United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 155 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 2009 No. 134

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,
September 22, 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.

OVER ONE MILLION ATTEND ''PAZ SIN FRONTERAS'' CONCERT

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, on Sunday, a historic event took place in Havana, Cuba. An estimated 1.2 million people attended an all-star concert made up of many of the top Latin pop, rock and salsa stars from Latin America, Europe, Puerto Rico and Cuba.

The concert, known as Paz Sin Fronteras, or Peace Without Borders, was the dream of Colombian singer, songwriter and multiple Latin Grammy winner Juanes and his two primary collaborators Miguel Bose of Spain and Olga Tanon of Puerto Rico.

The message of the Peace Without Border concerts is to circumvent politicians, and using the medium of music, speak directly to young people and encourage them to think in fresh ways—to change their way of thinking—and leave behind the old politics, the old hatreds, prejudices and national enmities that have locked too many people into patterns of conflict, violence, poverty and despair, dividing them from one another. It is an attempt to break down barriers and ask people to join in common purpose.

Both the United States and Cuban governments helped facilitate the concert, including providing Juanes and his company of 15 international and Cuban artists full control over message and staging. The Departments of State, Treasury and Commerce, and especially Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, are to be commended for providing in record time the various licenses and authorities required for U.S. musicians, technicians, musical and production equipment to travel and enter Cuba.

This is the second Peace Without Borders concert organized by Juanes in what he hopes will be a series of concerts in the hemisphere in places where people, if not politicians, might be open to a message of change, especially young people, who are more readily engaged by the language of rock-and-roll. The first such concert took place last year on the Peace Bridge on the border of Colombia and Venezuela when military tensions escalated between the two countries.

I applaud Juanes and all the participating artists for their courage, their vision and commitment to working together to communicate directly to the Cuban people through the language of music.

More than just a rock concert, this massive cultural event in Havana was a moving and emotional testament, even to many of its critics, about the power of the human spirit to reach across barriers during times of tension and opportunities. The ripples and waves created by this concert are just beginning to be felt in Cuba, the United States and throughout the hemisphere. I very much look forward to supporting other Paz Sin Fronteras initiatives in the future.

Madam Speaker, I include the following materials for the RECORD.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 21, 2009]

IN CASTRO COUNTRY, GIVING A CONCERT FOR PEACE

(By William Booth)

HAVANA.—Rock-and-roll diplomacy came to the communist isle on a smoldering afternoon, as hundreds of thousands of Cubans filled the Plaza of the Revolution on Sunday and sang along to a dozen international musical acts led by the Colombian singer and peace activist Juanes.

The free ''Peace without Borders'' concert was criticized by hard-line Cuban exiles in Miami as a propaganda coup for the Castro brothers, and that it might have been. But for thousands of young Cubans, it was a rare treat to hear a lineup of global Latin music stars, such as Olga Tanon of Puerto Rico and Miguel Bosé of Spain.

Under the watchful gaze of a huge mural of Ernesto ''Che'' Guevara, and beneath the socialist slogan ''Always Toward Victory!'' on the side of the Ministry of Interior building, there was no trouble from the mostly young crowd. Many were dressed in white, in keeping with the peaceful vibe.

From the stage, framed by giant posters of a white dove, musicians offered hopeful but admittedly vague appeals for change, solidarity and, of course, peace. Bosé told the crowd that ''the greatest dream we can live is to dream the dream of peace.'' He also announced that there were more than a million people in the square, though there were no official estimates.

Tanon shouted that she brought greetings from Miami—home of many Cuban exiles who live in opposition to the Cuban government—and no one in the crowd booed, but instead whistled and cheered.

The United States has pursued a policy of economic embargo and diplomatic freeze

Printed on recycled paper.

against Cuba for almost 50 years, hoping to topple the government, to no avail. Despite promises by President Obama, change in the U.S.-Cuba relationship has been slow in coming.

In an interview aired Sunday on the Spanish-language network Univision, Obama acknowledged that the concert would only go so far. ''I certainly don't think it hurts U.S.-Cuban relations,'' he said. ''I wouldn't overstate the degree that it helps.''

The plaza is iconic as the scene of some of Fidel Castro's biggest rallies and longest speeches, though he has not been seen in public for almost three years, after intestinal surgery. Anti-Castro Cuban exiles in Miami have voiced heated opposition to the concert, saying it only served to support the government here, which would milk the event for publicity even as it imprisons hundreds of political dissidents.

Because of his participation, Juanes has received death threats. But some of the pressure on him eased when, earlier this month, 24 of the 75 Cuban opposition leaders arrested in a 2003 crackdown on dissent signed a letter saying the show must go on.

