 811 program, over the last several years, has only built about a thousand new units despite all of the resources that it has. And it is taking right now upwards of 6 years for a supportive housing project funded with 811 dollars to move from the application stage to the completion stage. This is unacceptable. Representative BIGGERT has been a great spokesperson for this for years, and the culmination of her work and the advocacy community's work is this legislation.

This bill fixes the 811 program as well as reauthorizes it. It does this in a number of ways. First, it takes all of the vouchers that have traditionally been used to fund individuals who are looking for supportive housing, it takes those vouchers, which have been very inefficiently administered by the

811 program, and moves them to the broader section 8 program. The section 8 program is much better equipped to track these vouchers and make sure they are actually being used by people with disabilities. That has been a big problem through that program within the section 811 program.

That money that is now freed up by moving those vouchers over into the section 8 program is now going to be used to build new units. That's really what we need to do here. We need to build more capacity in the system—1.3 million living in inappropriate living; we need more of it for them.

It also will use that money in more creative ways. Instead of just building a full apartment complex with supportive housing in it, it's now going to work with developers who might have affordable housing projects currently underway to have them build in to that complex two or three or four or five units of supportive housing to allow for more scattered site housing throughout the community leveraging existing affordable housing projects to build in scattered site supportive housing projects.

And lastly, it cuts a lot of the red tape and bureaucracy that has restrained applications from moving forward, chiefly by allowing State affordable housing agencies to do a lot of the bureaucratic work that right now is being performed by Housing and Urban Development here in Washington, D.C. We think that through the passage of this Act, we can triple the number of supportive housing units that are built across the country with this 811 program. And I think by doing so, we will do justice by the individual whose name is on this Act.

Mr. Speaker, this Act is called the Frank Melville Supportive Housing Investment Act. Frank Melville was a constituent of mine. He and his widowed wife, Ellen, started the Melville Charitable Trust which funds much of the affordable housing and supportive housing advocacy work in the Northeast and throughout this country. Frank Melville is no longer with us, but this bill—which we hope to pass today and bring to the Senate for its consideration—does justice to his legacy.

I commend this bill to the House for passage. I think it is going to do so much to live up to the initial promise of this Nation's commitment to individuals with physical and mental disabilities.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately Congresswoman BIGGERT is unable to be here today, but I would like to take this opportunity to recognize her work on this legislation.

As an original cosponsor, I know she has worked hard to ensure that the section 811 program continues to be an effective solution to the housing needs of very low-income persons with disabilities.

There are nearly 4 million non-elderly, disabled adults in the United States that are in need of housing assistance. The section 811 program is the only Federal program that allows persons with disabilities to live independently in the community by increasing the supply of affordable rental housing with the availability of supportive services.

H.R. 1675 restructures the section 811 program in a way that provides for a continued creation of permanent supportive housing and provides rental assistance that would make housing affordable for very low-income individuals with disabilities.

This bill will improve the section 811 disabled housing program by streamlining and simplifying the development of HUD section 811 properties and makes changes to the program to encourage integration and mixed-use developments, such as low-income housing tax credits and HOME program funds. This legislation is identical to H.R. 5772, which passed the House during the 110th Congress.

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

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, just briefly to close. In Connecticut during the course of my work in the State legislature, a lot of us would occasionally don a button that said ''keep the promise.'' That was a reminder to us that when we deinstitutionalized those with mental illness, that we had a promise to them to make sure that they had humane and responsible housing in the community. This bill I think does just that. It helps us keep that promise to those people living with mental and physical disability that we are going to find them appropriate and supportive housing in the community.

I thank Representative POSEY for his support and Representative BIGGERT for her advocacy.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1675.

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. POSEY. 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.

NEW FRONTIER CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL ACT

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2245) to authorize the President, in conjunction with the 40th anniversary of the historic and first lunar landing by humans in 1969, to award gold medals on behalf of the United States Congress to Neil A. Armstrong, the first human to walk on the moon; Edwin E. ''Buzz'' Aldrin, Jr., the pilot of the lunar module and second person to walk on the moon; Michael Collins, the pilot of their Apollo 11 mission's command module; and, the first American to orbit the Earth, John Herschel Glenn, Jr.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2245

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 ''New Frontier Congressional Gold Medal Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) as spacecraft commander for Apollo 11, the first manned lunar landing mission, Neil A. Armstrong gained the distinction of being the first man to land a craft on the moon and first to step on its surface on July 21, 1969;

(2) by conquering the moon at great personal risk to safety, Neil Armstrong advanced America scientifically and technologically, paving the way for future missions to other regions in space;

(3) Edwin E. ''Buzz'' Aldrin, Jr., joined Armstrong in piloting the lunar module, Eagle, to the surface of the moon, and became the second person to walk upon its surface;

(4) Michael Collins piloted the command module, Columbia, in lunar orbit and helped his fellow Apollo 11 astronauts complete their mission on the moon;

(5) John Herschel Glenn, Jr., helped pave the way for the first lunar landing when on February 20, 1962, he became the first American to orbit the Earth; and

(6) John Glenn's actions, like Armstrong's, Aldrin's and Collins's, continue to greatly inspire the people of the United States.

SEC. 3. CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL.

(a) PRESENTATION AUTHORIZED.—The President is authorized to present, on behalf of the Congress, to Neil A. Armstrong, Edwin E. ''Buzz'' Aldrin, Jr., Michael Collins, and John Herschel Glenn, Jr., each a gold medal of appropriate design, in recognition of their significant contributions to society.

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

SEC. 4. DUPLICATE MEDALS.

The Secretary of the Treasury may strike and sell duplicates in bronze of the gold medal struck pursuant to section 3 under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, at a price sufficient to cover the cost thereof, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses, and the cost of the gold medals.

SEC. 5. NATIONAL MEDALS.

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

SEC. 6. AUTHORITY TO USE FUND AMOUNTS; PROCEEDS OF SALE.

(a) AUTHORITY TO USE FUND AMOUNTS.—There is authorized to be charged against the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund, such amounts as may be necessary to pay for the costs of the medals struck pursuant to this Act.

(b) PROCEEDS OF SALE.—Amounts received from the sale of duplicate bronze medals authorized under section 4 shall be deposited

into the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. POSEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRAYSON. 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

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

Today we mark and celebrate the 40th anniversary of the Apollo 11 landing on the Moon on July 20, 1969. On that date, an 11-year-old boy stayed in a hotel room in San Juan, Puerto Rico, all day long—while his parents went to St. Thomas with his sister—and watched in awe to see mankind take this enormous step forward. That 11-year-old boy was me. And if somebody had said to me at the time, One day you will be standing in Congress and celebrating this day, marking this day, I would have said what every other 11-year-old boy would say, Oh, come on. That's ridiculous.

But here we are celebrating this day, marking this day explaining what it means to all of us in conveying a Congressional Gold Medal to Neil Armstrong, Buzz Aldrin, Michael Collins, and John Glenn, the first American—and the third human being—to orbit the Earth. Certainly this was the greatest technological achievement of any time, anywhere on this planet by human beings.

But for many of us, it was more than that. For many of us it was the most important moment of our lives.

Think about it. What would you choose as the most important moment of your life? For some of us it would be the fall of the Berlin Wall; for others, it might be the election of Nelson Mandela to lead South Africa and end apartheid in that country; and for sure for others it would mean the election of Barack Obama as the first black President of the United States.

But for many of us, it would mean that time, 40 years ago today, when men landed on the Moon and for the first time, and the only time, in our history visited our celestial neighbor. That's exciting, and it's good to look back on that time and to ask ourselves what led to that moment.

Everybody attributes that moment to President Kennedy, the leader of the new frontier. President Kennedy used these words to spur us to take this action. He said as follows: ''We choose to go to the Moon in this decade and do other things, not because they are easy, but because they are hard, because that goal will serve to organize and measure the best of our energies and skills, because that challenge is one that we are willing to accept, one that we are unwilling to postpone, and one which we intend to win.

''Many years ago, the great British Explorer George Mallory, who was to die on Mount Everest, was asked why did he want to climb it.

□ 1700

''He said, 'Because it is there.' Well, space is there,'' Kennedy told us, ''and we're going to climb it, and the Moon and the planets are there, and new hopes for knowledge and peace are there.

''And, therefore, as we set sail,'' Kennedy said, ''we ask God's blessing on the most hazardous and dangerous and greatest adventure on which man has ever embarked.''

That's what President Kennedy said, that this was the greatest adventure on which man has ever embarked, and he was right. These astronauts, these brave three, they crossed dead space for almost a quarter of 1 million miles. They landed with less than 25 seconds of fuel remaining when they finally reached the Moon, and when they reached that Moon, they were only there for 21½ hours. Their moonwalk was only 2 hours and 37 minutes. They brought back a mere 47 pounds of Moon rock, but they inspired everyone on this planet. One-fifth of all of this planet was watching at that moment on TV. One out of every five human beings. That's pretty good ratings, Mr. Speaker.

And when the landing occurred, what we heard was the following: ''The Eagle has landed.'' The eagle meaning the American eagle, because this was an assertion of our superiority as a Nation, our fortitude, our determination, our discipline, and our resourcefulness. That's what led us across that deep space in only 8 years from the first time when President Kennedy set forth this goal to the time that we actually landed on the Moon. ''The Eagle has landed.'' The American eagle has landed.

But then during the moonwalk, we heard another theme. When Mr. Armstrong first put his foot down on the Moon, when Neil Armstrong put his foot down on the Moon he said the following: ''One small step for man, one giant leap for mankind.'' Not just Americans, but all mankind.

And when these brave explorers left behind their inscription, the inscription said something very important: ''We came in peace, for all mankind.''

And when Buzz Aldrin was returning, the day before the flight actually landed back on the Earth, he said the following: ''This stands as a symbol of the insatiable curiosity of all mankind to explore the unknown.''

So on that day 40 years ago we learned a lot about ourselves. We learned a lot about what kind of people human beings really are. The first thing we learned is that in our heart we are explorers. We have that spark to see what's on the other side of that hill and then go and find it, and that spark is what led us 50,000 years ago to cross as far as Australia all the way from Africa. And 15,000 years ago one of my ancestors went as far as eastern Siberia in the midst of the Ice Age. And now, today, we see it's possible to explore this whole planet, and that just makes us want to explore other areas as well.

I have visited 175 countries myself. I have that urge to see, to explore, to look beyond the next hill, and it's what makes us human beings. Wolves howl at the Moon; human beings go there.

And we've also learned that these challenges that we pose for ourselves, these goals that we have for ourselves, we reap rewards from just seeking those goals, from pursuing those goals. In this case, NASA developed integrated circuits which led to the modern computer age. They developed computer-directed machining, which is used throughout manufacturing today, including in computers. And they developed fuel cells, which could very well be the key to our energy future. And all of that was done through the Apollo program for less than $150 billion in today's money, which is actually less than, in many cases, the costs of the war in Iraq for 1 year.

We've also learned something else important about it. When we visited the Moon, we looked back on the Earth, and we have in that day 40 years ago the roots of the environmental movement. Earth Day was first celebrated barely 9 months later on April 22, 1970, because when we went to the Moon and we looked back on the Earth, we saw ourselves. We recognized how fragile the Earth really is.

And Joni Mitchell best captured that in a song that she sang, these words from her song, ''Refuge of the Roads.'' She wrote:

''In a highway service station, over the month of June was a photograph of the Earth, taken coming back from the Moon.

''And you couldn't see the city, on that marbled bowling ball, or a forest, or a highway, or me here least of all.''

And so we recognize in that moment, when we looked at the entire Earth, the entire planet, we didn't see individuals, we saw all of us, and it created a newfound respect for the environment.

But beyond that, we reached the realization that we're only beginning to appreciate right now 40 years later, and that realization is this. We are one planet; we are one people. This is not a planet of blacks versus whites; we are one. This is not a planet of men versus women; we are one. This is not a planet of the young versus the old; we are one. We are one species, one set of human beings, one people, proud of our accomplishments, this above all, to visit the Moon.

And when we return to the Moon, as we're scheduled to do 10 years from now, I hope that we'll say not just,

''One small step for man, one giant leap for mankind,'' but I hope we'll say, ''Today the Moon, tomorrow the stars.''

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend Representative GRAYSON and the nearly 300 cosponsors of H.R. 2245, the New Frontier Congressional Gold Medal Act. As we know, this legislation authorizes the President, on behalf of Congress, to issue gold medals to Neil Armstrong, Edwin ''Buzz'' Aldrin, Michael Collins and John Glenn in recognition of their accomplishments, and pave the way for future missions.

As we celebrate the 40th anniversary of the Moon landing, we recognize President Kennedy's vision to support the great explorers of our lifetime, like the Christopher Columbuses, the Magellans and the Marco Polos before them. President Kennedy proved to the world that the free enterprise system of the United States of America would outperform the socialist Soviet Union in the international challenge of landing a man on the Moon and returning him safely to Earth.

One of the highlights of my life was the opportunity to work on the Apollo program as a young man when McDonnell Douglas was the contractor for the third stage. What a privilege it was to work alongside the thousands of men and women who helped make that historic achievement possible.

And you know, from a personal perspective I will always cherish this little medallion that they gave each member of the launch team, the metal part of which was carried to the Moon and back by the Apollo 11 astronauts.

You know, it's one of those points in time where everyone old enough to be aware of their surroundings knows where they were when man took that historic first step. It was before, as Congressman GRAYSON said, the largest viewing audience in history. I was holding up my 3-month-old daughter in front of the TV so that she might some day be the last person living to have witnessed that historic thing. Just what a marvelous event it was for all.

Let us remember also that their legacy continues in today's exemplary space shuttle workforce, those who safely and efficiently worked to ensure the completion of the shuttle's remaining flight manifest. As we hear many times, America's space program is the only thing for which the United States is undeniably, unequivocally, and universally respected for around this globe.

We sometimes take for granted the thousands of technological spinoffs we enjoy from space exploration, but let us take a moment to recognize the explorers of our lifetime and appreciate how all of us have been inspired by their pursuits and benefited from America's advances in space.

Hopefully we will continue to maintain the leading edge in space under the leadership of President Obama.

I yield back my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to note that what the accomplishment was here was to make America number one in space exploration, and I look forward to the time when we are number one in health care, when we are number one in education, when we are number one in meeting our human needs and making a 21st-century workforce.

The thing that inspired people from President Kennedy's words was the desire to be number one, and that's something that we can and will accomplish, not only in this particular part of human endeavor but across the board.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to support H.R. 2245, the ''New Frontier Congressional Gold Medal Act'', which authorizes the President to award Congressional Gold Medals to Neil A. Armstrong, Buzz Aldrin, Michael Collins, and John Herschel Glenn, Jr., who took great risks to lead our nation and society to new frontiers in outer space.

Historic moments in space exploration, such as the 40th anniversary of the first lunar landing by humans that we are celebrating this week, and the first orbiting of the Earth by an American, inspired a generation of young people to devote their careers and lives to the scientific and human exploration of outer space and created a multiplier effect that has benefited American society, including our educational system, our economy, and our national security.

The Apollo 11 mission of Neil Armstrong, Buzz Aldrin and Michael Collins and the pathfinding Mercury mission of John Glenn continue to spark the excitement and anticipation of what is possible for our nation as explorers of outer space.

Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Gold Medal is a fitting recognition of the unique and lasting imprint that these gentlemen have made on society, and I am pleased that so many of my colleagues in Congress have joined together in their support.

I thank the gentleman from Florida, Mr. GRAYSON, for his leadership in introducing this bill.

Ms. GIFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, today Congress is considering legislation to honor the Astronauts of Apollo 11 and Mercury Astronaut John Glenn with the Congressional Gold Medal, and as a proud cosponsor, I rise to urge support of this bill to recognize the trailblazing accomplishments of these brave American heroes.

Their courage and the success of their missions have become symbols of what we as Americans can accomplish when we come together and put all of our energy and hard work into reaching a goal in which we all believe.

The launch of Sputnik in 1957 initiated the Space Race of the 1960s between the United States and the Soviet Union. Just 12 years later, this Space Race culminated with Apollo 11's historic touchdown on the Moon's Sea of Tranquility in July of 1969.

Even though NASA and the goal of landing men on the Moon were in some sense directly inspired by Cold War rivalries, the Apollo 11 lunar landings and John Glenn's orbital flight became a means of uniting all of us here on Earth in a collective adventure of humanity.

Moreover, the lessons learned and the technology developed for John Glenn's orbital flight and the flight of Apollo 11 to the Moon spawned countless advances which have directly contributed to a better quality of life here on Earth.

In the decades since, many important technologies can be traced back to our space program. For even though the goal landing humans on the Moon had been attained, NASA went on to undertake world-leading research and development initiatives in Earth and space science, aeronautics, and human space flight.

Yet, ultimately it comes down to people—hard-working, dedicated men and women who made it all possible.

That is why I am pleased to join my colleagues in support of legislation to bestow one of the nations highest honors, the Congressional Gold Medal, to Neil Armstrong, Buzz Aldrin, Michael Collins, and John Glenn.

In closing, I want to commend Representative GRAYSON for introducing this bill, and I urge Members to pass it.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2245.

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. POSEY. 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.

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 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1832

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. HALVORSON) at 6 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. FLAKE. Madam 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 my resolution is as follows:

Whereas, The Hill reported that a prominent lobbying firm, founded by Mr. Paul Magliocchetti and the subject of a ''federal investigation into potentially corrupt political contributions,'' has given $3.4 million in political donations to no less than 284 members of Congress.