''We came to Cuba with love. We have overcome fear to be with you, and we hope that you too can overcome it,'' Juanes told the masses. ''All the young people, from Miami in the United States and in all the cities, must understand the importance of turning hate into love.''

More than 100 buses could be counted bringing young people to the concert. ''This is the best concert to come to Cuba in, like, 50 years,'' said Yeilene Fernandez, a student at the University of Havana who was dancing with friends.

Sitting in his hotel room on the eighth floor of the Hotel Nacional the night before the show, Juanes was typing out messages for his Twitter followers. He was wearing a silver crucifix, jeans and a T-shirt. ''It's important to do this. I know this in my heart,'' he said. ''Our region, Latin America, is very complicated right now. We're all going our separate ways because of our ideologies. It's time to change our minds, to do something beyond politics, for young people.''

Juanes had previously met with Obama administration officials, and being a 17-time Latin Grammy winner who has become a kind of roving diplomat in Latin America, he got to see Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton. She gave her blessing to his participation in the concert.

''We asked what they thought, and they said, 'Go ahead.' She was very positive,'' he said. ''Me, I am Colombian, so I didn't need to ask permission. But we did need permission for all our staff, and they said sure.''

Juanes said he asked some artists to come, ''but they were afraid. Latin artists, we live in Miami, and when you live in Miami, anything to do with Cuba is always a challenge. Some people in Miami are against anything to do with Cuba. Some are in the middle. And the young people, they definitely support cultural exchange.''

Next up in that exchange: The New York Philharmonic is coming to play a series of concerts at the Teatro Amadeo Roldan in Havana at the end of October.

''I see an increase in these cultural exchanges, and I think it's healthy, it's a step in the right direction,'' said Bill Richardson, governor of New Mexico, in an interview. He traveled this month to Cuba to discuss trade issues with the government.

In Havana on Sunday, those who were not at the Plaza of the Revolution watched the concert on rickety old TV sets in airless living rooms—or sat in their front courtyards to catch the breeze and listened to the show on the radio.

The artists performed free and covered the cost of shipping stage and sound equipment from Miami for the mega-concert. The Cuban government provided logistical and technical support. Juanes insisted that the signal from the show is free to use, download or broadcast anywhere in the world.

Juanes performed his first ''Peace without Borders'' concert on the frontier between Colombia and Venezuela last year during a time of heightened animosity between the countries. He said he would like to perform a third peace concert at the border between El Paso and Ciudad Juarez, Mexico. A vicious battle between street dealers and drug cartels, fighting among themselves and against federal troops, has left more than 1,600 people dead this year, making Juarez the most violent city in the world.

Juanes said: ''I am from Colombia. I have no idea what it means to live in peace.''

[From the Miami Herald, Sept. 20, 2009]

THIS IS THE POWER OF MUSIC

(By Lydia Martin and Jordan Levin)

As a sea of revelers jammed Havana's Plaza de la Revolución, Puerto Rico's Olga Tañon opened the controversial Peace without Borders concert Sunday with a sentiment that, despite all the debate on both sides of the Florida Straits, simply could not be disputed:

''Together, we are going to make history!'' she yelled. And the multitude, wearing white and hoisting colorful umbrellas that did little to alleviate the punishing heat, cheered. Then Tañon kicked off her performance with a merengue that, at least in Miami, seemed to carry a double meaning.

''Es mentiroso ese hombre,'' she sang. That man is a liar.

But whether she chose the lyrics as a dig to either or both of the Castro brothers seemed less relevant than the overall, palpable joy in the plaza.

Then, at the very end of the show, a major surprise from Colombian pop star Juanes, who was criticized by a segment of the exile community for organizing the concert because they believed it would lend support to the Castro regime. Juanes, who had insisted the concert had nothing to do with politics, made it political after all, to much approval from Miami's naysayers.

He moved away from the day's ambiguities and shouted a straightforward ''Cuba libre! Cuba libre!'' (Free Cuba!) And then he chanted, ''One Cuban family! One Cuban family!''

Reached by phone in Havana shortly after the concert ended, Juanes said the day was indeed about much more than music.

''There aren't words to talk about something so huge, something that's so beyond music,'' he said. ''This is the power of art, the power of music. We're so happy because the people are happy, and that's what matters to us.''

The crowd, which Juanes said from the stage was estimated at 1.1 million, was mostly young people; many had arrived as early as 7 a.m. to stake out spots near the stage. Although several trucks around the perimeter dispensed cold water, many people in the middle of the crowd could not reach them. Dozens of concertgoers who had been in the sun for hours passed out.

Yonder, 25, and his girlfriend Yaima, 19, retreated from the front of the stage after Yaima fainted. She lost a shoe in the crowd. ''She bent down to try to find it but wound up grabbing somebody else's shoes that were lost,'' Yonder said. ''There is a lot of pushing and shoving. There are shoes and sunglasses all over the ground.''

(The couple did not want their last names printed.)

The likeness of communist hero Che Guevara towered over the plaza that has been the site of endless political harangues by Fidel Castro over 50 years of dictatorship. But judging from the dancing, singing and arm-waving, what mattered most in Havana, at least for a few hours, was the partying inspired by this unprecedented mega-concert.

MIXED REACTION

Toward the end of the show, U.S. Rep. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (R–Miami) said in an interview with WLTV–Univision 23 that the event had been a triumph for the Castro regime, because there was no mention from the stage about Cuba's human-rights violations or about the many political prisoners who were behind bars for opposing the government. But many others in Miami called it a good start in trying to bridge the divide between the island and the exile community.

Whatever the show's lasting effects, it was still historic. All of Havana seemed mesmerized; as one walked the city's streets every TV set seemed to be blasting the concert. Never had the plaza, where Pope John Paul II addressed the Cuban people in 1998, been used for a such a lighthearted purpose. Never had the Cuban people been treated to such a musical blowout by major foreign acts—something for which the island is always thirsty.

And never had Miami watched a live show from Havana. It was carried by local Spanish-language stations and by Univision.com. Channel 23 tagged it ''Concert of Discord.''

As with most matters related to Cuba, the gray shades of debate clouded the days leading up to the concert, which featured 15 artists from six countries, including such big stars from the island as Los Van Van and Silvio Rodriguez, government-backed and government-backing performers. Some Miami exiles criticized Juanes for agreeing to share the stage with them.

Members of the Cuban American National Foundation, which seeks to bring democracy to the communist island, tuned in from the Kendall home of president Francisco ''Pepe'' Hernandez.

They watched in awe as Juanes performed, his lyrics and short speeches flirting with political commentary.

''To go to that same plaza—where [Cubans] have been forced to listen to things they don't believe in—for music? It's great,'' Hernandez said. To him, the concert symbolized a sharp turn away from isolationist policies used by pro-democracy Cuban exile groups during the last 50 years.

''I hope that all of the young people in the United States, in Miami, everywhere, lose their fear and change hate for love,'' Juanes told the audience.

Although the performers had agreed to not make overt political statements, the possibilities of political interpretation seeped into many of their songs. ''Down with the control. Down with those who manipulate you'' chanted a female rapper with X Alfonso, a Cuban rap and funk artist.

''We're all here together—for the dream of concord, for the dream of dialogue!'' said Spanish pop singer Miguel Bosé. He was joined by Cuban singer-songwriter Carlos Varela for Varela's Muro (Wall), which Bosé has recorded, about longing for the outside world from Cuba's seawall.

SONG OF PEACE

No one's songs were more emotionally loaded than those of Juanes, who took the stage to chants of his name. ''I can't believe it. This is the most beautiful dream of peace and love,'' he said. ''Whatever differences we have, at the end we are all brothers.'' He then launched into A Dios le pido (I'll Ask God), his huge hit that pleads for peace. Most of his statements, until his strong words at the end, were general but carried the possibly of much meaning.

''Youth of Cuba, of Latin America, the future is in your hands, guys!'' he said before singing No creo en el jamas (I Don't Believe in Never), which calls for hope against all odds. He turned the rocker Suenos (Dreams), about a kidnapping victim who longs for home, into a quiet ballad, telling the audience ''this song is for everyone who is imprisoned unjustly and seeks liberty!''

''Juanes is so brave,'' said Gabriela, 14, who went to the show with her sister, mother and grandmother. ''He didn't have to come here and confront all of those people who were against him. He did it because he wanted to sing for us. For Cuba.''

Many Cubans in Miami watched with conflicted feelings.

''This is supposed to be a concert for peace, but there is no peace without political discourse or democracy in Cuba,'' said paralegal Blanca Meneses, who lives in the Doral area. ''But I feel for the people in Cuba, because, obviously, they are enjoying this from a musical perspective. The truth is, I thought nothing good could come of this concert. But I did think that when Juanes and Bosé were singing 'Libertad, libertad,' that was a positive message to the people of Cuba.''

[From the Miami Herald, Sept. 21, 2009]

A DAY AFTER JUANES' SHOW, EMOTIONS IN MIAMI STILL MIXED

(By Jordan Levin)

When Fabio Diaz settled in with 15 members of his extended Cuban family to watch Colombian singer Juanes' historic concert in Havana on television Sunday, he—and the rest of his clan—had mixed feelings. Diaz, who is 35 and came to Miami at 19, thought the event should have been staged in an intermediary location between the island and Miami, as a bridge between the two sides. And he wanted Juanes to speak out directly about freedom in Cuba.