Whereas, the New York Times noted that Mr. Magliocchetti ''set up shop at the busy intersection between political fund-raising and taxpayer spending, directing tens of millions of dollars in contributions to lawmakers while steering hundreds of millions of dollars in earmarks contracts back to his clients.''

Whereas, a guest columnist recently highlighted in Roll Call that ''. . . what [the firm's] example reveals most clearly is the potentially corrupting link between campaign contributions and earmarks. Even the most ardent earmarkers should want to avoid the appearance of such a pay-to-play system.''

Whereas, multiple press reports have noted questions related to campaign contributions made by or on behalf of the firm; including questions related to ''straw man'' contributions, the reimbursement of employees for political giving, pressure on clients to give, a suspicious pattern of giving, and the timing of donations relative to legislative activity.

Whereas, Roll Call has taken note of the timing of contributions from employees the firm and its clients when it reported that they ''have provided thousands of dollars worth of campaign contributions to key Members in close proximity to legislative activity, such as the deadline for earmark request letters or passage of a spending bill.''

Whereas, the Associated Press highlighted the ''huge amounts of political donations'' from the firm and its clients to select members and noted that ''those political donations have followed a distinct pattern: The giving is especially heavy in March, which is prime time for submitting written earmark requests.''

Whereas, clients of the firm received at least three hundred million dollars worth of earmarks in fiscal year 2009 appropriations legislation, including several that were approved even after news of the FBI raid of the firm's offices and Justice Department investigation into the firm was well known.

Whereas, after a cursory review, the fiscal year 2010 defense appropriations earmark list recently made available includes at least seventy earmarks worth hundreds of millions of dollars for former PMA clients.

Whereas, the Associated Press reported that ''the FBI says the investigation is continuing, highlighting the close ties between special-interest spending provisions known as earmarks and the raising of campaign cash.''

Whereas, the persistent media attention focused on questions about the nature and timing of campaign contributions related to the firm, as well as reports of the Justice Department conducting research on earmarks and campaign contributions, raise concern about the integrity of Congressional proceedings and the dignity of the institution.

Now, therefore, be it: Resolved, That the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct shall immediately establish an investigative subcommittee and begin an investigation into the relationship between the source and timing of past campaign contributions to Members of the House related to the raided firm and earmark requests made by Members of the House on behalf of clients of the raided firm.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from Arizona will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

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:

Approval of the Journal;

H. Res. 607; and

H.R. 2245, each by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 159, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 593]

YEAS—233

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Bachmann
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Butterfield
Capito
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (CA)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fortenberry
Foster
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Gerlach
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Heller
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E.B.
Jones
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NAYS—159

Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Arcuri
Austria
Bachus
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Carney
Cassidy
Chandler
Childers
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
Etheridge
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Granger
Graves
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kline (MN)
Kratovil
Lamborn
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Markey (CO)
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McCotter
McHenry
McHugh
Melancon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Minnick
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Olson
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Platts
Poe (TX)
Price (GA)
Putnam
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Westmoreland

Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—41

Barrett (SC)
Boswell
Boucher
Brady (TX)
Bright
Brown, Corrine
Capuano
Conaway
Conyers
Costa
Crenshaw
Davis (AL)
Davis (IL)
Forbes
Gohmert
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hinchey
Johnson (IL)
Kirk
Larsen (WA)
Lewis (CA)
Lucas
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (NY)
McKeon
Moran (VA)
Rohrabacher
Sanchez, Loretta
Sessions
Sestak
Sires
Smith (WA)
Stark
Tiberi
Towns
Turner
Wasserman Schultz
Wittman

□ 1900

Messrs. STEARNS, THOMPSON of California, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, Messrs. BOCCIERI, SOUDER, KRATOVIL and KING of Iowa changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. LEVIN, CROWLEY and SPRATT changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

CELEBRATING 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF APOLLO 11 MOON LANDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 607, 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 gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 607.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 390, nays 0, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 594]

YEAS—390

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Guthrie
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
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)
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
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—43

Barrett (SC)
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bright
Brown, Corrine
Capuano
Conaway
Conyers
Costa
Crenshaw
Davis (AL)
Davis (IL)
Doyle
Forbes
Gohmert
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hinchey
Johnson (IL)
Kirk
Larsen (WA)
Lewis (CA)
Lucas
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (NY)
McKeon
Moran (VA)
Rohrabacher
Sanchez, Loretta
Sessions
Sestak
Sires
Smith (WA)
Stark
Tiberi
Towns
Turner
Wasserman Schultz
Wittman

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1908

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.

NEW FRONTIER CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2245, 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 Florida (Mr. GRAYSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2245.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 390, nays 0, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 595]

YEAS—390

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (CA)
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
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
Guthrie
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
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)
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
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—43

Barrett (SC)
Boswell
Boucher
Brady (TX)
Bright
Brown, Corrine
Capuano
Conaway
Conyers
Costa
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (AL)
Davis (IL)
Forbes
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hinchey
Johnson (IL)
Kirk
Larsen (WA)
Lewis (CA)
Lucas
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (NY)
McKeon
Moran (VA)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Sanchez, Loretta
Sessions
Sestak
Sires
Smith (WA)
Stark
Tiberi
Towns
Turner
Wasserman Schultz
Wilson (SC)
Wittman

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1915

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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, on July 20, 2009, I was called away on personal business, I regret that I was not present to vote on the Journal Vote, H. Res. 607, and H.R. 2245.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on all votes.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from this Chamber today. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall votes 593, 594 and 595.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate notifies the House of Representatives that the Senate shall convene as a Court of Impeachment at 2 p.m., on Wednesday, July 22, 2009, for the purpose of receiving the Managers on the part of the House of Representatives in the matter of the Impeachment proceedings against Samuel B. Kent, formerly a Judge of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas.

ROSENSTIEL SCHOOL OF MARINE AND ATMOSPHERIC SCIENCE AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to announce that today the Department of Commerce awarded a $15 million grant to my alma mater, the University of Miami, for the construction of a new marine science research facility as the Rosenstiel School of Marine and Atmospheric Science. The Rosenstiel School will construct an integrated seawater laboratory building that will also house a state-of-the-art marine life science center. The lab will be the only facility in the world with a wind-wave storm surge simulator capable of generating hurricane-force winds in a three-dimensional test environment.

Building on past initiatives to protect coral reefs and Florida's unique habitat, the University of Miami will conduct research to understand how structures withstand natural disasters, how environmental challenges threaten human health, and how dynamic action can enhance resiliency and protect lives. All of us will be safer due to the advances it will yield in technological innovation, environmental protection and public safety.

Madam Speaker, again, it's a $15 million grant from the Department of Commerce to my alma mater, the University of Miami, for a new Rosenstiel School of Marine and Atmospheric Science.

EXPRESSING CONCERN FOR THE AMERICAN SOLDIER HELD CAPTIVE IN AFGHANISTAN BY THE TALIBAN

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise to express grave concern for one of our soldiers being held in harm's way by the Taliban in Afghanistan. I join with Secretary Gates to call this disgusting. Knowing the brave men and women of the United States military, I know they will not leave one soldier behind. The 18th Congressional District has approximately the largest number of active duty soldiers returning from Iraq and Afghanistan. The numbers are large throughout the State of Texas. We have grave concern and are in sympathy with his family. We want them to know that we do care. We want them to know that as the soldiers are on the battlefield in Afghanistan, we will not stop until he is found.

It is necessary to express our belief that our soldiers are precious. We thank them for the sacrifice they make on behalf of our freedom and know that we will not leave one behind. It is disgusting, and the Taliban need to know we will never give up.

CELEBRATING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE APOLLO 11 MISSION

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

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and celebrate the 40th anniversary of the Apollo 11 mission and, notably, the commander of that crew, Neil Armstrong, as the first person to set foot on the Moon. President John F. Kennedy told a joint session of Congress in 1961: "I believe that this Nation should commit itself to achieving the goal, before this decade is out, of landing a man on the Moon and returning him safely to Earth."

That goal was achieved nearly 8 years later on July 20, 1969, by Ohio's

own Neil Armstrong, along with Buzz Aldrin and Michael Collins. Tonight I honor Neil and the men and women who worked tirelessly to make Apollo 11 a success. I, as a child, was mesmerized by Apollo 11's mission. I was one of the hundreds of millions who watched on television as Neil Armstrong took that historic step on the Moon.

Landing on the Moon wasn't just an American event. It was a proud and historic event for all mankind. In the wake of this incredible accomplishment, Neil Armstrong has received many, many awards. Most notably, he received the highest award offered to U.S. civilians, the Presidential Medal of Freedom. Neil has undertaken several endeavors since that walk on the Moon, and I am especially proud of one professor of aerospace engineering at the University of Cincinnati, my alma mater. I am extremely proud to call Neil one of my constituents.

Madam Speaker, let me leave you with the quote that has become the core of our American history: ''That's one small step for man, one giant leap for mankind.'' Thank you, Neil Armstrong, for taking that giant leap; and thank you to everyone who made Apollo 11 a success. Forty years later we ponder its magnitude.

TO ENSURE PROPER TRANSPARENCY, LEGISLATION SHOULD BE ONLINE 72 HOURS PRIOR TO A VOTE

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Madam Speaker, next week Congress will likely vote on a health care bill that costs over $1 trillion and has serious repercussions for every American. I simply request that every Member be given the appropriate time to review the final bill.

Just a few weeks ago, a 300-page amendment was made to the cap-and-trade bill at 3 a.m. and voted on just hours later without allowing Members and staff ample time to peruse it. The over 1,000-page stimulus bill was similarly hustled through Congress without time for Members to even read it. This is not an acceptable way to run Congress.

To that end, I am cosponsoring a bill that will require legislation be available on the Internet for 72 hours so that the public and Members of Congress will have a chance to see it. As we debate health reform or any other issue, the American people want us to get it right. To do that, we must avoid arbitrary deadlines and passing measures in the dark of night without full debate or proper transparency.

THE MOON MEN

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, on July 20, 1969, America accomplished the greatest single technological achievement in the history of the world: Americans walked on the Moon. And on that July afternoon 40 years ago today, we all crowded around our TV sets and radios, listening to mission control in Houston, Texas. At 4:17 p.m. the distant word came from Lunar Module Flight Commander Neil Armstrong: ''Houston, the Eagle has landed.'' Shouts and cheers rang out at mission control in Houston, Texas, and spread out across the United States. Six hours later, kids in America, including me, were still up way past their bedtime. Neil Armstrong stepped down from the ladder of the lunar module in his big, bulky space suit and said: ''That's one small step for man, one giant leap for mankind.'' He was standing on the Moon. Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin then planted the Stars and Stripes on the lunar surface.

These men, along with Michael Collins who was circling in the command module, had done something unbelievable. By their achievement, they summed up the greatness of America. A country founded by bold explorers had, itself, boldly explored the universe. The Moon men proved that in America, no mission is impossible.

And that's just the way it is.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF FIVE MINNESOTA NATIONAL GUARDSMEN KILLED IN THE LINE OF DUTY

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

Mrs. BACHMANN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of members of the Minnesota National Guard who were killed in the line of duty this past week in the service of our great country. Minnesotans gathered together last evening in a silent vigil in my hometown in Stillwater where they remembered, cried and prayed for five brave members of our American military who willingly laid their lives on the altar of freedom.

On Friday I spoke with the parents of one of these servicemen who only hours earlier received a knock on their door, the knock that no parent ever wants to answer. And in their conversation with me, Madam Speaker, the parents honored their son amidst their grief, their pride in his bravery swelling their hearts.

May these families be comforted in their sorrow, and may the memories of these brave soldiers live in our hearts forever.

□ 1930

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

THE NEED FOR A CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION AGENCY

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

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I have long been an advocate of consumer protections and consumer rights, and I'm proud of the work we have accomplished on these issues this session. Laws such as the recently enacted Credit Cardholders' Bill of Rights, of which I'm an original cosponsor, will help to ensure consumers have access to fair and easy-to-understand credit products. That said, there is still much more work to be done in order to safeguard consumers from predatory and discriminatory lending products.

This Congress is about to embark upon the adoption of regulatory reform. We have had an economic meltdown and a subprime mess, and we discovered that our regulatory agencies were asleep at the wheel. We discovered that there had been deregulation that led us to the point of this economic meltdown.

Judging from the proliferation of products such as subprime mortgages and payday loans, our current regulatory framework inadequately protects consumers. There are many reasons why we need a new consumer financial protection agency. There will be a comprehensive piece of legislation that will talk about how we do credible regulatory reform. But of all that is in the proposed legislation that is being developed, we are getting a pushback from the financial services community on the consumer financial protection agency.

Why is that? Why is it that given what we have gone through the financial services community can boldly and barefacedly come before us and talk about why a consumer financial protection agency is a bad idea?

I suppose one of the reasons is jurisdictional. There are several types of consumer financial products which, because they are offered by non-banks, fall into what may be classified as a ''shadow banking industry.'' These products and institutions escape Federal regulation yet often lead to Federal problems, such as our current economic and foreclosure crisis.

A prime example of this is mortgage servicing. Mortgage services is an important part of our housing market, and consumers often have more contact with their mortgage servicers than they do with their mortgage broker, real estate agent or bank combined. However, lately, many servicers have been unable to properly assist consumers due to lack of capacity or perhaps just the will to do so.

The servicers are the ones that are supposed to be doing loan modifications. They are supposed to be helping the consumers to unwind the mess that many of them have found themselves in because of the predatory lending.

There is currently no Federal agency with specific jurisdiction over the mortgage servicing industry, and therefore, no mechanism for anyone to address this pressing issue. The proposed consumer financial protection agency would bring nonbanks who offer financial services to and interact with consumers into our regulatory system.

Another reason we need a consumer financial protection agency is to protect consumers from complicated products and hidden and predatory fees. According to Harvard Professor Elizabeth Warren, the average credit card offer now comes bundled with more than 100 pages of fine print. Buried within this fine print are provisions about restrictions, teaser rates and penalties. This fine print is nearly impossible for consumers to make informed decisions and pick the credit card or other lending product which is right for them. This leads some borrowers to be trapped in credit cards or loan products with hidden and abusive fees. This agency could solve this problem by working with the industry to reduce fine print and hidden fees.

The final reason we need this new agency is stability. Our financial markets are built on consumer lending. Our current crisis began when collateralized debt obligations and mortgage-backed securities were packed with exotic products, such as no-doc loans and liars loans. It was exacerbated as consumers were continually squeezed with excessive penalties and fees from bank products, reducing purchasing power and leading families everywhere to make tough decisions. A strong regulator, one which focused solely on consumer safety and championed simpler disclosure and products, could have prevented all of this.

We need a consumer financial protection agency to deal with this kind of crisis so that it never occurs again.

NATIVE AMERICAN INDIAN HEALTH CARE MEDICAL MALPRACTICE, PAGE 2

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, government-run health care leads to doctor shortages, rationing of services and long waiting lines. The United States Government has been trying to run health care for the American Indians for over 200 years. And it is a miserable failure. It has resulted in medical malpractice against Native American Indians.

Over the last two centuries, Members of Congress have spoken out about the way Indians are treated by the Federal Government. Among those outspoken critics include David Crockett and Sam Houston. The prime example of mistreatment today is the government-run health care for Native Americans.

In 1787, the Federal Government agreed to provide for the health, safety and well-being of Indian tribes on reservations in exchange for over 450 million acres of land. The United States Government has been running Indian health care ever since.

The Indian Health Services is part of the Department of Health and Human Services. They took over the Indian health care in 1954 from the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Now, Indian Health Services oversee medical care for about 2 million American Indians and Alaskan Eskimos in 35 States.

Last week, I talked about just a few of the tense tragic stories of some of the victims of this U.S. Government-run health care system. Like Ta'Shon Rain Little Light, the little girl who went to an Indian Health Service clinic in Montana. The doctor said Ta'Shon was just depressed. But she kept complaining to her mom that her stomach hurt and stopped eating and drinking. After going back to the same clinic 10 more times, her lung collapsed. She was then airlifted to a private children's hospital, where she was diagnosed with terminal stomach cancer. She died a few days later. Ta'Shon Rain Little Light was 5 years of age.

Rhonda Sandland lives on the Standing Rock Reservation in North Dakota. She had to threaten to kill herself to finally get treatment for severe frostbite on her fingers. The government health care providers wanted to cut off all of her fingers. A private doctor happened to stop by on the reservation and prevented the amputation. Instead, he prescribed the medicine that took care of the problem.

And then there is Victor Brave Thunder who had congestive heart failure. The clinic at Standing Rock gave him Tylenol and cough syrup and sent him home. He died of a heart attack a few weeks later. Then there's Harriet Archambault who died when her hypertension medicine ran out. She tried five times to get an appointment to get her medicine refilled. She never got to see a doctor before she died.

These are not isolated incidents.

The Cheyenne River Sioux tribal officials have held hearings on their South Dakota reservation to document conditions at the Eagle Butte Indian Health Services hospital. Betty Crowe worked at the reservation hospital for years. Betty said all they could do most of the time was hand out painkillers. Others testified at that hearing that people who had appendix problems were given pain medicine and sent home until their appendix burst. Betty's own son had leukemia. He used to get his leukemia medicine through his wife's private insurance, but then he got a divorce and he lost that insurance. He couldn't pay for it by himself. And Betty said that the bureaucrats at the Butte Indian Health Services hospital wouldn't allow him to get the leukemia medicine from the Federal Government.

Germaine Means says that nonmedical staff was deciding who would or would not get medical treatment. Now imagine that, Madam Speaker. In the Indian Health Services agency, a bureaucrat, not a doctor, decides who can get medical care and who doesn't. That is called ''rationing.''