But as he and his family watched the show, which aired live from Havana on three Miami Spanish-language television stations—itself an unprecedented event—Diaz said his feelings overpowered his doubts. ''What I loved was seeing so much of the Cuban people—and I feel completely Cuban—all together for a celebration and not for something political,'' Diaz says.

Much of Cuban and Latino Miami witnessed that celebration via their television and computer screens. Univision's Channel 23 in Miami drew 220,000 viewers for their five-hour long broadcast, and 140,000 in the U.S. and Puerto Rico watched on the network's website. Telemundo's afternoon-long coverage on its Channel 51 in Miami drew triple their normal viewership, and more than 600,000 visits to their website which streamed the show—more than four times the usual web traffic for that time period.

Emotions in Miami were mixed about the show, which drew hundreds of thousands of people to pack Havana's Plaza de la Revolucion on Sunday for performances by 15 artists from six countries. (Spanish singer Miguel Bosé announced from the stage that the audience was 1.15 million).

A protest by exile group which brought a small steamroller to Calle Ocho to run over Juanes' CD's, sparked a counter demonstration that led to physical clashes between the two sides.

Some callers to radio talk shows were happy that, as one woman put it, ''young Cubans had the chance to feel happy for one day'' while others felt that the joyful image on television was far from Cuban reality. And some exiles remained disenchanted and angry that the show did not directly address problems and repression in Cuba.

''It's not about foreign musicians singing in Cuba,'' said Esperanza Brigante. ''A real concert for peace should start by denouncing the human rights violations that plague the island . . . because we all know this is a political show.''

But there was a strong, often emotional response at seeing the sea of young Cuban faces, and a sense that the concert signaled a turning point in exile attitudes towards Cuba. ''I was very moved,'' said Ana Maria Perez Castro, 38, who came from the island in 1979. She watched the entire concert at home with her 16-year-old son.

Castro said she cried during the performance of Cucu Diamantes, a Cuban-American singer with the U.S.-based group Yerbabuena. ''She's also Cuban and she left, and to see her going back and performing for her people in her country was very emotional,'' Castro said. ''I could totally connect to the message to break that barrier, that fear which is what keeps all this old mentality intact.''

Juanes, who was traveling Monday and could not be reached, was optimistic that the show had achieved his goal of helping to bring people together.

''Today the hearts of everyone here have changed. Cuba cannot be the same after this event,'' the multi-Grammy winning rock star told The Herald from Havana Sunday evening. ''This event reaffirmed the necessity for all of us to unite. . . . The government of the U.S. has to change and Cuba has to change too. But this show of love and peace and affection is so important for both sides.''

Juanes has said hopes to stage the next Paz Sin Fronteras concert on the U.S.-Mexico border between Ciudad Juarez, where violent clashes between drug gangs and authorities have made the most violent city in the world, and El Paso, Texas.

That the Havana concert was allowed to take place at all, with so many people allowed to come together freely in the largest non-governmental gathering since the Pope visited Cuba in 1998, was itself indicative that Cuba was changing, said Fernand Amandi, executive vice-president of Bendixen & Associates, a public opinion research firm which specializes in the Cuban-American community.

''More than anything [the concert] underscores the fact that Cuba and relations with Cuba are undergoing a dramatic transformation that is irreversible,'' Amandi said. ''At the end of the day it is simply a concert . . . But you're beginning to see a loosening of the very rigid, very totalitarian Cuba . . . while it is still totalitarian, the government is probably beginning to recognize that it cannot survive in the future by further isolating itself.''

Another change, said Amandi, was an increased acceptance of differing points of view in the exile community, and frustration with the strife that often seems to dominate discussion of Cuba. On radio talkshows people were critical of the media focus on the raucous clash between anti and pro concert demonstrators in Little Havana. Many more Cuban-Americans ''that have never agreed with the hardline stance are no longer afraid to speak up,'' Amandi said.

On the island, Cuba's best-known blogger, Yoani Sánchez, gave an insider's view of the concert in frequent posts on her website, *www.desdecuba.com,* and her Facebook page. She also uploaded a video of the concert on YouTube—''from the people's point of view'' which shows she is wearing an olive green T-shirt with the Generation Y logo.

''I didn't go dressed in white to the concert for peace, but I opted for the color of freedom, which is the color each of us chooses to wear,'' she said. ''The color each one of us chooses—that's the color that I like.''

To Diaz, what finally mattered most was that the concert brought the world a glimpse of Cuba and its hopes to him and to the world. ''We could tell that Juanes's goal really was to bring a moment of happiness to the people,'' he said. ''And I think he did this. And I think the world should see 1,150,000 Cubans there who hope for change, for peace, for understanding of dialogue, and that history has to take another direction.''

REFORM NEEDED AT UNITED NATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, Ambassador Susan Rice, our Permanent Representative to the United Nations, has emphasized that the U.S. is ''taking a new approach'' to the U.N. as part of its broader ''new era of engagement.'' Instead of protecting the investment of our tax dollars, instead of conditioning our contributions on real reform, the U.S. has adopted a strategy of ''money now, maybe reform later.''

At the U.N. General Assembly as it begins its new session this week, there is perhaps no better time to evaluate the effectiveness thus far of this so-called ''new approach.''

Well, let's see what has resulted. In March, the U.S. sent an observer to participate in the U.N.'s so-called Human Rights Council, which is dominated by dictatorships like China, Cuba and Saudi Arabia, and is notoriously anti-Israel.

Despite U.S. engagement, the Council stayed true to form. What did they do? Overwhelmingly passed five separate resolutions condemning Israel, passing no resolutions condemning human rights violations by the regimes in Iran and Syria, Sudan, Cuba, Zimbabwe or many other dictatorships.

True to form, the Council-appointed panel recently released a report accusing Israel of ''war crimes'' and ''possibly, crimes against humanity'' for defending its citizens against rocket and mortar fire from Islamic militants in Gaza.

When it comes to the Council's biases and backwardness, there is no end in sight. There is no change in sight. Yet, the U.S. silently nods and sends millions of our taxpayer dollars, with no questions asked.

There is also UNRWA, the United Nations Relief Works Agency, the U.N.'s discredited, biased agency for Palestinian refugees. This year alone, we have given UNRWA a record of $260 million. In return, UNRWA continues to compromise its strictly humanitarian mandate by engaging in propaganda against Israel and in favor of Hamas. In fact, UNRWA's head says she doesn't even consider Hamas to be a Foreign Terrorist Organization, and her predecessor even admitted that members of Hamas were on the payroll of UNRWA, saying ''I don't see that as a crime.''

Deputy Secretary of State Jacob Lew testified before our Foreign Affairs Committee in May, and he said

UNRWA's activities received ''the highest level of scrutiny'' by the State Department. But we don't even require UNRWA to vet its employees and aid recipients through the U.S. watch lists.

Turning to the U.N. General Assembly, Madam Speaker, it remains silent in the face of intense repression and violent attacks by the Iranian regime against peaceful demonstrators. Yet, in late June, it moved swiftly to condemn and isolate the constitutional democratic government of Honduras for acting in accordance with and in protection of the rule of law.

As for the leadership of the new session of the General Assembly, it's a ''who's who'' of the world's worst regimes. The President? The former foreign minister of Libya. One of the vice-presidents? From Sudan. A vice chair of the legal committee? Iran. But the U.S. has said nothing as such rogue regimes were selected for leadership positions at the U.N.

Administration officials have said, ''The U.N. is essential to our efforts to galvanize concerted actions that make Americans safer and more secure.'' Libya, Sudan, Iran? Are you feeling secure now?

One of the greatest threats to the security of our Nation and an existential threat to our ally Israel comes from the Iranian regime and its nuclear program. This week, for the first time, a President of the United States will chair a meeting of the U.N. Security Council and will have a golden opportunity to raise the threat of Iran on the world stage. The Council will even be holding a special summit on the general issue of nuclear nonproliferation.

Yet the actions of specific countries such as Iran will be ignored. The U.S. will not use its presidency of the Council this month to push for increased sanctions on Iran or any other regime that pursues nuclear capabilities or sponsors violent extremist groups.

The International Atomic Energy Agency continues to provide nuclear technical assistance to Iran and Syria, and the U.S. remains silent.

The U.N. Development Program is accused of misusing funds in Zimbabwe, in Afghanistan and in North Korea, to name a few, and the U.S. continues to provide them with hundreds of millions of dollars every year in funding. No strings attached.

Madam Speaker, enough is enough. Let's put U.S. taxpayer dollars to work for the American people, and not for the U.N., where the inmates run the asylum.

EXCLUDING AMERICANS FROM HEALTH CARE BASED ON GEOGRAPHY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) for 1 minute.

Mr. SABLAN. Madam Speaker, I have been explaining the issue of health care reform in the United States territories. Here is the problem:

Reform is sorely needed for the American citizens living in the territories, but the bills currently before this House deny us that reform. Under these bills, we will be required to purchase health insurance, but we will not be eligible for the affordability credits that help pay for it, even though more than 40 percent of those in the Northern Mariana Islands live below the poverty level.