On the reservations it is said, don't get sick after June because the government runs out of money and runs out of medicine. The Indian Health Service Agency itself calls their organization a ''rationed health care system.''

When the taxpayer money runs out, they can't pay for those services. So they ration. America has proven universal nationalized health care results in a rationed system of care by the way we treat the American Indians. And every nation that has tried socialized medicine has proven its results in rationing and in poor health care.

There are more problems with this universal plan. To cut costs, the government solution is to pay all the private doctors the Medicare rate for their services. It's in their 1,000-page bill. They call it ''cutting medical costs.'' The main problem with that scenario is that Medicare rates don't pay for a doctor's overhead. So they run the doctors out of business. Why would anyone want to go to medical school and spend all that money just to open up a practice that doesn't pay for itself? And to make matters worse, the American Medical Association has warned us that we are losing more doctors than we are getting.

Madam Speaker, we don't have to wonder what health care, run by the Federal Government, looks like. We have our own long, lamentable, sad, sick history to prove it doesn't work. Socialized medicine has the competence of FEMA, the efficiency of the post office and the compassion of the IRS, and results in medical malpractice against the American Indians. Just ask them. And that's just the way it is.

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

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

WE MUST RETHINK OUR POLICY IN AFGHANISTAN

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, the administration is currently reviewing our military strategy in Afghanistan. General McChrystal, the leader of U.S. and NATO forces, is expected to give his report to the President in just a few weeks.

But the President isn't the only one who should be reviewing our policy. Every Member of this House should be reviewing our policy too, because we are once again relying on the military

option, just like we did in Iraq. And that's just not the best way to stop the violent extremists who threaten us.

If you need proof of that, just remember that al Qaeda has launched more attacks since 9/11 than before 9/11. And our National Intelligence Estimates have warned us that al Qaeda is getting stronger—stronger—not weaker. And if you need even more proof, Madam Speaker, that military force doesn't work, I urge you to read the RAND Corporation report entitled ''How Terrorist Groups End.''

RAND studied 648 extremists groups that existed between 1968 and 2006. It found that military force was effective against these groups only 7 percent of the time. In its analysis, RAND discovered two strategies that actually worked better. The first was negotiated political settlements; the second was the use of intelligence and police agencies to penetrate and disrupt extremist organizations. Combined, these two strategies were effective 83 percent of the time.

RAND applied its analysis to al Qaeda and concluded that ''policing and intelligence should be the backbone of U.S. efforts.'' And they believe this to be true in Afghanistan and other parts of the world. This is because ''al Qaeda consists of a network of individuals who need to be tracked and arrested,'' which requires the cooperation of U.S. and foreign intelligence agencies.

RAND also said that America ''should generally resist being drawn into combat operations in Muslim societies, since its presence is likely to increase'' the recruitment of violent extremists.

Madam Speaker, instead of using military force, we must change our mission in Afghanistan. We must use the far more effective tools of SMART power. SMART power can do a much better job of ending violent extremism than bombs, bullets, invasions, and occupations.

In this session of Congress, I have introduced House Resolution 363, the SMART Security Platform For the 21st century. It calls for strengthening intelligence and law enforcement agencies to track and arrest those involved in violent acts, while still respecting the rule of law.

SMART security also calls for improvements in civilian policing. A well-trained police force is a highly effective counterinsurgency tool because it is located where the extremists actually lurk. My SMART security platform also includes many other initiatives to provide for stopping extremism in Afghanistan and other parts of the world. SMART security addresses the root causes of violence and it encourages diplomatic and multilateral action. It promotes nuclear nonproliferation, and it ends our dependence on foreign oil.

Madam Speaker, the death toll in Afghanistan is on the rise. A summer of heavy fighting is ahead of us. Let's stop this bloodshed before we have another Iraq on our hands. Let's do the smart thing. Let's change our strategy before it's too late.

HONORING THE OLD GUARD

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

Mr. JONES. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the outstanding individuals of the Old Guard located at Fort Myer, Virginia.

The 3rd United States Infantry, proudly nicknamed the Old Guard, has served our Nation since 1784, making it the oldest active duty infantry unit in the United States Army.

□ 1945

Since World War II, the Old Guard has served as the Army's official Honor Guard. Soldiers from the Old Guard protect Washington, D.C., escort the President, and conduct military ceremonies at the White House, Pentagon and national memorials in the capital, including funeral details and other special ceremonies at Arlington National Cemetery.

Last month, I had the pleasure of spending the morning at Arlington National Cemetery and seeing the inside workings of the Old Guard. One of their most recognized duties is to provide sentinel at the Tomb of the Unknowns. Since April the 6th of 1948, the Tomb of the Unknowns has been guarded 24 hours a day, 365 days a year, regardless of weather. The sentinels rotate walks every hour in the winter and at night and every half hour in the day during the summer. They are all volunteers and considered to be the best of the Old Guard. Each soldier must be in superb physical condition, hold an untarnished military record, and be between 5 foot 10 and 6 feet 4 inches tall with the proportionate weight and build.

During the trial phase, soldiers are required to memorize seven pages of Arlington National Cemetery history, and the knew sentinels learn the grave locations of nearly 300 veterans.

The sentinels' duty time not walking is spent in the Tomb Guard Quarters below the Memorial Amphitheater, where they study cemetery ''knowledge,'' clean their weapons, and help the rest of their relief prepare for the Changing of the Guard. The guards also train on their days off.

A portion of the Sentinels' Creed states: ''My dedication to this sacred duty is total and wholehearted. In the responsibility bestowed upon me never will I falter, and with dignity and perseverance my standard will remain perfection.''

Madam Speaker, it was a humbling experience to witness the sentinels' dedication and commitment to honoring all American servicemembers who are ''Known But to God.''

I encourage every American who visits our Nation's capital to stop by Arlington National Cemetery to pay tribute to the fallen military heroes of the past, and to witness the dedication of the Old Guard.

I also encourage my colleagues in Congress to make the time to visit Arlington National Cemetery and meet with the fine soldiers of the Old Guard. Their motivation and dedication to service should truly fill every American with pride.

And as I close, Madam Speaker, as I do many times on this floor, I ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform. I ask God in his loving arms to hold the families whose child has given their life for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq. And I ask three times, God please, God please, God please continue to bless America.

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

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CELEBRATING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE APOLLO 11 MOON LANDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, as a 12-year member of the House Science Committee and a resident in Houston, Texas, I too rise to celebrate and to commemorate the 40th anniversary of Apollo 11.

This coming Friday, the NASA community and all of Houston will join in a splashdown celebrating the 40th anniversary of Apollo 11 at Space Center Houston.

Madam Speaker, I cannot tell you the great excitement in our community, because NASA has been a real anchor both economically, but really one of great pride, even though we realize it is a national treasure.

The words of a young President John F. Kennedy in his May 25, 1961, speech to Congress rings clear in our ears because he challenged America. He challenged those who had the ability to dream and gave them the goal of landing a man on the Moon and returning him safely to Earth.

The Apollo 11 program was designed to achieve the goal established by President Kennedy, by sending a crew of three astronauts to the Moon and returning them safely, but he didn't realize the drama and the excitement and the inspiration that that would provide. He did not realize what it would mean when Buzz Aldrin and Neil Armstrong and Michael Collins took flight in Apollo 11. He did not realize that when the crew of Apollo 11 launched into space aboard a Saturn V rocket on July 16, 1969, was almost equal to, I guess, the discovery of this Nation.

And then on July 20, 1969, Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin successfully piloted the Eagle lunar module to the

surface of the Moon. And who can forget ''The Eagle has landed.'' It was exciting for all of us who really believed in the greatness of America, but also the peace that America generated.

And then on July 20, 1969, when Neil Armstrong took his first step on the Moon, he became the first person to walk on the surface of another celestial body. We know his famous words that, in fact, as I paraphrase them, one step for man and one giant step for mankind.

And so we recognize how important it is to celebrate 40 years, because we want there to be another 40 years of NASA, to recognize the economic arm that it presents, to recognize the value of the inquisitiveness of scientists, mathematicians, doctors, those who are engaged in the business of exploration and human challenges.

Astronauts have come from all walks of life. They've happened to be my neighbors. We've lost some in Columbia and Challenger. We mourn for their families, but we celebrate their families and thank them for their sacrifice because we recognize that this is a time that we are now to pay tribute to them by continuing our work with NASA.

How excited we are to have retired General Charles Bolden to be the new NASA administrator, a former astronaut, the first African American, a Houstonian in the years that he lived there.

And so we celebrate and hope that this inspiration goes into the nooks and crannies of prekindergarten, kindergarten, primary, secondary education, college, graduate school. Let us send forth more astronauts, chemists, physicists, biologists, doctors, mechanical engineers, engineers, all of the people that can help us discover a peaceful way to live in this wonderful universe. That's what Apollo 11 was all about. Showing us that it is a place of peace, the Moon, that we can explore, we can find out information, we can make lives better for Americans and others around the world.

I always believed in the international space station. As a member of the Science Committee, I was able to craft legislation to create a safety scheme, if you will, to ensure that the international space station is safe. We see now that there are constant checks and constant emphasis on ensuring the safety of this particular large building in space, if you will, the size of large football fields. We know that that is important, even to the extent of fixing a toilet.

So, Madam Speaker, I rise to support and to salute Buzz Aldrin, the lunar module pilot; Michael Collins, the command module pilot; and Neil Armstrong, the mission commander, who understood what it was to make this giant step.

His other words as well, as we came in peace for all of mankind, that should be the mantra, the standard, the medal, if you will, the heart of NASA as we explore: We come in peace for all of mankind.

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

(Mr. INGLIS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE IRANIAN PEOPLE'S PEACEFUL STRUGGLE FOR FREEDOM

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

Mr. McCOTTER. Madam Speaker, the Iranian people's peaceful struggle for freedom continues despite the tyrannical regime's barbarous crackdown. In fact, in his Friday's sermon, former President Rafsanjani called into question legitimacy of the present government and rebuked the regime for its crackdown on peaceful protesters and its cavalier rejection of the cries that the election was stolen.

Finally, former President Rafsanjani called upon the regime to free and fully account for all those peaceful freedom seekers who have been arrested in the repression. Then, on Sunday, former President Khatami called for a referendum on the legitimacy of the Iranian regime and asked that the results be tallied by an objective independent Iranian body to ensure its accuracy.

This led the current opposition, Presidential candidate Hossein Mousavi, to say, You are facing something new, an awakened nation, a nation that has been born again and is here to defend its achievements. Arrests won't put an end to this problem. End this game as soon as possible and return to the nation its arrested sons.

While humanity agrees, Supreme Leader Khamenei disagrees. And to leaders who both tacitly and expressly support the freedom seekers in Iran, Khamenei issued this warning. The elite should be watchful since they have been faced with a big test. Failing the test will cause their collapse.

I'd ask Supreme Leader Khamenei to look at this picture. Her name is Taraneh Mousavi. She was arrested near Ghoba Mosque, where she was on her way to attend hairdressing college. After her arrest, she was raped, sodomized and tortured by her captors, taken to a hospital in a coma, and it was there that she died. Upon her death, her body was removed to the outskirts of Karaj Qasim where, to prevent an autopsy, it was burned.

She came from a religious family. Taraneh was only 19 and an only child. Her family has been threatened to keep quiet, and yet the resistance wants her story out. Why? Because here's the truth denied by Khamenei and his misogynistic, murderous regime. Your referendum has been held and you have failed your test. Taraneh and Nadeh condemn you as the despicable killers of women. You have no legitimacy either in the eyes of the Iranian people or in the eyes of the civilized world. You are doomed by your own hands, and it is but a matter of time until your regime collapses and the Iranian people breathe free.

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

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mrs. SCHMIDT addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ALL JOBS ARE NEEDED NOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Madam Speaker, all jobs are needed now in the United States. We need jobs here and we need jobs now. Unemployment stands at a 26-year high at 9.5 percent.

And what is the response of Washington, D.C.? Government is increasing the costs on job creators. By the end of this week, Madam Speaker, government will have mandated that the price of the minimum wage will increase another $0.70 per hour. This comes when teenage unemployment stands at nearly 25 percent, nearly another record. Employers expect to be cutting more minimum wage jobs as a result of this action, not adding more jobs. Teenagers in my district are going from day to day to day, many of whom have given up now that it's the end of July, looking for work. Unemployment stands at a high for teenagers. They're competing with 40-year-olds for jobs at fast food companies.

So what else does Washington do?

Washington is passing a crushing debt burden on to the 19- and 20-year-olds with our $1.1 trillion stimulus plan. Clearly, the stimulus plan hasn't worked to create more jobs for Americans. Two million jobs have been lost since the stimulus law was passed earlier this year. The public was told that if Congress failed to pass the President's stimulus plan that we would see 8 percent unemployment. A lot of

States today would love to see 8 percent unemployment.

Try the State of Michigan. Last week they reported their unemployment stands today at 15.2 percent. We can do better, so much better. We have before and we can again.

Let's ask every business owner in America, Madam Speaker, if it would help them if we would cut their costs of doing business with the Federal Government.

Let's ask the average American if they would like to see government take less of what they make. Let's see if Washington would allow the American people the freedom to reclaim their lives, rather than waiting for a Washington bureaucrat to give them permission to move forward with their lives.

□ 2000

This last weekend, I spoke to a Minnesota businessman who has created four dozen jobs in my district. He would love to provide health care for his employees, but he simply can't afford to. Why? It's because of the government mandates.

Do his employees go without health care? No, they don't. Almost all of them have health insurance either through a spouse or they purchase health care on their own.

What would his employees like to see? They would like to have help with the full deductibility of their health care costs on their tax returns; also if they could purchase health insurance in the same way they purchase their car insurance in a competitive, free-market manner. Many of them would like to see the increased use of health savings plans. They want to own their own health insurance because they want to be able to take it with them in case they want to be able to change jobs.

Madam Speaker, fully 77 percent of all Americans respond that they prefer their present health insurance. They like what they have, and they want to keep it, but they think, Madam Speaker, that they will be shocked if they learn that they could lose their private health insurance, and they would be shocked to learn if their only option would be the government as their only health decision-making.

Page 16 of the House Democrat plan that was revealed last week of the government takeover of insurance is quite a shocker. Page 16 says that no new private health insurance policies will be allowed to be written after the passage of the bill. Government insurance is expected to be subsidized by taxpayers to the tune of 30 to 40 percent.

Approximately 114 million Americans are expected to leave private health insurance. Why? Their employers will drop the insurance because the taxpayer-subsidized plan will be 30 to 40 percent cheaper. This action will collapse the private health insurance market, and then the Federal Government will own the health provider game.

The problem is that every American will have to hope that the government will act benevolently toward their cases. Why? Because government will be the only game in town.

We can do better, Madam Speaker. We have done better. We can take a plan that truly does represent compassion and that does represent the best interests of the American people by offering them freedom and true options.

THE CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS: HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PERRIELLO). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. FUDGE. The Congressional Black Caucus, the CBC, is proud to present this hour on health care. The CBC is chaired by the Honorable BARBARA LEE from the Ninth Congressional District of California. I am Representative MARCIA L. FUDGE from the 11th District of Ohio, and I am the anchor for this hour.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to yield to our Chair, the Honorable BARBARA LEE, the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LEE of California. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, first, let me thank my colleague, Congresswoman MARCIA FUDGE of Ohio, for leading this Special Order, not only tonight but each and every Monday night, to keep our caucus and the country focused on addressing the key issues which are looming today. She consistently and is constantly on the case, making sure that we speak with one voice on the very, very critical issues which our country and the world are facing.

So thank you, Congresswoman FUDGE, for your leadership.

As Chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, I join my colleagues tonight in this very timely discussion of health care and of our efforts. Also, I want to make the case tonight for prevention as a very cost-effective strategy for health care reform. Prevention and, of course, public health should be the cornerstone of any true health care package. Prevention that takes place outside of the doctor's office can be just as important in impacting the health of Americans as health care on the back end when one ends up in an emergency room. Disease prevention is universally popular from coast to coast and across political spectra. Americans understand and appreciate the value of prevention, the value especially for reducing disease rates, for improving the quality of life and for lowering health care costs.

Yes, given the rise in deficit, we all are extremely concerned about the costs of health care, but we also must remember that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. For whatever reasons, those experts who are giving us the numbers in terms of the costs don't seem to, for whatever reason, want to tell us how much we will save based on prevention as a key element and strategy in our bill.

In a new poll released last month by the Trust for America's Health, Americans actually ranked ''prevention'' as the most important health care reform priority. The poll also found that more than three-quarters of Americans believed the country should invest more in keeping people healthier; and by a ratio of nearly 4–1, they supported putting more emphasis on preventing disease rather than on treating people after they become sick.

People are convinced it will save the health care system money, but surprisingly, the poll also found that more than 70 percent of Americans say investing in prevention is worth it even if it doesn't save money, because it will prevent disease and it will save lives. We also know that it will save money.

Now, this is not about lecturing people about behavior. Instead, what we want to do is to remove barriers to good health that are beyond the control of most people. One role of government in health care is to provide opportunities to make it easier for people to make healthy choices. Americans are not as healthy as they could be or should be, and this is resulting in skyrocketing health care costs that threaten to bankrupt American businesses. Our workforce is less productive than it could be or it should be as it relates to competing with the rest of the world.

Tens of millions of Americans suffer every day from preventable illnesses like diabetes, heart disease, some forms of cancer, and infectious diseases which rob them of health and the quality of life that they deserve, and it also drives up health care costs. More than half of Americans suffer from at least one chronic disease. Two-thirds of Americans are obese or are overweight, and 20 percent of Americans smoke. Due to the epidemic of obesity, today's children could be the first generation to live shorter, less healthy lives than their parents. This is very scary. The Nation's economic future demands that we find ways to reduce health care costs. Helping Americans stay healthier is one of the most effective ways to lower costs and to ensure that our workforce is strong and productive enough to compete in a global economy.