CHIP programs will be brought to an end, but without an exchange or public option in the territories, thousands of children will lose coverage. Our Medicaid program will remain criminally underfunded.

Madam Speaker, for health insurance reform to exclude some Americans simply because of geography is wrong. It is discriminatory. And until it is remedied, my colleagues should know this ''reform'' leaves behind many of those who need it the very most.

A NEW PLAN NEEDED IN AFGHANISTAN

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

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, 8 years ago, in the wake of the worst terrorist attack that we have ever faced in America's history, the United States sent troops to Afghanistan. These troops were sent to accomplish a difficult mission, but an achievable mission, and despite the gains that have been made to date, our mission has not been properly resourced and executed.

As such, 8 years later, the fight rages on and terrorists are still plotting to hijack our planes, blow up our bridges, wreak havoc on our cities, and murder innocent people. So the threat has not changed. Afghanistan remains a crucial theater in the war against terrorism and extremists who seek to destroy our way of life, and it deserves our utmost attention and adequate resources.

To his credit, President Obama recognizes that the war in Afghanistan does need these greater resources, but some within his administration and party are advocating a ''small footprint'' strategy, calling for a reduction in the number of U.S. troops on the ground and a sole focus on al Qaeda only, instead of on the Taliban-led insurgent coalition.

But a ''small footprint'' strategy did not work in Iraq. What did work was a robust counterinsurgency strategy backed by the surge of American troops. In fact, it was this strong presence of American soldiers in Iraq that encouraged Iraqis to come forward with valuable intelligence, which in turn led to more effective targeting of al Qaeda and other insurgent groups.

My colleagues, this can be done in Afghanistan, but it also must include support from our European allies and other freedom-loving countries who desire to rid the world of terrorism.

General McChrystal, the U.S. Commander in Afghanistan, is advocating an expanded military effort within a new counterinsurgency strategy that focuses on protecting Afghans from the intimidation tactics of the Taliban through a troop surge.

General McChrystal is a highly capable and accomplished officer with extensive counterinsurgency experience. Yesterday he warned that we need more forces within the next year and that without them, our mission in Afghanistan will ''likely result in failure.''

When it comes to military strategy, we should listen to those who know firsthand what the situation on the ground is in Afghanistan. But, my colleagues, we must also look at the political infrastructure of Afghanistan and be sure its political leaders are representing the best interests of the Afghan people and that political corruption is eliminated.

It is clear that the Afghan military needs our help—and our numbers. But currently there are only 173,000 men in the Afghan army and police. Compare that with Iraq. In that country, which is smaller and less populated, there are over 600,000 Iraqi army and police. Clearly we need to train more Afghan military personnel.

Unfortunately, though, for the past 8 years Afghanistan has not been a properly resourced war. The new strategy proposed by General McChrystal and General David Petraeus is focused on expanding and improving Afghan forces with better training and embedded advisers and forming a true partnership and trust between Afghan units and American units, with the end goal of growing the Afghan army and police to the point where U.S. troops could be reduced dramatically.

But before we put more American troops in Afghanistan, we need a more deliberate plan with the Afghan military that includes participation by our allies and adequate support from the Afghan people and legitimate political leaders.

The reality of the situation on the ground in Afghanistan is that it would take another 2 years to expand Afghanistan's forces to around 300,000 personnel. Experts suggest at least 360,000 Afghan troops and police are needed to adequately fight the counterinsurgency and to effectively police the country's 33 million inhabitants. This is the key to our success.

One thing we must not forget is that a withdrawal at this critical juncture would destabilize Pakistan, an ally in a region of instability and a country in possession of nuclear weapons.

So, my colleagues, we need a new strategy that can work, but this new strategy can work only if we ask for patience from the American people and the knowledge that a mission of this magnitude and importance is not going to be won overnight or from afar. The sacrifices we make overseas now will prevent another 9/11-style attack here at home in the future.

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 46 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. DAVIS of Tennessee) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

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

Lord God, how simply children learn to pray: ''Thy will be done.'' Are they more dependent, innocent, and free compared to the rest of us? Or is it because they are more practiced in obedience? ''Thy will be done.''

As adults, Lord, do we try to convince You by our prayers to see events, problems, or others as we see them? Perhaps blinded by our own fears and guilt, we are easily convinced by the cumulative lies of selective history and the intellectual culture. So much so, that we insist on thinking that we are on an even match with You, Lord.

So, it is Your will against ours. How arrogant even Your people of faith can be.

In truth, make us humble of heart, Lord; or else You may find Your own way to humble us before You.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN 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.

CONGRATULATING CHIEF TIM McELWEE

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

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, on August 28, Chief Tim McElwee of the Prescott Fire Department was named the 2009 Safety Officer of the Year by the International Association of Fire Chiefs. A 30-year PFD veteran, Chief McElwee heads his agency's training division. He literally wrote the book on safety and training requirements for the department.

Chief McElwee's accomplishments also extend beyond the Prescott Fire Department. He sits on the Arizona Wildfire Academy Board of Directors, helps oversee disaster response for his region, and has managed an organization that provides training to fire departments throughout the area.

Chief McElwee will be retiring in May 2010, but his many contributions to the Prescott Fire Department and to Arizona will help keep our communities safe for years to come.

I congratulate Chief McElwee for this much-deserved honor.

JOB CORPS DAY CELEBRATING 45 YEARS OF PRODUCING PAYROLLS FOR AMERICA

(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. Today marks a historic event for the Nation's most significant Federal job-training agency. The Job Corps celebrates its 45th anniversary today, recognizing the agency's many years of service to America during which it has helped launch the careers of nearly 3 million disadvantaged youths.

As part of the National Job Corps Association's celebration of this important anniversary, I'm proud to cosponsor Congressman JERRY MORAN's resolution, H. Con. Res. 163, to designate September 23 as National Job Corps Day.

Since 1964, the Job Corps has created a network of 123 Job Corps centers in 48 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. As part of the 45th anniversary celebration, I am pleased that one of my area's Job Corps interns, Esmeralda Sanchez, will be shadowing me tomorrow.

Additionally, my local Homestead Job Corps center is hosting an open house event on Thursday, October 1, for the entire south Florida community to attend.

Both locally and nationally, the Job Corps has definitely benefited America by producing payrolls for our country.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION EXTENSION ACT

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

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, today the House will consider the Unemployment Compensation Extension Act. The legislation would extend unemployment benefits by up to 13 weeks for over 300,000 jobless workers who reside in high unemployment States and that are projected to run out of unemployment compensation by the end of September. This bill will serve as a lifeline, aiding those who are still struggling to find work in Las Vegas and other parts of Nevada.

The once recession-proof economy of my district of Las Vegas has not been spared from the effects of this downturn. In fact, Nevada has been hit harder than any other State by the foreclosure crisis, and our unemployment rate has skyrocketed to over 13 percent, the second highest in the Nation. This legislation will bring much-needed relief to many jobless Nevadans.

It is absolutely critical that Congress step up and pass this federally funded extension of unemployment benefits. I support the bill we are considering today because it will help hardworking Nevadans get by until the situation improves—and it will—and they can return to work.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION

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

Mr. GOHMERT. This week, the conference committee will meet on Defense authorization. Defense authorization: we are supposed to provide for the common defense. That is the number one job of this government, not all the social engineerings going on. And guess what? We're going to be having a discussion over a hate crimes bill in Defense authorization. We're going to be talking about defending America and, in the same bill, taking away the rights of Americans.

There is not one law that will be covered by that hate crimes bill that is not already in existence in every State in the Union. Every one of those crimes is covered.

James Byrd's defendants got the death penalty, the two most culpable. This will not do anything. But if you want to have a discussion on hate crimes, let's have it head up on hate crimes. Let's don't stick it into something as important as Defense authorization.

IN TRIBUTE TO ARMY PFC JEREMIAH J. MONROE

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

Mr. MURPHY of New York. I rise today with the very sad duty of reporting the tragic passing of Army Private First Class Jeremiah J. Monroe. PFC Monroe was taken from us on September 17, 2009, by a roadside bomb in Afghanistan, just 2 months after his deployment.

Private First Class Monroe was assigned to the 630th Route Clearance Company, 7th Engineer Battalion, 10th Mountain Division, based in Fort Drum, New York. A beloved father, brother, son, friend, and soldier from Warren County, Jeremiah, will be sorely missed by the entire Adirondack and Fort Drum communities.

Jeremiah Monroe was just 31 years old. He quit his job last year as a tradesman to enlist in the Army. He wanted to support his daughter and the extended family and serve the Nation he loved and the ideals for which he gave the ultimate sacrifice.

Private First Class Monroe was willing to give his life in service to all of us and to the country that he loved. The expression of our gratitude for his sacrifice to our Nation is beyond words.

Jeremiah is survived by his mother, Dolores Monroe; his brother, Robert Monroe, Jr.; his 9-year-old daughter, Delilah Rose; and her mother, Michelle. On behalf of a grateful Nation, our thoughts and prayers are with the entire Monroe family, who lost four relatives in the last 18 months, including Jeremiah's father, Robert Monroe, Sr.