According to the United States Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, a vast majority of chronic diseases could be prevented through life style and environmental changes. For too long, the health care system has focused on treating people after they become sick instead of keeping them healthy in the first place. We need to shift from a sick care system to a health care system. Prevention can improve the quality of lives of Americans, can spare millions from needless suffering and can eliminate billions of

dollars of unnecessary health care costs. Research shows that strategic investments in disease prevention programs in communities can result in a big payoff in a short time, reducing health care costs, increasing the productivity of the Nation's workforce and helping people lead healthier lives.

Let me just conclude by saying I have to take a moment to commend Congresswoman Donna Christensen and the Congressional Black Caucus' Health Task Force, along with the Congressional Hispanic and Asian Pacific American Caucuses' task forces, for their diligent and effective work to ensure that any health care reform bill includes a real public health option and provisions to address the racial and ethnic disparities which we face each and every day. Unfortunately, people of color are disproportionately seen in emergency rooms because they don't have health insurance and can't get preventative care.

For example, African Americans are 3½ times more likely than whites to get an amputation as a result of diabetes. African American men with colon cancer are more than 40 percent more likely than white men with the same condition to receive major diagnostic and treatment procedures too late.

So, Mr. Speaker, as we debate health care reform, let's look at the real costs and focus on the billions—and I mean billions—of dollars that we will save if we remember that old adage that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

Thank you, Congresswoman FUDGE, for your leadership and for giving me a few moments to talk about this very important issue tonight.

Ms. FUDGE. Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

Mr. Speaker, we have the honor of being joined this evening by the majority whip. I would at this time yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN).

Mr. CLYBURN. I thank the gentlelady for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the American people that this whole issue of health care reform is something that needs to be focused on, not as an individual condition or situation but as to what is happening to the American families, as to what has happened to American businesses and as to what is happening to the American economy.

This is not about government-run health care. It's about removing insurance companies and costs from health care decisions, and it's about allowing you and your doctor to make those decisions. The status quo is not acceptable, and it is not sustainable. Here is why:

Every day, Americans are worried not simply about getting well but about whether or not they can afford to get well. Millions more wonder if they can afford preventative care to stay well. Premiums have doubled over the last 9 years, rising three times faster than wages. The average American family already pays an extra $1,100 in premiums every year for a broken system that supports 46 million uninsured Americans. For American businesses, soaring health care costs put American companies at a competitive disadvantage in a global economy. Small businesses are forced to choose between coverage and layoffs.

The broken health care system will cost us as much as $248 billion in lost productivity this year alone. We have the most expensive health care system in the world. We spend almost 50 percent more per person on health care than the next most costly nation, but we are no healthier for it. If we do nothing, in a decade we will be spending $1 of every $5 on health care. In 30 years, it will be $1 of every $3. Health care reform is curbing health care costs. It is the single best tool for deficit reduction.

Now I want to answer a question for all of the American people: What is in the reform plan for the average American?

Without reform, the health care costs for an average family of four is projected to rise $1,800 every year for years to come, and insurance companies will make more and more health care decisions. America's middle class deserves better.

Now, here is what is in this reform package for you: no more co-pays or deductibles for preventative care; no more rate increases for preexisting conditions, gender or occupation; an annual cap on your out-of-pocket expenses; group rates of a national pool if you buy your own plan; guaranteed affordable oral, hearing and vision care for your kids.

□ 2015

With this health care, there is greater choice. Keep your doctor and your plan if you like them. More choice with a high-quality public health insurance option competing with private businesses.

And so I want to say to the American people, this health care plan that we are marking up in the Energy and Commerce Committee over the next 2 days—and it's already been marked up in three of five committees in both houses of the Congress—is a plan that will say to the American people, You no longer have to worry about the cost shifting that's taking place in our current health care system; you will no longer have to worry about your premiums going up in order to cover that cost shifting for those people who do not have insurance. There will be stability in your families, there will be decreases in your premiums, and there will be an expansion in the coverage for all Americans. This is something we cannot afford not to do.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I would now like to yield to my friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Let me thank our congresswoman from Ohio, Congresswoman FUDGE, for organizing this Special Order on health care.

Over the years, the degree of accessibility and quality of health care in the United States has faltered. We are a Nation in crisis. Many Americans who are uninsured and unable to pay their hospital bills are deprived of the care and attention needed to ensure their well-being. Fundamental change is necessary to truly make progress toward a healthy America. We must rescue our health care from the insurance companies and the pharmaceutical companies.

My experiences as a State and Federal legislator and a nurse have provided a unique vantage point from which to discuss this issue.

During my 15 years as a professional nurse and that of a chief psychiatric nurse at the Veterans Administration Hospital in Dallas, Texas, I witnessed the diminishing state of our health care firsthand. Our system of health care is especially weak when it comes to mental health, for example. Individuals with mental illness do not receive sufficient coverage from insurers. While some are uninsured and unemployed, others may make too much to qualify for Medicaid. The limited options that our health care system offers mental health patients results in their inability to obtain appropriate treatment.

Some years ago in the State of Texas, there was a lawsuit, and the ruling came down that said patients had a right to treatment. Many of the patients that were in State institutions were discharged because we did not have the staff to treat them. Guess what happened to them? They became homeless and many went to prison. They become victims of our flawed health care system, become unable to gain employment, and at times really have no other place to go but to the sidewalks and the streets and the doorways. People with mental illness are amongst those least served by local and national health care systems.

Individuals and families across the country are being affected by the faults in our care system. Thousands of families are crushed by the growing cost of health care. Today, Americans are spending more on health care than housing or food, and they sometimes must choose between paying their health premiums or their rent or even their prescription medications.

With our ailing economy, Americans should not be forced to make that choice, and now is the time for reform. We must not allow these millions of dollars that are going to lobbyists to distort this plan win this time. We can reform our health care system by improving and expanding our current systems of Medicare, Medicaid, and CHIP, making them available and affordable to all Americans. I don't think we ought to have a total Federal or a government plan, but we ought to have a choice because the insurance companies have no one to compete with now and they can charge what they want and limit what patients can get. They are dictating to doctors what they should order. That needs to end.

We need to guarantee and provide quality and affordable health care to all. We need to ensure that care is patient-centered and accessible, setting higher benchmarks for quality and efficiency. We need to enforce rules that make sure our insurance companies put health care over profit. They've had their day.

Americans should be able to keep the health care that they have but also have the option of a public plan that does not leave anyone at the mercy of

fate in order to stay healthy and avoid bankruptcy. We can take the best of our current models and lessons learned and use them to reform our health system.

Forty-six million uninsured Americans—including 5.7 million in Texas—are in great need of health care coverage. Many of our uninsured in Texas are working people. We need to act now to reduce health care costs as well as health care disparities to ensure the well-being and the healthiness of all Americans.

This country we call the leading Nation and the richest country does less to make sure that the people here, the citizens, are healthy. We must change this now. We must not allow the millions of dollars going to lobbyists to distort this and defeat it this time.

Thank you.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, CBC members are advocates for families nationally, internationally, regionally, and locally. We stand firm as the voice of the people. We continue to work diligently to be the conscience of the Congress. We are dedicated to providing focused service to citizens that elected us to Congress. The vision of the founding members of the Congressional Black Caucus—to promote the public welfare through legislation designed to meet the needs of millions of neglected citizens—continues to be the goal of our legislative work.

Tonight, the CBC is going to focus all of its attention on health care. I am proud to serve on one of the three House committees that are working on health care reform legislation. I serve on the Education and Labor Committee. The other two committees are Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

While each member of the CBC has his or her own area of concern, I will focus on two categories which directly affect the most vulnerable citizens: the poor and those with mental illness. I will examine how the House's health care reform bill, H.R. 3200, the America's Affordable Health Choices Act of 2009, assists these two groups.

I will begin by examining the problems people with low incomes and those in poverty face while attempting to access our current and expensive and broken health care system.

One quote comes to mind, Mr. Speaker. This statement was made by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., more than 40 years ago. Dr. King said, Of all the forms of inequality, injustice in health care is the most shocking and inhumane. Sadly, Dr. King's statement is still relevant today.

Statistics prove that the high cost of health insurance causes or deepens financial hardships. The Service Employees International Union reported that in 2004, half of all people filing for bankruptcy cited medical costs as the reason; and in 2008, half of all home foreclosures were due, in part, to the high cost of coverage and care.

The numbers also prove that the high cost of health insurance causes people to remain or become uninsured. Due to the high cost of health care coverage, one in six—or 43.6 million Americans—under the age of 65 do not have any type of health insurance. That comes from the Centers for Disease Control. The Children's Defense Fund reports that 9 million children are uninsured in America.

Statistics demonstrate that the high cost of health insurance and lack of access to quality health insurance disproportionately affects African Americans. According to a new report issued in June of 2009 by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, minority and low-income Americans are much more likely to suffer from a chronic, debilitating illness than whites, and are far less likely to have the kind of coverage that will ensure quality care.

For example, nearly half—or 48 percent—of black adults suffer from some form of chronic condition compared to 39 percent of all adults. Yet, one in every five black Americans lack health insurance compared to one in every eight whites. Considering the statistics that I mentioned, I'm glad to report that affordability and access to quality health care are two problems that are addressed by the America's Affordable Health Choices Act. Effective in 2013, assistance will be available for individuals and families that fall below the 133 percent to 400 percent of the Federal poverty level. Financial assistance will limit individual and family spending on premiums from a minimum of 1.5 percent of income for those with the lowest income and maxing out at 11 percent of income for those at 400 percent of poverty or more. Also effective 2013, people with incomes at or below 133 percent of poverty will all be eligible for Medicaid.

In addition to the financial assistance provided by our bill, while vitally necessary, monetary help will only address part of the problem. Prevention and wellness measures need to be a part of the solution as well. Fortunately, there are measures that are included in our legislation to address this gap.

I was speaking with a constituent the other day, Mr. Floyd Perry from my district, who was born in 1938. He is in good health and does not take any medication. Mr. Perry attributes his good health to preventative health care, and he wanted me to share with everyone that preventative health care works.

H.R. 3200 authorizes additional funding for existing community health centers and creates community-based programs to deliver prevention and wellness services and waives cost sharing, both co-insurance and deductibles, for preventative services—which means that you will no longer have to pay for cancer screenings or adult and child immunizations or vision screenings or hypertension treatment.

I would like to turn my attention just for a moment to citizens with mental health issues.

In my most recent town hall meetings, many constituents were concerned about health insurance, the affordability and the coverage. Some questions were fairly general, of course, and others were fairly specific.

One woman in particular was concerned about mentally ill felons who are released from jail without access to the medications they need to remain mentally stable. My constituent found that ex-offenders with mental and emotional problems are more likely to commit crimes again due to the lack of treatment. Fortunately, access to mental health care will be improved under the current House health reform bill, but the distinct needs of ex-offenders are not explicitly addressed. Among others, my office is currently working on this issue with Representative RUSH of Illinois.

The following statistics will help us understand the current problems felons and ex-offenders with mental illnesses face.

According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics, at mid year 2005, more than half of all prison and jail inmates had a mental health problem, including more than 700,000 inmates in State prisons, more than 78,000 in Federal prisons, and almost 500,000 in local jails. More than two-fifths of State prisoners—43 percent—and more than half of local jail inmates—54 percent—reported symptoms that met the criteria for mania. About 23 percent of State prisoners and 30 percent of all local jail inmates reported symptoms of major depression.

We also have problems with mental health hardships with our children.

According to the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, while almost one in five children in the United States suffers from a diagnosable mental disorder, only 20 to 25 percent of affected children receive treatments for illnesses such as attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, eating disorders, depression, and substance use disorders.

□ 2030

The Department of Health and Human Services reports that serious emotional disturbances affect one in every 10 young people at any given time, and our general population faces many more problems with mental illness. One in four uninsured adult Americans has a mental disorder, substance use disorder or both. Adults with serious mental illnesses die 25 years sooner than those who do not have mental illness. Almost 1 in 4 stays in acute care hospitals involve depression, bipolar disorder, schizophrenia, and/or other mental health and substance abuse disorders.

Treatment for mental health and substance use disorder is very effective. Recovery rates for mental illnesses are comparable to and even surpass the treatment success rates for any physical health conditions. For example, up to 85 percent of people with depression

who are treated with a combination of medication and therapy experience substantially reduced symptoms, enhanced quality of life and increased productivity.

Mr. Speaker, I see I have been joined by my colleague and friend, the gentlelady from Texas, Ms. JACKSON-LEE.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Let me thank the gentlelady from Ohio, first of all, for bringing this important Special Order to the floor of the House tonight and for her continued leadership. Allow me to thank Mr. Speaker for his leadership as well on these many issues because this is a dialogue with our colleagues on an important topic.

And so I would like to begin by just congratulating you for focusing on the mental health issue, and some of our colleagues were focused on preventative medicine, and certainly, our majority whip indicated, in essence, a message to the American people of just what would be occurring.

I would like to follow suit and try to walk us through the construct of what we're trying to do here in the United States Congress in the light of day, if you will. The Tri-Committee, members of those three committees, have marked up their bills in an open process, starting last week. That markup is continuing. Members will have an opportunity to engage in issues that they believe are extremely important.

But while I discuss the bill, I think it is important that I point out that this is, in fact, the organizational chart of the Republican health care plan. I hope everyone can see it, and so as I discuss it we see that there is one option. It is the option that the President and the Democratic leadership and Members of Congress, which we hope will be bipartisan, will focus on curing the cancer, if you will, of uninsured people in America. When I say cancer, of course I'm speaking in the metaphoric manner, meaning that it is a cancerous sore to have people that cannot have access to health care.

On July 25, I am going to hold a job fair because Houston has the highest unemployment since 1987, and many people believe Texas has been immune. And of course, I know that some will pick up on that and suggest that they told you so about the stimulus. We understand that the stimulus is making its way into our communities, and we know that jobs are being created and jobs are saved. But it's hit a point where various cities are being impacted at different points of time. So we'll have that job fair, and we expect any number of employers to come and we expect to have success.

But in the interim, we realize that people are without health insurance. They are part of the 47 million-plus, including those who have never had health insurance, including those with preexisting diseases.

So what is the Democrats' health insurance about? It is about closing the loopholes. It is about answering the call of Americans who cannot find pediatricians to take their children to, who have the elderly who need home care, who have articulated the major disparities in health care.

You know, I heard my good friend from Texas rise today and talk about the Native Americans. I'm glad to tell him that the Tri-Caucus, Asian Pacific, Hispanic Caucus and African Americans, are way ahead of that question, and so we're focusing on the issue of disparities in health care.

Just this past weekend I joined with Organizing for America to work with volunteers as they were calling to explain to constituents just what this health care package is about because we're not trying to hide the ball. And so it is about reducing costs, because rising health care costs are crushing the budgets of governments, businesses, individuals, and families, and they must be brought under control. That's what we want to do.

It's about guaranteeing choice. Every American must have the freedom to choose their plan and doctor, including the choice of public insurance, a vigorous and robust public option.

Ensure affordable care for all. All Americans must have quality health care. And unfortunately, I'm hoping that we are watching the plan that our good friends have so we can realize how important it is to focus on what we're trying to do, and it is complex.

What we're trying to do in this health care reform is to answer the call that more than 8 in 10 of those Americans surveyed say: It's extremely or very important that the legislation make health insurance more affordable. We think that's very important.

Without reform, the cost of health care for the average family of four is projected to rise $1,800 every year for years to come.

And so our draft legislation has—and I want us to have the comparison of what we're seeing from our friends on the other side of the aisle, we will have no more co-pays or deductibles for preventative care. Can I use a term we use in our communities? Hallelujah. Can you imagine? Can you imagine?

I know that you have the Cleveland Clinic. I have come and admired that. It's in your district. You have done great work for the Cleveland Clinic. Can you imagine those scientists and doctors will have the ability to design a preventative medicine program? I am sure they have one. The Texas Medical Center will be able to design a preventative program.

Dr. Lovell Jones, who heads a minority populations program at the M.D. Anderson, will be able to finally get his way to work on the issue of disparities in health care but work on prevention.

No more rate increases for preexisting conditions, gender or occupation.

An annual cap on your out-of-pocket expenses. How many of us have heard the stories of catastrophic bankruptcies, financial collapses, because families have had to deal with catastrophic illnesses?

Group rates of a national pool if you buy your own plan and guaranteed affordable oral, hearing, and vision care for your kids. I have worked on the issues of vision care, and I know as Chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus children, as Chairwoman BARBARA LEE said, are the most vulnerable.

So we realize that we've got to do something. By a 23 point margin, 56 to 33 percent of Americans endorse the idea of enacting major health care reform this year. Half call it extremely or very important, and the idea of not having a health plan is really nightmarish, if you will.

It is a fact that 68 percent of all personal bankruptcies are the result of health care expenses and that 75 percent of those are filed by people who had health insurance. Given that, it is clear that the existing system of private health insurance companies is no protection against financial ruin.

That's why we need a robust financial option, and I refute the arguments that are being made that if we have a robust public option that all the people in the private sector will run for this. No, they won't, because obviously there will be criteria. There will be standards which they will meet, and there will be standards which we meet. There may be extras that the private insurance has. We wish them well, and they will be judged by the market, and their particular members will be subscribing on the basis of their desires and their ability.

But I think one thing that we need to be careful of, and we need to find language to ensure that—we know they're writing the bill. We cannot allow willy-nilly for corporations to close their doors on the most sick of their employees and throw them, in essence, without their will, without their desire, into another plan. That's what we have to protect against, and I believe that we'll do so.

The public option is going to be a very good plan, but if you are any corporation, and you're an employee, then you should not be thrown unless you desire to go into the public plan. And so we will protect against that.

But I think it is important to note that our plan is, again, not one that is throwing money out and around and flooding, if you will, the streets like greenbacks by throwing them out on the street. We're not talking about that. We are talking about being fiscally responsible.

Let me tell you how we're doing that—and this is important because the argument has gotten that this is a tax bill, that this brings no relief to anyone, but let me tell you, we don't ultimately know how it will manage in the size that it is to be fully paid for. But we are committed to being responsible with taxpayers' dollars.

We are going to be working on programs that will prevent waste, fraud and abuse. This is going to be a health care reform with integrity, and I ask

the American people, lift up the curtain. We have the lights on right now. You actually see what is going on as we mark up this bill.

But I tell you what we're going to do. We're going to strengthen Medicare and Medicaid program requirements for provider, suppliers and contractors. No more willy-nilly rates and having no knowledge of how much things cost. I think there's a way of doing it. There is one position being proposed that some of us do disagree with, but I do believe that we can find a way to have common ground.

We'll require providers and suppliers to adopt compliance programs as a condition of participating in Medicare and Medicaid. We'll require Medicare and Medicaid integrity contractors that carry out audits and payments reviews. We're going to be looking at why are you charging this amount for renting something—I just saw an expose today about paying $1,200 to rent a wheelchair, and you can buy it for $300. Let's slash that out. Let's slash and burn that out. That's what we're going to be doing, and the American people should understand that.

Then we're going to improve screening of providers and suppliers. Create a national preenrollment screening program to determine whether potential providers or suppliers have been excluded from other Federal or State programs, that have revoked licenses; allow, in any state, enhanced oversight periods or enrollment moratoria in program areas determined to pose a significant risk of fraudulent activity; and require that only Medicare-enrolled physicians can order durable medical equipment or home health services paid for by Medicare. And a number of other checks that we are going to have.

This is a not a fool-around-type effort. This is going to be a serious effort.

May I share with you just a few other thoughts, and I will show you how our plan is going to be work. I am likewise very pleased to have been part of the CBC health task force for a number of years, but I, too, want to congratulate the Congressional Black Caucus health task force and DONNA CHRISTENSEN, who I believe is right now involved in marking up the bill.

We have worked for a long time as a Tri-Caucus on this issue called disparity, and since my colleague was speaking just a few moments ago about Native Americans and that public system, and you know what, I agree. It has not been the best. It hasn't been run by a health care system. It's run by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. We need to overhaul that as well.

A robust public option does not entail the kinds of abuses or misdiagnoses that my good friend was talking about. And let me tell you why the Tri-Caucus of Hispanic Caucus, African American Caucus—Congressional Black Caucus and Asian Pacific Caucus, includes Native Americans. And what we are going to be doing is ensuring that community-centric health efforts, particularly those that will expand access to care and improve the health and well-being of communities that are the hardest hit by health inequities—and that happens to be Native Americans among others—are integrated into health reform.

So as we improve health reform we'll be looking to fix the broken native American health system. It is broken: high rates of diabetes, high rates of heart disease, bad nutrition in many instances, not good care for children. We're looking at turning Americans, all Americans, on this soil into healthy, healthy individuals.

This is what I really like: prioritize prevention and public health promotion in both clinical and community settings. We couldn't have it any better. Recognizing that the traditional medical home has been the office of the family and other primary care provider, efforts must be undertaken to increase their numbers and the reimbursement, and they must be an integral part of this process.

These words are very important. Every measure must apply equitably to American Indian tribes and the territories, and barriers to Federal health programs and the territories must be eliminated. This comes out of the Tri-Caucus health care reform, and we are working to make sure that we get those elements in our particular health care reform.

I want to conclude by suggesting that after you see this health care plan, organizational chart of Republican health care plan—and we'll look forward to maybe something coming on this chart, but I think this is easy to read. This is the path to health care for all, and this has been done by my good friend. I am vice Chair of the Progressive Caucus.

□ 2045

We are working together. So this has been done by my good friend, KEITH ELLISON, Congressman ELLISON of the Progressive Caucus. And I believe that this is a straightforward, neutral presentation that anyone of whatever viewpoint they have that wants health care reform can understand how this can be the path to health care for all, every American.

Employer-based insurance, exactly what you have now, except costs less. No more discrimination for preexisting disease, and at least 85 percent of premiums must go to patient care. Would anybody refute and reject that? I think not.

Public programs—Medicare, Medicaid, CHIP—still available to children, seniors, and families below the poverty level. In fact, we're going to reinvigorate Medicare. We're going to make that vigorous and ensure that payments are made. Then, health insurance exchange, individual, small businesses, subsidized for up to 400 percent of the poverty level, which will include a public plan and private plan.

The good news is that small businesses—and small businesses can be one person that wants to go out and follow their dream. They want to be inventive. They want to be creative. They want to do what they had desired to do maybe from a child. Now they are without health insurance. Their families are without health insurance. Their mother that they may be taking care of, their father, their elderly relative is without health insurance. We give them the opportunity.

And so I want everyone to set their eyes on this as I come to a close about a very important point, and I hope that I can encourage you to be interested in this point, and that is the issue of physician-owned hospitals and specialty hospitals.

I am hoping that we will have an opportunity to recognize how important these hospitals are in care. For example, in the State of Texas, let me make it clear, the economic impact of physician-owned hospitals, which cover eight States, concluded that Texas physician-owned hospitals employ over 22,000 Texans, have a net economic impact of nearly $2.3 billion in Texas, and will pay approximately $86 million in taxes in 2009.

What are they? Many people believe that they are boutique hospitals. No, they're not. They're hospitals in the valley, where people in the valley of Texas—we call that south Texas—had no hospitals. They're a hospital in the heart of downtown Houston in the 18th Congressional District where the hospital was about to close, and it serves a population that some are below the poverty line, some are above it, but it is called St. Joseph Hospital. It was the only hospital that stayed open during Hurricane Ike. So we want to ensure that public hospitals or physician-owned hospitals have their fair chance.

Very briefly, the emergence of physician-owned special hospitals focusing on high-margin procedures have generated significant controversy; yet it is unclear whether physician-owned special hospitals differ significantly from nonphysician-owned specialty hospitals.

The scrutiny on this lacks significant merit. Our objective is to support physician-owned specialty hospitals that deliver a significant share of their services to underserved. That could be part of the criteria. Currently, the House Tri-Committee bill contains provisions that effectively eliminate these services. We would like to see a revision of that.

We have—when I say that many of us who represent these hospitals, I have visited them. I visited one that is in south Texas. It's state-of-the-art. People are healthier. Emergency rooms work, and it works.

I do want to conclude and share just a comment and yield to the gentlelady. I think this is my third one, but I am concluding.

I hope the bill will include a review or that we can review this issue of physician-owned general acute hospitals in

underserved areas. They should not be penalized.

I would like to make sure that we increase health care professionals—I think that is already in the bill—in underserved communities, and especially provide grants to secondary schools.

I came across a program in New York where a nurse by the name of Jose—I'll just call him Jose—is going out to high schools, taking his staff and doing mock operations and having them dress up in scrubs and getting high school and middle school students exposed to health care professionals. I like that idea, and I'd like to see it supported.

Provide tax incentives for the development community health care centers that are environmentally safe. Introduce language providing employers a tax credit to develop preventative services for all employees, and launch a pilot program that seeks to discover proven alternative medicine and also to address the question of abuse of prescription drugs.

Mr. Speaker and to Congresswoman FUDGE, let me thank you for the opportunity to share these thoughts and to be here to show the comparison between the work that's being done by the Democratic leadership and our caucus and the work that is being done or represented to be done by the critics who are, at this point, criticizing the plan.

Let's roll up our sleeves, let's work, and let's do what is right for America, a good health care reform package.

I yield to the gentlelady.

Ms. FUDGE. Thank you so much. I found very interesting the charts that you have there. I'm certainly hoping that people at home will see what we are trying to do for them. Certainly, I think it's important that they understand that our job is to represent them. Our job is to make sure that we can provide the best plan that is possible, and I believe that we are moving in the right direction to do that.

I certainly do want to talk a little bit more about small businesses. That has been a real issue in this Congress, as to what is going to happen with small employers once we move to a plan such as this.

Let me just say that I do sit on the Education and Labor Committee and was able to include an amendment, a very important amendment, that will provide small employers, those who have 100 employees or less, tools that can give them the resources and counseling to help them make better health care plan choices once this plan takes effect.

We want to keep our small businesses very strong. We know that small businesses represent 99 percent of all businesses in America and employ more than 53 percent of our Nation's workforce, so we cannot afford to not help our small businesses.

I don't know why people continue to say, Oh, we're not going to help small businesses. We indeed are. We all understand how important it is. We're going to help them when they have to make the important decisions about affordable health care and coverage for their employees.

I believe that this assistance will greatly reduce the chances of a small business choosing a health care plan that does not serve their interest or that of their employees.

I, too, want to thank the Congressional Black Caucus for their work, and Dr. DONNA CHRISTENSEN, who has worked so tirelessly on our bill, which is the Health Equity and Accountability Act of 2009, which was under her leadership.

But what they're talking about is making it easier for people who live in underserved communities to be a part of America and a part of what it means to be a healthy and well-rounded person in this country.

We're going to talk about improving workforce diversity, strengthening and coordinating data collection, which is so very, very important. We're going to ensure that there is some accountability, and we're going to improve the evaluation and information that comes back to us so that we can say, Yes, we are doing well, or, No, we need to change, or, We can get better at this area.

So we're going to work very, very hard to improve all health care services for all Americans.

I want to just thank you for spending some time with me. I certainly do believe that if we put together the kind of plan that is on this chart, then we're going to do what the American people want us to do.

We know that 72 percent of all Americans today want health care reform. I believe that if we want to do the job that people have sent us here to do—they have given us a direction. They have said we want health care reform, and I believe that it is incumbent upon us to provide that.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Will the gentlelady yield for a moment?

You have eloquently articulated, I think, what our marching orders should be. I would just like to add an addendum to the vastness of what we're doing.

I want to congratulate you for that amendment. With the rising number of seniors who are now reaching the point where good medicine is keeping them where they can be with their families, this bill is going to be looking at home care. We appreciate the vast network of nursing homes, but we're finding out that that's more efficient, to be able to keep seniors in their home, giving them good care.

I'm experiencing it firsthand with a senior mother who is lively at home and enjoys the neighbors but needs home care. And it's a very important aspect of our work. We're going to do that.

I love the expression or the emphasis on prevention. Why weren't we doing this before? We can then have a generation who has been engaged in preventative medicine, making them healthier middle-aged people or healthier seniors.

The other point I think is important is the returning soldiers that will be coming home—some on active duty. They do have a system of health care. It's called TRICARE. I'm very glad one of our hospitals has been named a TRICARE site, historically black hospital.

But we'll have all of those individuals that will be out and about needing health care, whether its veterans, whether it's through the TRICARE system, or whether or not they will be going to a civilian system. That is why health care is so important.

I yield back to the gentlelady by simply saying I'm proud to be able to stand by a system that responds to the needs of all Americans.

Today, I stand with my fellow colleagues in an unprecedented era, an era that can bring about change that all of us can believe in. During the 2008 campaign, the American people cast a vote for change, and in an unprecedented move elected Barack Obama as the 44th President. With his election, the country made a bold statement. They realized the Nation was in peril with skyrocketing costs—that were driving many in the 18th Congressional District and other throughout this country into bankruptcy.

Faced with these challenges, America decided to make a calculated risk of monumental reform. Today, as we tackle this reform of the Nation's health care system, we must not become idle spectators and allow any debate over policy divide our country and serve as an excuse to maintain the status quo. The fact is, those who are not eligible for Medicare, Medicaid, or any form of private insurance, in most cases end up in a dangerous position, uninsured. Today, there are over 47 million Americans uninsured.

I am required to alert the citizens of America that this single issue affects every single American and if we do not enact the appropriate kind of reform, Congress will have failed by giving the American people less than what they deserve.

The rising uninsured Americans and medical costs today are a direct link to the economic future of America. Healthcare reform is no longer a choice for Congress to make, it is a necessity. So I pose the question, what will be the reform needed to ensure a brighter future in our health care system? From a cost savings analysis, having a public option included in our reform is the least expensive option that will ensure quality affordable coverage for all Americans. In fact, the House Tri-committee bill has been confirmed to remain deficit neutral by the Congressional Budget Office.

The Public Option, similar to Medicare, will provide a publicly driven health care system, unique to the U.S. and separate from what is in place in any other country. The program will ensure: (1) Early and periodic screening, diagnosis and treatment; (2) Case management for chronic diseases; (3) Dental and mental health services; and (4) and even language access services.

The U.S. healthcare system is broken and if not remedied in the immediate future, consequences will be far greater than anything we

can measure. That is why many of us are fighting for reform to improve the health in every State, city, county, and American.

However, though a public plan will ensure so much, there are still some issues that need to be addressed in the Tri-Committee bill.

(1) Ensure physician owned general-acute hospitals that provide services in underserved communities are protected;

(2) support and strengthen language to increase health care professionals in underserved communities, especially provide grants to secondary schools in underserved communities;

(3) provide tax incentives for the development of Community Health Care Centers that are environmentally safe;

(4) introduce language to provide employers a tax credit to develop preventive services for all their employees;

(5) launch a pilot program that seeks to discover proven alternative medicine; and

(6) in the wake of ongoing abuse of prescription drugs, introduce language that will launch a Pilot Program to Reduce Abuses of Prescription Drugs.

This legislation will not be easy, but if we want true reform we must guarantee no one will fall through the cracks. This means solidifying every hole in our current health care system. In order to ensure this, allowing those hospitals that serve a high indigent patient base maintain daily operations. The emergence of physician owned hospitals has generated significant controversy. Yet, it is unclear whether physician owned hospitals differ significantly from those not owned by physicians. Currently the House Tri-Committee Bill, contain provisions that will effectively eliminate physician owned hospitals. ''The Economic Impact of Physician-Owned Hospitals in Eight States'' concluded that Texas physician-owned hospitals, which employ over 22,000 Texans, have a net economic impact of nearly $2.3 billion on Texas economy and will pay approximately $86 million in taxes in 2009.

St. Joseph Hospital is a general acute hospital, in Houston, TX, and the only hospital in the Houston area to remain totally operational throughout Hurricane Ike in September 2008. The limitations in the health care bill will particularly harm the hospital's ability to deliver much needed services to underserved communities. If a hospital like St. Joseph is eliminated, countless people in Houston will not receive adequate care. I seek to work with all my fellow colleagues, even those across the aisle to introduce language to exempt those hospitals like St. Joseph.

Achieving diversity in our health programs must include diversity in our health profession. We need to enact a system that includes people of every race, religion and socio-economic backgrounds. By proposing language that awards grants to the secondary education system in underserved areas to encourage students to seek health professions will improve our health care system. Encouraging young teens and young adults to pursue health care careers in areas of low population are often times only done through scholarships and grants to relieve those financial barriers that keep so many young children reaching for their dreams.

With the recent passage of the Clean Energy Act, a call for new advances in technology can be implemented in our health care system. Permitting incentives for the construction and renovation of community health centers to one of the four standards set by the National Green Building Association—Bronze, Silver, Gold, and Emerald, will ensure that the patients will be treated in an environmentally safe building. Increasing funding aims to improve the air quality and other environmental features of buildings used for the provision of health care services particularly targeting underserved communities.

While these services are great for physicians and the patients who see them, Americans are having a harder time preventing ever seeing a medical physician. Safeway has implemented a program that provides preventive services to their non-unionized employees. Based on the belief that rising health care costs are mostly driven by behavior (smoking, eating poorly, not checking your cholesterol, etc.), I seek to introduce language that will allow companies to establish a program that gives periodical screenings, questionnaires, prevention-related facilities like fitness clubs, along with advice and referrals to help improve behavior. Ensuring discounted premiums or refunds for those employees passing the screenings or showing improvement and establishing higher premiums for failing tests and no measurable improvement in behavior will hold people accountable and gives them incentives to live a healthy life style. This is the approach of Safeway, and it has kept Safeway's health care costs to $1 billion or so a year, mostly flat over the past five years. This achievement few other companies can claim.

When it comes to healthcare, just about everyone wants alternatives, especially options that include alternative and complementary medicine. This is why introducing an amendment to provide what a large majority of respondents expect healthcare providers to do is so important. The majority of society wants more research dedicated to alternative medicine, and believes insurers and Federal healthcare programs should cover the cost of those therapies. Seventy-seven percent of the public favor more research. I seek to work with my fellow colleagues to introduce an amendment to launch a pilot program to prove alternative medical treatments, medicine, and services are safe. In doing so legislation can be enacted and will ultimately lower costs and provide the majority of the population requested sources.

Though this reform seeks to improve the lives of every American citizen, it's important we consider every American citizen. In the sudden and tragic death of Michael Jackson, introducing language to study the abuse of prescription drugs by professional entertainers. Abuse of drugs often times has an impact that goes well beyond the individual performers, and frequently encourages impressionable young people to imitate this behavior. Depiction of such conduct in film and other video programming may also lead young people to mimic harmful behavior therein relating to prescription drugs. With this study, Congress can be guided on how best to address this dilemma and ensure the life of our children and celebrities alike.

It brings great joy that the Congressional Black Caucus are at the forefront to lead our country in taking the initial steps to secure our economic future, health of our society, and the ideals of our country. There are those who want to destroy our initiatives, seek to divide our country, and maintain the status quo, and I ask my fellow colleagues in Congress to ensure the quality of our life will not fall to the ideals of those who seek this effort. It's been a long time coming, but in this Congress and administration, America will now see a brighter day.

Ms. FUDGE. Let me say this as well as we talk about preventive health care. I do live in a community where we do have some of the best health care in the world. But what I also know is it costs three times as much to go to a hospital emergency room as it does to your doctor's office.

What I envision with this preventative care is people who now only see a doctor when they are so sick that they have to go to an emergency room will now go to see a physician on a regular basis, that they will go and have annual physical exams, they will go and have their mammograms, they will go and have their cancer treatments.

They will do that because it will be less expensive. They will have the health care to do it. We're going to make sure it is accessible because we're going to put money into these community clinics so that they can get to these clinics and go on a regular basis.

I just believe that if we do this, we're going to see a much healthier and happier America. We're going to be able to take care of our seniors, to take care of our children. I think it's going to make a huge difference in where we go as a Nation.

So I just want to be as supportive as you have been and as all of us are as we look at where we're going to take this country as it relates to health care.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I so much thank you for the opportunity to address you and this body, and I yield back the balance of our time.

DEMOCRAT'S VERSION OF HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the privilege to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the House and in the aftermath of the previous Special Order that has discussed primarily the health care and health insurance issue here in America.

I notice continually the expression ''health care'' gets substituted for the expression ''health insurance.'' There is a distinction. Everybody in America has access to health care, which means everybody in America has health care. Everybody in America does not have health insurance.

When we blend our verbiage, sometimes it's intentional and sometimes it's not. I catch myself occasionally using the wrong expression because our debates here blur the two. It's comparable to the situation when people say ''immigrants.'' They sometimes

mean illegal immigrants and sometimes they mean legal immigrants. Sometimes they mean legal and illegal immigrants. Well, health care and health insurance have been blended the same way, but there are distinctions.

We should remember, everybody in this country has access to health care. Everybody in this country that needs service will get service. We're talking about how we address those that are uninsured, not those that don't have access to health care or that do not have health care.

I thought it was interesting that the gentlelady from Texas put up the poster: Republicans' ideas on health care—or health insurance. I've forgotten which that is. I look back on last week, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) put up a poster that actually had about the same title to it. The gentlelady from Texas' poster was blank on Republican ideas and the gentleman from Ohio's poster was full of question marks on Republican ideas, but they were both generated by the same people. The Democrat majority caucus produces these posters that come here to the floor.

□ 2100

But we are full of all kinds of ideas. I am happy to talk about those ideas, Mr. Speaker. Some will say that you can't beat something with nothing, and I would submit that you can beat bad ideas with most anything. And a really, really bad idea is socialized medicine, national health care, HillaryCare, ObamaCare, United Kingdom Care, Canadian Care, European Union Care. All of that is bad stuff. Freedom is good stuff. I am all about freedom, and these proposals that are coming from the Democrat majority are about diminishing our freedom, about taking away our rights, about taking away our responsibilities and in the process of doing so, devolving downward the American vitality, the American Dream, the American can-do spirit.

What kind of American would sit around and wring their hands and say, Woe is me, I can't figure out how to take care of myself? Did anybody come to America and walk through the Great Hall at Ellis Island, thinking, I'm so glad I am here now in this welfare state where I don't have to worry about taking care of myself, woe is me no longer because the United States of America will take care of me?

That kind of people didn't come through Ellis Island. Ellis Island now is a tourist center. The United States of America is a welfare state. Now they sneak into the United States, thinking, Yes, America will take care of me. They think that they have now arrived at the giant ATM of the Western Hemisphere that will provide for everyone's wants and needs. And if they aren't so sure, they just have to listen to Congress here for a while, and somebody over on this side of the aisle, as a rule, will articulate some other defined want of some people that's not a need. But even though it's just a want, not a need, it will be declared to be a right and maybe even a constitutional right.

We have got to understand what we're doing here. It's real people that are working, real people that have jobs, real people that toil away to produce goods and services that have a marketable value; and they're being taxed day after day, month after month, tapping into the sweat of the brow of the salt of the Earth people in America.

They're being told, Your taxes won't increase. It will just be everybody else's taxes that increase and that ObamaCare is going to be a better deal than whatever care you have. But if you like yours, then you don't have to worry because if you like the health care you have, you get to keep it. That's what the President said, correct? If you like the health care or the health insurance—I'm not sure which phrase he was actually talking about—if you like it, you get to keep it.

The problem is, it's not true. The President of the United States, however powerful he is, cannot make that promise with any sense of confidence that he can keep that promise because it will not be the President that decides whether Wal-Mart, for example, keeps the health insurance programs that they have in place for their employees. That will be decided by the management of Wal-Mart who, a little over a week ago, announced that they would support an employer-mandated program that requires employers to provide health insurance for employees. Now once they made that decision, it didn't necessarily mean that they endorsed the Obama plan because it really isn't quite yet an Obama plan. There are only concepts throughout and some language that is moving through this House. But what it said was that they would endorse an employer-mandated plan.

Now that opens the door for Wal-Mart to be in a position to make the decision when the public option, the Federal Government-run health insurance policy would be set up to compete directly against the many hundreds of private health insurance policies that we have.

For the President to say, If you like your health insurance policy, fine, you get to keep it, you only get to keep it until there is an alternative there that might be a better alternative for your employer. Your employer, like Wal-Mart or any other proud private sector company that's there that is providing health insurance for a majority of their employees, will be making a decision on whether they want to opt into the public plan or they want to maintain the private plan; but also the newly-to-be-named health insurance czar will be writing some new rules for every single health insurance company in America.

Now that lays the backdrop for what was said over this last hour and the way we need to be thinking about what transpired here within the last hour. However, I've also come here to talk about a number of different things.

One of them is that if we remember correctly, Speaker PELOSI came to this Congress, and she said that she was going to drain the swamp. She was going to drain the swamp of corruption and alleged that there was corruption. Night after night a team would come down here for years—I would say 2 or 3 or 4 years—and make allegations about certain Members of Congress, allegations about the motives of certain Members of Congress. The comments about the culture of corruption was fairly baffling to me. You can point to examples on either side. But NANCY PELOSI pledged that she would produce the most open Congress in history and that there would be legitimate debate, and there wouldn't be favorites being played.

Now here is an example of what NANCY PELOSI said. She said, ''I don't want to have legislation that is used as an engine for people to put on things that are not going to do what we are setting out to do, which is to turn this economy around. I have the most to prove with this package. The choices we are making are those that will work, that must work. Our economy requires it. America's families need it. This is urgent.'' That's Speaker NANCY PELOSI, January 25, 2009, this year, the end of January.

That was her statement about how we were going to direct the efficiency of the stimulus plan to doing what's good for our economy. We're going to turn this economy around. Well, I came down to the floor and put up this very same picture. This very same picture is of a saltwater marsh harvest mouse. This is the saltwater marsh harvest mouse. It's a mouse that Speaker PELOSI has been trying to get special earmarks for for a long time. And as she has been resisted on that, I pointed out that in the stimulus package, there were $32 million set aside for the saltwater marsh harvest mouse. I came to the floor with a picture of this mouse and the numbers up on top.

Of course, the spokespersons for the Speaker, the defenders of the status quo, and the defenders of the person that was going to come here and clean up this Congress, the one who has now established the most draconian Congress, I believe, in history, the one that is the least deliberative body in history, the one who has launched an all-out assault on this deliberative democracy and said that she didn't have an earmark in the stimulus bill for this saltwater marsh harvest mouse and others in her defense said, Steve King made it up. He just pulled a number out of the air and made an allegation that there was an earmark in there for the saltwater marsh harvest mouse.

However, now here we are far enough down the road, here are the real facts: the $32 million has been reduced to $16.1 million. Now the saltwater marsh harvest mouse not only has his own special earmark of $16.1 million, it sets aside his brackish little marsh down there by San Francisco so that he can

hop around in it and sets aside a marsh down there near San Francisco at the cost of $16.1 million, Madam Speaker, which is no economic stimulus plan.

We're going to do the things that count. We're going to do the things that do the most for the economy. The language here: turn this economy around. We're going to do that by setting aside a hopping zone for a pet project here. This little pet, the saltwater marsh harvest mouse, he gets an earmark. You can't quite see it there, but he needs that ear notched a little bit because now he is a $16.1 million earmark.

All this borrowing, expanding the debt to the American people, the American taxpayers and Americans not yet born, to where the debt for every man, woman and child in America today totals up to over $37,000 per individual. Still their hearts are hardened, and still they want to raise the debt, and still they want to spend money on frivolous projects that don't have a merit that affects the people that are paying the taxes, nor could a project like that ever gain the support of the majority of the people in this Congress.

This is like the little mouse bridge to nowhere, $16.1 million for the little pet project, notched little earmark, the saltwater marsh harvest mouse, the pet project of Speaker PELOSI. She said she came here to clean up this process to make sure that there weren't favorites, and President Obama went on at great length about how he wasn't going to sign any bill that had any earmarks in it. Then he signed a bill with about 9,000 earmarks in it, and then President Obama made other remarks about the integrity of the process.

Yet we've seen earmark after earmark, billions and billions of dollars that have been unfolded here going on our debt, stacking it up against the American people. We've seen a process that has been shut down where we get surprise bills that get dropped on us. The stimulus package was a last-minute drop on us, and we could count not days but hours of reading and understanding what's in a bill. Thinking in terms of 1,000 or more pages with 8 or 10 hours to read the bill and then try to analyze all that it means when bills reference other sections of existing code, they reference definitions that exist in other places; and then if you get something like that read through, you also have to figure out what's not in it, what's missing, what's been omitted and, furthermore, what are the implications of what is in it, and what are the implications of what's missing.

That's why we need the public. There is no one person—in fact, all 435 Members of this House of Representatives do not have among them, even if given enough time, the ability to analyze the implications of big pieces of legislation on their own, not without our staff, not without our constituents, not without people that have a direct responsibility for the components of the legislation that affects them the most.

Good legislation is written by Members of Congress that go out among the districts and among the real people that are working for a living and paying real taxes out of their income and their profits, taking a look at the circumstances of what's right and what's wrong, listening to the proposals that come from them and putting together careful legislation that brings about a right result.

Once that's put together, and then you float that out to get the input from Democrats and Republicans; and it isn't just the input from the people that sit in these seats, Mr. Speaker. It's the input from the American people that talk to the people that sit in these seats who make the difference. When you short-circuit this process, when you take this process and bypass the committee process or do a mock markup, a sham markup in a committee process and pass a bill out and then do a bait-and-switch and bring a different bill to the floor than passed out of the committee—and it has happened at least three times this year, a different bill came to the floor than was passed out of the committee because they didn't like an amendment that actually passed in the committee—they don't seem to understand that the job of the Speaker or the job of the Chair of a committee is to bring out the will of the group. That's the essential responsibility of someone who is the Speaker or someone who is the Chair of a committee, bring out the will of the group.

It's not to impose their will on the group but to bring out the will of the group even when the Chair of the committee recognizes that there are good ideas coming before the committee but maybe it doesn't exactly fit the politics that they've been directed to bring about out of committee, and when an amendment comes out of committee like, example for, an amendment that would have blocked all funding to ACORN to have the Chair afterwards change the language, send a different bill or a different piece of substance to the floor of the House of Representatives, and the Members here have a right to have full confidence that the bill that comes to the floor reflects the product of the committee, too often it does not.

The window for reading a bill and debate and deliberation has been so short that on the cap-and-trade bill, that big bill of 1,100 pages that we had a very short time to digest, was brought to the floor, was filed, scheduled for debate; and at 3:09 a.m. there was a 316-page amendment to an 1,100 page bill that was dropped into the RECORD at 3:09 a.m.; and that morning we took the bill up.

□ 2115

And we are to debate and deliberate and understand and evaluate with good judgment and due diligence the implications, ramifications and factors that come out of one of the biggest, most important bills in the history of this Congress? I believe Congress made, the House of Representatives made the most colossal mistake ever made in the history of this House. Three hundred sixteen pages at 3:09 a.m. on an 1,100-page bill. If you wanted to read it, no one had a chance to read it. No one had an opportunity to evaluate it. It was a surprise tactic. Actually, it wasn't a surprise. We have gotten to the point where we expect those kinds of tactics. But that is bad policy. If you are passing legislation that cannot withstand the light of day, it should be pretty clear that it must be bad legislation, and the American people will reject it.

To read a bill and have time to read a bill, I would direct, Mr. Speaker, your attention, and the public's attention, to section 108 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 which reads in part, A measure or matter reported by any subcommittee shall not be considered in the House unless the report of that committee, upon that Member or matter, has been available to the Members of the House for at least 3 calendar days. And that is 3 calendar days prior to the consideration of that Member or matter in the House of Representatives.

We have a law, Mr. Speaker, we have a law that requires 3 calendar days to read a bill. But Mr. Speaker, the ''saltwater marsh'' Speaker, the ''personal earmark for brackish wetlands'' Speaker, insists that a bill can come to the floor, and it can be a bill that no one has seen, it can be one that is written in the Speaker's office, and it can have an amendment right behind it written also in the Speaker's office just as a surprise tactic, and before the public can understand what is going on, actually before they can even believe someone would tear asunder this deliberative body in the process, it is an act of the House of Representatives messaged over to the Senate, and on the cap-and-trade bill, the 1,100 pages sat down here, the 309 pages didn't. And when the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) asked the question, do we have a bill before us that is the subject of our debate? The answer that came from the Speaker's chair was—I don't remember exactly, but I remember the response: Well, we don't quite have it yet, but everyone knows what we are talking about.

So after many exchanges, finally, we suspended the operation for about 35 minutes while we went through this exchange of trying to determine, what is the subject of our debate? Shouldn't the House of Representatives have, even if no one else can get their hands on the paperwork or the electronic version, shouldn't the United States House of Representatives have at least one copy of the subject? Have got a dictionary over here, a big unabridged dictionary. It is there if someone were to argue about what the English language is. But we are here arguing about a bill that no one can look up and read. No one can verify if we are accurate. The

bill's amendment was not here. The bill was. The amendment wasn't. Later they brought the amendment down and began to integrate it. It takes a long time to integrate 316 pages into 1,100 and to get it right.

And the question was asked, If this bill passes the House and it is not available for inspection by any Members of the House, is it possible for us to message over to the Senate if it doesn't exist at the time of its passage? Well, somehow, we did. But it shouldn't be possible. The process has to be right.

We should follow the law. We should follow this section of the law that is section 108 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970. That is one of the laws we should follow. We should follow the law of common decency and respect for each other and respect for the process and the Founding Fathers and for the Constitution and do due diligence and not put generational legislation up and pass it because there was a political momentum to get it done before anybody can see what it is that we are actually doing here and do it sometimes in the middle of the night.

I would be really happy to yield to the gentlelady from Minnesota, who I know has been very engaged in these issues and on top of helping to clean up some of the open doors that are here for the culture of corruption that exists under this leadership of the House of Representatives.

I yield so much time as she may consume to the gentlelady of Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN).

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa for this moment just to be able to speak about what is happening here in Washington, D.C. I don't think anyone has ever seen anything like what we have seen in the recent months, and we can even trace it back to last fall when the Democratic Congress could not wait to get passed the TARP funding bill together with the former Bush administration.

They were in a hurry, just like the gentleman from Iowa has stated. We are seeing that this is a Congress that is in a hurry, in a hurry because they have got an agenda. They are on a steamroller path. They are on a blitzkrieg path. They have to get everything done yesterday. We can't have time to read bills. We can't take time to truly count the costs, because we are in a hurry. There is an agenda that has to be performed.

We heard the President of the United States tell the Democrat Caucus just last week, We can't miss this opportunity for reform. We have got to get it done. We have to do it now. We can't wait. We have got to do everything now. That is what we were told last fall. We were told that we would see economic Armageddon if we didn't pass the $700 billion TARP bill.

What was that? That was a blank check. We were told, Just trust me. It was a ''trust me'' defense. We were told, Just trust the Treasury Secretary. They have to have $700 billion, or we will see an absolute collapse of the financial world. And so we were all pushed into it. I voted ''no'' on that bill. But the Democratic-controlled Congress passed the $700 billion bailout for the banking system and also for the foreclosure and the subprime mess that we are in.

Well, where are we at today with the subprime mess? We are seeing foreclosures still at a record high. We are seeing unemployment still at a record high. Did this help us, this $700 billion blank check that went to the Secretary of the Treasury? What did that lead to?

Well, President Obama was all for the TARP bailout when it came, when he was Senator Obama, and then we saw in December when he was President-elect Obama, he prevailed upon the President. He said, We can't wait, we have got to hurry. We can't wait until January until I'm sworn in as President. I'm asking you, President Bush, to release to the Automobile Task Force something like $17 billion so we can bail out GM and so we can bail out Chrysler, because it has to be done today. We can't wait until January when I'm sworn in. It has got to be done today.

So President Bush gave that $17 billion to the Automobile Task Force at President-elect Obama's request. And we all know what happened. We saw what happened to Chrysler. It essentially collapsed in a shotgun wedding to Fiat. A foreign car company was brought in and forced to purchase and buy out Chrysler. We saw the bondholders, whose rights were virtually stripped away from Chrysler, and we saw the UAW instead jump in front of the bondholders and take advantage of that position, and now the Federal Government and the UAW and Fiat own that company.

What happened to GM? We saw that UAW owns that company and the Federal Government now, as of the Friday before last, is the 61 percent shareholder. What did that get us? One hundred fifty thousand jobs lost. Because we saw pink slips go to 3,400 dealers of Chrysler and GM across the country, and 150,000 people, potentially, are out of work. Well, then we had to get the stimulus passed, the largest spending package in the history of our country, $1.1 trillion. Think of that: $1.1 trillion. But it had to be done today. And we didn't have time to read that bill, oh, no, sir. We can't read that bill because this is too important. President Obama told us we had to pass that bill.

The bill was passed by Congress. I voted against it. Representative KING voted against the stimulus bill. But President Obama had to have that bill. Well, did he sign it? No. He went to Chicago. He went to play basketball. He took 4 days, rather than passing this bill he had to have in his hands, because he had to have this $1.1 trillion stimulus bill.

Well, we didn't get that bill very much ahead of time either, and it was a little bit embarrassing because of all the earmarks that bill contained. Oh, we weren't told they were earmarks, but they were earmarks nonetheless. All sorts of special projects were in that bill.

Then we were told we had to pass the budget bill, an 8 percent increase over the previous budget bill. We had to pass it right away. We couldn't wait and have extra time for debate, no, no, no. We had to pass that bill now because otherwise bad things might happen.

Well, what has happened? What happened as a result of the stimulus bill? We were told if we didn't pass that stimulus bill, we could see 8 percent unemployment. Wouldn't that be terrible? What is unemployment today? Nine point five percent. In the State of Michigan it is 15.2 percent. What about jobs? What about all the jobs that were created? Two million jobs have been lost since the stimulus bill was put forward. One hundred fifty thousand jobs were lost because the government got involved in GM and Chrysler and handed out pink slips. This isn't going real well for us.

Then cap-and-trade, cap-and-tax, the ultimate authority that government could have over every person's life in the United States. Literally, every time we flick on a switch, it will be the government telling us how much we are going to pay to flick on that switch, or if we can even have the power to do that. Cap-and-trade, the mother of all bills, and we got that bill 13 hours before we passed that bill. Thirteen hours before, 1,100 pages, but don't worry, trust me. Trust me. It will bring good things to this country. And what will that give us? We already know. Two and one half million jobs a year leave the United States. We might as well call it the ''China-India stimulus plan'' because we are going to lose 2.5 million jobs, bye bye, away they go, out of the United States.

And then what is the next bill we have in front of us? Well, an article today in the newspaper says that on this health care bill that we are looking at, that by the way, we have got to pass, it was revealed last week, here it was, 1,018 pages long, that the next day Members of Congress had to vote on it, and the House Ways and Means Committee revealed to the public that the next day we need to be prepared to vote on a 1,018-page bill.

Mr. Speaker, it isn't that Members of Congress are lazy. And it isn't that Members of Congress are too stupid to be able to read these bills. It is the fact that the Democrat leadership in this House is unwilling to allow us to read the bills. We even had the majority leader, STENY HOYER, probably in an accident, admit that if many Members of this body actually read the bills, there probably would be very few votes. As a matter of fact, the gentleman from Iowa has the quote of the majority leader, and it says ''If every Member pledged to not vote for the health

care bill if they hadn't read it in its entirety, I think we would have very few votes.''

I would agree with the leader. I think that there would be very few votes if Members of Congress would read this bill. That is why the Obama administration and the Democrat leadership are steamrolling these bills through before anyone has time to be able to read it because they know, as was written in the paper today, this is by Christina Romer, President Obama's Council of Economic Advisers chairwoman, she said that this bill will cost employers $300 billion. It will cost workers 5 million jobs. Well, let's think about that now. Five million jobs from health care loss, and that doesn't include the taxes that would be put on small businesses, so it is 5 million there, 2.5 million from cap-and-trade, that is every year though, and then 2 million from the stimulus, 150,000 from GM and Chrysler. I don't think we are going in the right direction.

And this is from a President who said that he wouldn't be raising taxes on 95 percent of the American people. Unfortunately, it appears that that promise has already been broken.

I yield back to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentlelady from Minnesota. And I can't help but reflect that the President's earliest promise on this stimulus package was that he would create or save 3.5 million jobs and that got lowered down to 2 million jobs altogether. But the instant those words came out of his mouth, I thought, why would someone say ''create or save?'' ''Create or save,'' what does that mean? What would be the point of a promise that he would ''create or save'' 3.5 million jobs? And the answer, of course, is that if you say, I will create 3.5 million jobs, then you have to identify which jobs it is that you have created. Was it Caterpillar who he said had actually signed on with him in his stimulus plan? Was that an assumption on the part of President Obama? So where are these jobs that you would create? You would have to point to them and get a CEO that said, Yes, because of this stimulus plan, I have opened up this new production line, and here are 20,000 jobs here, and you add them all up, and you have to come up with 3.5 million. But if you say ''create or save'' jobs, you can always point to existing jobs and claim that you have saved them.

So in the analysis of his rationale, if someone is going to create or save 3.5 million jobs, if they are remaining, if they haven't been laid off except for the last 3.5 million and you can say, Oh, yes, they are the ones I saved. I saved the 3.5 million that were left, even though we may have lost 137.5 million jobs in the process, and he would be telling the truth.

This is a situation where we have the master of ambiguity. We do have the master of mesmerization going on at the same time. People hear what they want to hear because the language is crafted to speak to our hearts instead of our heads.

□ 2130

When he says I'll create or save 3½ million jobs, that is mostly on the save side, not on the create side, because this has gone south in a sad way. And we've seen our unemployment go from the promise that it could go above 8 percent to 9.5 percent. How many people is that, Mr. Speaker?

Well, the number is 14½ million unemployed. That's the ones on the unemployment roll. Then there's another 5.8 million people that don't qualify for unemployment that are looking for a job. So you add the total up to that, and it isn't hard to get up in that number of over 20 million.

And there was an article written just the other day. I believe it was in National Review. I've forgotten the name of the author that had done the calculation of this. And the projection was that it's closer to 25 million people unemployed, especially when you account for those that are underemployed, those that have seen their hours reduced.

So we have had the data that shows that unemployment, the extended period of time that people are claiming unemployment is longer than it's been. I believe the number is the longest it's been in 48 years of unemployment. And at the same time that was extended, the length of unemployment benefits, we've also seen people who are working fewer hours per week. So we have a lot of underemployed that don't qualify yet as unemployed.

This economy that's here completely misunderstands what this economy is about. This is the experiment of the Keynesian economists on steroids; the people that believe that you can borrow money to no end, grow government to no end, replace private sector jobs with government jobs, and stimulate the economy with borrowed tax dollars, and buy goods that are made in China and borrow money from the Chinese to buy them.

This whole circle doesn't work. You have to produce things that have value, and you have to lay out the truth when you do it.

I want to go back to this statement that I made earlier, and just very briefly point out section 108 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 that says this. And without reading all that language through, it says, 3 days to read a bill or we're not going to take it up on the floor. That's the law. That's the law, but apparently the Speaker of the House isn't bound by the law, and I hope that there was a way to enforce that. And I actually don't know how we enforce such a law. Republicans are doing all they can do, everything they can do procedurally.

This is the quote, of course, from the majority leader that said, if every Member read the bill, well, there wouldn't be a bill because they would come to grips with their senses or else the public would make sure that they did.

This is a list of the bills that were rushed through to the floor, and many of them were addressed by the gentlelady from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN). But here in the 111th Congress, every controversial bill passed by the House has been forced through in less than 3 days, in violation of this section of the code here. In less than 3 days. Every one has violated this section 108 of the code, every one of these controversial bills.

And to take you through them, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2000, the stimulus bill. I guess I didn't really know what the real name was. The stimulus bill, $787 billion that was rammed through in less than 3 days. Violation of public law 108, section 108.

Children's Health Insurance Program, SCHIP, rammed through, and this violates the very principle that SCHIP was established on in the first place, and it's designed to bring about, to close the gap so that we end up with a mandatory national health care act. It's one of the incremental changes that are there. They actually passed out of this House a bill that was 400 percent of poverty, that would have paid people's health insurance so that children in families making over $102,000 in Iowa, and some of those families would have been paying the alternative minimum tax, in fact, 70,000 families in America would have been, well actually in the end, are paying the alternative minimum tax even though their children's health insurance is paid for because SCHIP is designed to pay health insurance on children whose families can't afford it.

So, $102,000. Tax them some extra in the rich man's alternative minimum tax. And we tax them so much they can't afford to provide health insurance for their children, so we buy them health insurance, and we rush the bill through. And by the way, in there it opens up the door for Medicaid to provide health care for illegals under Medicaid. That rule was also changed in this and the data that I put out holds up to be fact.

The Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act of 2007. That was the bill where Lilly Ledbetter alleged that she was discriminated against in a job way back some years ago. There was a statute of limitations on that bill, on the legislation that she sought to sue her employers under. The statute of limitations had expired, long past. And still Democrats argued that, even though the Supreme Court upheld the statute, that they thought it just wasn't fair. The old ''it ain't fair'' brothers got at it again and decided that they wanted to change the rules after the fact.

I'm okay with changing the rules after the fact, as long as it doesn't affect the people that were living under the law at the time, during the fact. But this was retroactive. This was like

double jeopardy for the taxpayers. And the Lilly Ledbetter Act rammed through this Congress.

The Paycheck Fairness Act, rammed through Congress. Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009, rammed through. Omnibus Appropriations Act of 2009, the big stacked bill that runs the government when you're afraid to do appropriations in a legitimate way, rammed through. No amendments either, by the way.

Then, to impose an additional tax on bonuses received from the TARP's AIG bonuses. So we had to ram through TARP, and then when the rules weren't written in TARP with any oversight, then AIG decided to pay millions of dollars of bonuses to people that worked for them, retention bonuses they were. But 11 of the people no longer worked for AIG. They got part of the millions in retention bonuses, too. That had to be rammed through because Democrats were vulnerable to public criticism because they had passed legislation that opened the door, and they rammed legislation through quickly so there wasn't an opportunity to evaluate, debate, amend or scrutinize. And the result was hundreds of millions of dollars paid off to provide retention bonuses for AIG executives, at least 11 of whom didn't work for AIG anymore. So we had to pass some legislation to take the public's pressure off of the people that opened up the door for that legislation. So that was that.

The Supplemental Appropriations Act of 2009, rammed through. The American Clean Energy and Security Act, which, I'm sure—yeah, here we are. The cap-and-tax bill, rammed through. All of these major bills rammed through in violation of public law section 108. Three days to read the bill. That's the law.

You know, they've got the votes to repeal any piece of legislation that's been passed by any previous Congress. When you've got the votes to do that, you would think you have—remember the audacity of hope that comes from the White House? You would think you'd at least have the audacity to change the law instead of violate it. That's what I'm seeing here in this Congress, and it really irks me to see people do this to our Congress and to our system.

This is the President's promise. I spoke to it but not—I didn't quote it. The President said, We need sunlight before signing bills. Too often bills are rushed through Congress and to the President before the public has the opportunity to review them. As President, I will not sign any nonemergency bill without giving the American public an opportunity to review and comment on the White House Web site for 5 days. Barack Obama.

Does that sound like anything we've seen him do?

Mrs. BACHMANN. If the gentleman would yield.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I'd yield.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I'm wondering what he means by that, by 5 days. Does that mean that once the bill gets to the President, he'll allow it just to rest on his desk for 5 days? People would have a chance to comment?

But it also seems, the public law that the gentleman from Iowa displayed, Members of Congress are supposed to be able to get a chance, too. I think this is wonderful that the President wants the American people to have 5 days to be able to read a bill, but I think it would be wonderful if Members of Congress could have 5 days to read a bill before we vote on it. After all, maybe we should all take an Evelyn Wood speed reading course, because if we have to read over 1,000 pages or 1,100 pages in a bill in 13 hours, we're going to need to have maybe those recordings where they're sped up a little bit so it sounds like Alvin and the Chipmunks reading a bill to us. I don't know what it's going to take, but Members of Congress should also have the opportunity to be able to read the bills, and to do that, we need to have time, too. So this doesn't say much.

If President Obama says that a bill should just maybe be on his desk for 5 days, if Members of Congress aren't also given that courtesy, after all, we are the people's representatives. We're sent here on behalf of the people back home to read these bills, talk about these bills between Republicans and Democrats. Isn't that what we're supposed to do, talk to each other, talk about what our ideas are, what the ideas on the other side of the aisle are, make the bill a little bit better, then put it on the floor?

Maybe part of the problem, I wonder, is the fact that we're just trying to do things a little too fast. That's what it seems like to me, that maybe this Congress is trying to rush through too much too fast. Maybe that's why we have a greater deficit than we've ever seen before.

We ran out of money in April. Back in April, this Congress spent all the money that it had in its budget already in April. So every day we've been spending billions and billions and billions, every single day that we don't have. And so now, today, it's July, we're already over $1 trillion in deficit. We're going to be nearly $2 trillion in deficit.

And here's something else I don't understand. The President is supposed to release, in mid-July, the budget update. We have the numbers already, but the President has said he's going to wait until mid-August to release his budget update.

Now, this is a little concerning to me, a little fishy to me, because we're being told, Mr. Speaker, that in less than 2 weeks' time the President of the United States expects that we will pass legislation that would allow the Federal Government to take over 17 percent of the private economy.

Now, there was an economist from Arizona State University 2 weeks ago on the front page of the Washington Times who wrote an article that said, we now have the Federal Government, for the first time, having control or owning 30 percent of all private business profits in this country. Thirty percent of all private business profits in America are owned or controlled by the Federal Government today.

If President Obama and if the Democrat-controlled Congress gets their way, that will be an additional 17 percent.

Now, this President's only been in office for 6 months, and already 30 percent of the private business profits are owned or controlled by the Federal Government. Now, by August 1st he wants to make that 47 percent? I certainly hope we can read these bills first before we're asked to do that.

I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentlelady from Minnesota. And as you talk about that percentage, 30 percent, the private business profits in the country, who would have been believed a year ago or 8 or 9 months ago, who would have believed that eight huge private sector entities would be nationalized by this administration?

We have three large investment banks nationalized by this administration, one large company, AIG Insurance, nationalized. Fannie and Freddie used to be private, became a government-sponsored enterprise, and now they're wholly owned by the Federal Government, with about $100 billion dropped into each and about $5.5 trillion in contingent liabilities wrapped up in Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. And of course we have General Motors, 61 percent, and Chrysler a smaller percentage. I don't remember that exact number.

But then you've got, also, the Canadians that own about 12½ percent of General Motors and the unions that own 17½ percent of General Motors. There's not a lot left out there for the bondholders, the people that were the secured creditors, because they got aced out.

Who would have thought eight huge entities, hundreds of billions of dollars, and taking these companies off, out of the private sector and put them into the hands of government control?

And the President fires the CEO of General Motors and hires his guy, Fritz. And the President cleans out the board of directors at General Motors and appoints all but two of the board of directors of General Motors.

And then he says, the President says, I'm not interested in the day-to-day operations of General Motors. I don't think we should be running the place. I don't want to do the nationalization of this. It is just something that we have to do.

And here's the irony of it. President Obama was elected at least in part because he attacked George Bush for going into Iraq and not having an exit strategy. Now, President Obama has gone in and nationalized these eight

huge private sector companies that I have listed here, and he says he doesn't want to be nationalizing and he doesn't want to be in the day-to-day operations, but he names the CEO, replaces the board of directors. His car czar is on the phone every day with the chairman of the board of General Motors, sometimes multiple times a day. Well, that was the former car czar. We don't know what the future car czar is going to be. We've got 32 czars.

□ 2145

The President is in the formerly private sector. He got invested in all of that. He found a crisis, capitalized on it: nationalized. Now, I have read the Web page for the Democratic Socialists of America. That is exactly their plan. It is in print. In fact, it's more aggressive than on their own Web site. The President has nationalized proud private-sector corporations, and he has done so without an exit strategy.

All at the same time, he has been critical of President Bush for not having an exit strategy in Iraq. President Bush's exit strategy in Iraq is in print. It's called the SOFA Agreement, the Status of Forces Agreement, negotiated and agreed to by President George W. Bush. The exit strategy for Iraq was victory, victory with honor, victory and leave a legacy of a self-governing democracy of a moderate country that could govern themselves and that could control their own national destiny.

All of that is in place today, and President Obama is carrying out the exit strategy of George Bush to the letter, spelled out in the Status of Forces Agreement, without a peep in the media about what's going on over there. All they talk about is we're deploying out of Iraq. No, we're deploying out of Iraq cities back to the bases because the surge worked.

Now, President Bush had an exit strategy. He didn't talk about it completely because he had to be a little flexible. He carried out his exit strategy. He ordered the surge. He negotiated the SOFA Agreement. He handed over an Iraq in a war that was won. The war was won on the day that Barack Obama took the oath of office here just outside these doors, and now it needs to be sustained and maintained. Afghanistan is a lot harder, but there is an exit strategy in place set by George Bush. There is no exit strategy for these eight private companies that have been nationalized by President Obama.

When I see the picture of President Obama standing next to Hugo Chavez and when they ask me what that tells me, I say, you know, the chief nationalizer is our guy, not their guy. Our guy has nationalized more companies and more billions of dollars' worth of privately held assets than Hugo Chavez ever dreamed of doing—well, at least within the last year. Chavez might have added a bit more companies over time, but so far this year, he has only taken out one Cargill rice plant, and has nationalized that in Venezuela.

It is a chilling thought to think of how fast this Nation has lurched to the left. We've leaped off of the abyss, and we've got to figure out how to fly to get back to where we are in the free markets again.

So I would be happy to yield to the gentlelady from Minnesota to pick up from there.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

There is a lot to contemplate when we're talking about this national takeover of health care. The gentleman has every reason to be concerned because, when the government takes over an area of American national life as we have seen, the American people are the ones who lose control and who lose choice over their economic destinies.

Here is one thing we've been hearing about from the Speaker of the House. She has been talking about how this nationalization of health care will be paid for through prevention, that we'll have new prevention in place that will keep Americans healthier and that we will realize something like over $500 billion in savings in prevention.

Well, where is it? Itemize it. What is it that we aren't doing now that we're going to see dramatically occur in prevention? It isn't there.

It's not going to materialize because we know where the savings will come from. It will come from the Federal bureaucracy, and we have the Federal bureaucracy that's contained in the bill that the Democrats have put forward. This big mess that's on this chart shows 32 new Federal Government agencies. This is what will stand between any American and his doctor. So think of an American standing on that side of the paper with 32 bureaucracies. You've got to get through this labyrinth, Mr. Speaker, before you can get to your physician.

Now, is this what Americans want?

A study was just completed that showed that 89 percent of Americans today are happy with the health care that they receive. Another study that was done said 77 percent of Americans are happy with the health care that they receive. Now, that doesn't mean that our health care system is perfect. It isn't. One of the greatest things that we can do is to make all Americans' medical expenses deductible on their insurance. That would be something great that we could do for the American people because the biggest problem in health care today is not access; it's the cost. Health care premiums are going through the roof. Well, what can we do?

We could change the Tax Code, and we could allow Americans to purchase their health care the same way they purchase their car insurance—across State lines, buy in pools, bring down the price, have true competition, and allow small clinics like the MinuteClinics, for instance in Minnesota, to be set up all across the United States. Have health savings accounts so that you control your own costs, and you take it with you. The government doesn't own your health care. You do.

Mr. Speaker, this is the plan that President Obama wants for the American people, a great labyrinth of bureaucracy. How are you ever going to get your health care if you've got to go through this bureaucracy?

One thing we know about bureaucracies is they justify their own existences, and they all make a lot of money. The average Federal employee today makes about $75,000 a year plus benefits. There are a lot of people out there who would love to make $75,000 a year. Well, we're creating 32 new bureaucratic agencies. This is nonsense. This is about a government-created welfare bureaucracy. That's what this is about. It's not about insuring more Americans, because even under the Democrats' own forecast, not all Americans are even going to be covered.

Potentially, about half of the people who are uninsured now can afford to pay for that insurance. Of the other half who can't afford it, we have a good amount of people who are under 35 who are in very temporary situations. About a third of those people are illegal aliens. Truly, only somewhere between 12 and 16 million people aren't insured. That out of 305 million? Surely, we can find an answer for them.

Why wreck the health care that 89 percent of Americans say they like so that we can give government control over 17 percent of the American economy? Why do we want to do this?

This is President Obama's vision for American health care. It's not what Americans want. There is no savings extracted out of prevention, not to the level that they're talking about. We need to get real about health care, and that's why the American people need to melt the phone lines of their Members of Congress. They need to let them know what they think about this plan before it's too late.

I yield back to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentlelady from Minnesota.

Having seen the Technicolor, modern version of the National Health Care Act that has been delivered to us courtesy, so far, of a committee or two here in the House of Representatives, I went back through the archives and dusted off this scary concept here. Some will look at this and will recognize what this is:

This is the 1993–1994 HillaryCare version. This is a copy of the poster that is the precursor to the full color one that Mrs. BACHMANN put up. This poster was on my wall in my construction office back in those years, and it actually hung there for years. I hung it there for years as a reminder to me of what they could cook up if you put people in a room and closed the door.

Remember, this was a secret process, too. It was driven about the same way.

It's a process that they don't want the American people to weigh in on, so they met in secret week after week with all of this intensity and with all of these—Ira Magaziner, do you remember that name? Harold Ickes was another one. These people were meeting in there. They were smart people. They put smart people in a room. I can tell you what happens when you put a whole lot of smart people together and you give them an assignment, Mr. Speaker. Highly intelligent people will always overcomplicate things. The reason they do that is, otherwise, there wouldn't be any particular advantage to being highly intelligent.

So you could just go down to the simple solution to the complex problems and let human nature take over, and all would go on just fine. But, no, we put highly intelligent people in place, and these are generally liberal elitists who are working to try to create this utopia here on Earth because they do think that is the ''be all and end all'' for them. It is not for us.

So here is the HillaryCare version. I look down through this list, and there are some things that concern me a lot: the Regional Health Alliance, the ombudsman. Why do you need him? You need another ombudsman here. The Accountability Health Plan, that sounds really familiar. I think that might be different lingo there. The HMO provider plan, I don't know that that's in there. HMOs were de rigueur then, but now they have reached a little bit of criticism. Here is one, the global budget. Why do you need a global budget to provide national health care?

So of all of these things on this schematic, this schematic, this scary flowchart, is, I think, the biggest thing that sunk HillaryCare back in the '90s because the American people looked at that, and it scared them that anyone could cook up such a schematic. This is the black-and-white version that could be printed back then, which was just shortly after the advent of the Internet.

Mrs. BACHMANN has the full Technicolor version, and I would appreciate it if the camera would turn there.

If the camera would focus on the colored chart, on the bottom are two identical-sized purple circles. The one on the left is the qualified health benefits plan, and the one on the right is the Obama plan, the Obama health insurance plan. The white box to the left of the left purple circle is the existing health insurance, the traditional health insurance plans. None of them could qualify to sell insurance to any American until the health insurance czar qualifies them to go into the purple circle, the qualified health benefits plan circle. The health insurance czar would be the guy who would make sure that the new public health plan that was written could compete with the private plans.

So if you're going to write the rules for your guy, are you going to make one size fits all? Are you going to put conditions on those private insurance plans so that the public plan can compete? Or are you going to take the public plan and try to get it to compete with the private sector? I think it's the former, not the latter. I think we will see a one size fits all.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Iowa. I would be happy to yield.

Mrs. BACHMANN. That was the aspect of the Hillary plan. It was an outlawing of all private insurance. The one thing we know from page 16 of the 1,018-page bill is that no more private insurance policies can be written—never, nada. You can't write any more private insurance. Of course, if the public option is subsidized by government at 30 to 40 percent less than the private insurance plans, what we know from the Levin Group is that 113 million Americans will be collapsed out of private insurance and will be put over into the government option, thus collapsing the private insurance industry. It will all be government, and that's within 5 years that we will see the end of private care in the public.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your indulgence, and I know I've convinced you deeply, and I would yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CAPUANO (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today through July 31 on account of back surgery.

Mr. CRENSHAW (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of being unavoidably detained in the district.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WATERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CARTER, for 5 minutes, July 22.

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, July 27.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, July 27.

Mr. BUCHANAN, for 5 minutes, July 22.

Mrs. SCHMIDT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCCOTTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, today, July 21, 22, 23 and 24.

Mrs. BACHMANN, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 21, 2009, at 10:30 a.m., for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2727. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Use of Commercial Software (DFARS Case 2008-D044) (RIN: 0750-AG32) received July 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2728. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Motor Carrier Fuel Surcharge (DFARS Case 2008-D040) (RIN: 0750-AG30) received July 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2729. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Lease of Vessels, Aircraft, and Combat Vehicles (DFARS Case 2006-D013) (RIN: 0750-AF39) received July 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2730. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Lead System Integrators (DFARS Case 2006-D051) (RIN: 0750-AF80) received July 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2731. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Limitation on Procurements on Behalf of DoD (DFARS Case 2008-D005) (RIN: 0750-AG24) received July 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2732. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Acquisition of Commercial Items (DFARS Case 2008-D011) (RIN: 0750-AG23) received July 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2733. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Reserve Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting the National Guard ChalleNGe Program Annual Report for Fiscal Year 2008, pursuant to 32 U.S.C. 509 (K); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2734. A letter from the Under Secretary for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting Selected

Acquisition Reports (SARs) for H-1 Upgrades (4BW/4BN) as of December 31, 2008, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2433; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2735. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Global Security Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's 2009 Annual Reports to Congress, pursuant to Section 234 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2736. A letter from the Attorney, Office of Assistant General Counsel for Legislation and Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedures for General Service Fluorescent Lamps, Incandescent Reflector Lamps, and General Service Incandescent Lamps [Docket No.: EERE-2007-BT-TP-0013] (RIN: 1904-AB72) received July 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2737. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 09-36, concerning the proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance for defense articles and services, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2738. A letter from the Vice Admiral, USN Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 09-27, concerning the proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance for defense articles and services, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2739. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 09-30, concerning proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance for defense articles and services, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2740. A letter from the Director, National Legislative Commission, American Legion, transmitting a copy of the Legion's financial statements as of December 31, 2008, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 1101(4) and 1103; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2741. A letter from the Attorney, Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Marinette Marine Vessel Launch, Marinette, Wisconsin [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0462] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 22, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2742. A letter from the Trial Attorney, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Interim Statement of Agency Policy and Interpretation on the Hours of Service Laws as Amended; Proposed Interpretation; Request for Public Comment [Docket No.: 2009-0057, Notice No. 1] received June 24, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2743. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a semi-annual report concerning emigration laws and policies of Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Moldova, the Russian Federation, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan, pursuant to Sections 402 and 409 of the 1974 Trade Act, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2744. A letter from the Chairman, Medicare Payment Advisory Commission, transmitting a copy of the Commission's ''June 2009 Report to the Congress: Improving Incentives in the Medicare Program'', pursuant to Public Law 108-173, section 507(c)(3) (117 Stat. 2297); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. OBERSTAR: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 2498. A bill to designate the Federal building located at 844 North Rush Street in Chicago, Illinois, as the ''William O. Lipinski Federal Building'' (Rept. 111–213). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. OBERSTAR: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 2093. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act relating to beach monitoring, and for other purposes, with an amendment (Rept. 111–214). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. OBERSTAR: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 1665. A bill to structure Coast Guard acquisition processes and policies, and for other purposes (Rept. 111–215). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. WAXMAN (for himself, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. SARBANES, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 3258. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to enhance the security of the public water systems of the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. INSLEE (for himself and Mr. REICHERT):

H.R. 3259. A bill to establish the Grants for College Access and Completion Program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BECERRA (for himself and Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin):

H.R. 3260. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make the expensing of environmental remediation costs permanent law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

H.R. 3261. A bill to permit an individual to be treated by a health care practitioner with any method of medical treatment such individual requests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

H.R. 3262. A bill to ensure that the goals of the Dietary Supplement Health and Education Act of 1994 are met by authorizing appropriations to fully enforce and implement such Act and the amendments made by such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

H.R. 3263. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that amounts paid for foods for special dietary use, dietary supplements, or medical foods shall be treated as medical expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia (for himself and Mr. BILBRAY):

H.R. 3264. A bill to improve Federal internship programs to facilitate hiring of full-time Federal employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia (for himself and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 3265. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reduce pollution resulting from impervious surfaces within the Chesapeake Bay watershed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. KLEIN of Florida (for himself and Mr. WHITFIELD):

H.R. 3266. A bill to establish a grant program to encourage the use of assistance dogs by certain members of the Armed Forces and veterans; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MEEK of Florida:

H.R. 3267. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide relief with respect to the children of members of the Armed Forces of the United States who die as a result of service in a combat zone; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REICHERT (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Washington):

H.R. 3268. A bill to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives and the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to increase earmark transparency and accountability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, Standards of Official Conduct, the Judiciary, and Oversight and Government Reform, 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. EHLERS (for himself, Mr. DICKS, Mr. PETRI, Mr. MICA, Mr. DENT, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. PAUL, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BOYD, Mr. OLSON, Mr. WOLF, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. CALVERT):

H. Con. Res. 167. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Aerospace Day, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. GOODLATTE):

H. Res. 661. A resolution instructing the managers on the part of the House of Representatives in the impeachment proceeding now pending against Samuel B. Kent to advise the Senate that the House of Representatives does not desire further to urge the articles of impeachment against Samuel B. Kent; considered and agreed to. considered and agreed to.

By Ms. SCHWARTZ (for herself and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas):

H. Res. 662. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of ''National Save for Retirement Week'', including raising public awareness of the various tax-preferred retirement vehicles as important tools for personal savings and retirement financial security; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 24: Mr. Letkemeyer.

H.R. 39: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
H.R. 138: Mr. MORAN of Kansas.
H.R. 211: Mr. MASSA and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H.R. 235: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 268: Mr. LATHAM.
H.R. 330: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 393: Mr. AUSTRIA.
H.R. 406: Ms. KILROY.
H.R. 426: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 470: Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 557: Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. TURNER, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. PITTS.
H.R. 560: Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 613: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia and Mr. ORTIZ.
H.R. 673: Mr. KRATOVIL.
H.R. 718: Ms. FOXX and Mr. MCHENRY.
H.R. 775: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. TURNER, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, and Mr. BOCCIERI.
H.R. 891: Mr. SESTAK.
H.R. 953: Mr. SHUSTER.
H.R. 977: Mr. SHULER.
H.R. 1147: Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 1162: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 1197: Mr. GRAYSON.
H.R. 1206: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.
H.R. 1207: Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. BOUCHER.
H.R. 1208: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. CAMPBELL.
H.R. 1305: Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 1339: Mr. CARNAHAN.
H.R. 1402: Mr. COOPER.
H.R. 1427: Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 1428: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 1479: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 1525: Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 1548: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 1570: Mr. POSEY and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 1587: Mr. TURNER.
H.R. 1618: Mr. REYES, Mr. LUJÁN, and Mr. SKELTON.
H.R. 1646: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. SHULER, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. MASSA.
H.R. 1691: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN.
H.R. 1700: Mr. LYNCH and Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 1799: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 1873: Mr. GRAYSON.
H.R. 1881: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 1970: Mr. RADANOVICH.
H.R. 1977: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 2024: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 2061: Mr. WAMP.
H.R. 2072: Mr. SCALISE.
H.R. 2112: Mrs. MALONEY.
H.R. 2137: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. BACA, Mr. CONYERS, and Ms. CLARKE.
H.R. 2139: Mr. KLINE of Minnesota and Mr. MEEK of Florida.
H.R. 2160: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 2166: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 2203: Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CAMPBELL, and Mr. KLINE of Minnesota.
H.R. 2215: Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 2296: Mr. FLEMING, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. WAMP, and Mr. GRAYSON.
H.R. 2329: Mr. HODES, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. BERMAN.
H.R. 2342: Mr. CRENSHAW.
H.R. 2373: Mr. HARPER, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. KIRK.
H.R. 2381: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2413: Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. ROSS, Ms. JENKINS, and Mr. MORAN of Kansas.
H.R. 2452: Mr. AUSTRIA and Mr. SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 2478: Mr. SARBANES.
H.R. 2499: Mr. HENSARLING.
H.R. 2515: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 2516: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 2522: Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 2546: Mr. COSTELLO.
H.R. 2558: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 2567: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 2632: Mr. LAMBORN and Mr. TEAGUE.
H.R. 2637: Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 2672: Mr. WAMP.
H.R. 2709: Ms. DELAURO and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 2744: Mr. GRAYSON.
H.R. 2819: Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 2882: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. STARK.
H.R. 2897: Mr. SIRES, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 2924: Mr. SESTAK.
H.R. 2941: Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 2964: Mr. BOCCIERI.
H.R. 3006: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 3029: Mr. INGLIS.
H.R. 3032: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 3036: Mr. NYE.
H.R. 3042: Mr. LEVIN and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 3044: Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. KRATOVIL, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
H.R. 3088: Mr. GRAYSON.
H.R. 3119: Ms. CHU.
H.R. 3126: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 3144: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 3149: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 3155: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 3167: Mr. BURTON of Indiana and Mr. AUSTRIA.
H.R. 3186: Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 3219: Mr. BOCCIERI.
H.R. 3221: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 3226: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Ms. GRANGER.
H.R. 3231: Mr. BOOZMAN and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 3245: Mr. FILNER.
H. Con. Res. 16: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H. Con. Res. 74: Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. COSTA, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Mr. MCMAHON.
H. Con. Res. 81: Ms. BORDALLO.
H. Con. Res. 94: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H. Con. Res. 98: Mr. HONDA and Mr. CARNAHAN.
H. Con. Res. 102: Mr. FILNER.
H. Con. Res. 129: Mr. FORBES, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. HINCHEY.
H. Con. Res. 158: Mr. MORAN of Kansas.
H. Con. Res. 159: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. COSTA.
H. Con. Res. 163: Ms. BERKLEY and Mr. WU.
H. Con. Res. 165: Mr. SABLAN and Ms. FUDGE.
H. Res. 57: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H. Res. 111: Mr. HIGGINS and Mr. GRAYSON.
H. Res. 270: Mr. MINNICK.
H. Res. 278: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H. Res. 412: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H. Res. 414: Mr. SCHOCK.
H. Res. 541: Ms. BORDALLO.
H. Res. 583: Mr. KISSELL.
H. Res. 591: Mr. BACHUS.
H. Res. 592: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H. Res. 595: Mr. ELLISON, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. WATERS.
H. Res. 596: Mr. ELLISON, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. WATERS.
H. Res. 605: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. BONNER, Ms. JENKINS, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. GORDON of Tennessee.
H. Res. 607: Mr. TURNER.
H. Res. 613: Mr. LATTA.
H. Res. 614: Mr. POLIS of Colorado.
H. Res. 619: Mrs. BONO MACK and Mr. BOOZMAN.
H. Res. 630: Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. DICKS, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H. Res. 654: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.