As we stand on this floor and debate the profound issues of our time, let us never forget the true cost of the freedoms we so often take for granted.

KEEP GITMO OPEN

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Guantanamo Bay is a first-class detention center that cost American taxpayers $100 million. But the administration is begging other countries around the world to accept the terrorists that are held there. In its attempt to farm out these terrorists, the administration may be sowing the seeds of future attacks, as the U.S. will have little say over how long these terrorists are held.

An interview with designated terrorist Abdul Haq should give all Americans cause for concern. Of the detainees who might be transferred to the island of Palau, at least eight have admitted that Haq was their leader.

In a recently translated interview, Haq is clear about his ties to the Taliban and al Qaeda. He glorifies attacks against Americans and our allies, and even blesses Osama bin Laden.

So, once again, why are we closing a first-class detention facility and putting terrorists in a position where they can do Americans harm?

THE PASSING OF RICHARD SHADYAC

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

Mr. COHEN. I rise today to honor the life of Mr. Richard Shadyac, who passed away last Wednesday at the age of 80. He was the former chief executive officer of the American Lebanese Syrian Associated Charities, also known as ALSAC, which is the fundraising arm of St. Jude Children's Research Hospital.

Mr. Shadyac leaves a wife, Lynn, and two children; Richard, who will take on his work at ALSAC, and a son Tom who is distinguished in the entertainment industry.

Mr. Shadyac served as CEO of St. Jude for over 13 years. He led an effort that raised millions of dollars for the purpose of research treating childhood cancers and other diseases.

St. Jude Children's Research Hospital is the leading hospital and research center on catastrophic illnesses in the Nation. It is located in Memphis, Tennessee. It was founded by Mr. Shadyac's good friend, Danny Thomas. After Mr. Thomas passed, Mr. Shadyac knew that they needed a new public face—and the new public face was the children—the children of St. Jude, who it serves.

Under his leadership, donations increased fourfold. He worked closely with the patients. He visited them often and stayed in touch with the families. He was a strong voice in the fight against cancer.

He was an important force here in Washington, where he represented the Lebanese Government at one point, and was one of the founders of the American Arab groups that worked to better relations with our Nation.

Our heart goes out to Mr. Shadyac's family and the St. Jude community. We will remember him for all of his good deeds and his work that will save many children's lives.

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:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 21, 2009.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, The Capitol, 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, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on Monday, September 21, 2009 at 5:18 p.m., and said to contain a message from the President whereby he notifies the Congress he has extended the national emergency with respect to those who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk of the House.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO PERSONS WHO COMMIT, THREATEN TO COMMIT, OR SUPPORT TERRORISM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 111–64)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice, stating that the national emergency with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism is to continue in effect beyond September 23, 2009.

The crisis constituted by the grave acts of terrorism and threats of terrorism committed by foreign terrorists, including the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, in New York and Pennsylvania and against the Pentagon, and the continuing and immediate threat of further attacks on United States nationals or the United States that led to the declaration of a national emergency on September 23, 2001, has not been resolved. These actions pose a continuing unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism, and maintain in force the comprehensive sanctions to respond to this threat.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 21, 2009.*

□ 1415

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.

Any record vote on postponed questions will be taken after 6:30 p.m. today.

CORAL REEF CONSERVATION ACT REAUTHORIZATION AND ENHANCEMENT AMENDMENTS OF 2009

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 860) to reauthorize the Coral Reef Conservation Act of 2000, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 860

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Coral Reef Conservation Act Reauthorization and Enhancement Amendments of 2009''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title.
Sec. 2. Amendment of Coral Reef Conservation Act of 2000.
TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO THE CORAL REEF CONSERVATION ACT
Sec. 101. Expansion of Coral Reef Conservation Program.
Sec. 102. Emergency response.
Sec. 103. National program.
Sec. 104. Report to Congress.
Sec. 105. Fund; grants; grounding inventory; coordination.
Sec. 106. Clarification of definitions.
Sec. 107. Authorization of appropriations.
TITLE II—UNITED STATES CORAL REEF TASK FORCE
Sec. 201. United States Coral Reef Task Force.
TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR CORAL REEF AUTHORITIES
Sec. 301. Amendments relating to Department of the Interior program.
Sec. 302. Clarification of definitions.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENT OF CORAL REEF CONSERVATION ACT OF 2000.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to or repeal of a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Coral Reef Conservation Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 6401 et seq.).

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO THE CORAL REEF CONSERVATION ACT

SEC. 101. EXPANSION OF CORAL REEF CONSERVATION PROGRAM.

(a) PROJECT DIVERSITY.—Section 204(d) (16 U.S.C. 6403(d)) is amended—

(1) in the heading by striking ''GEOGRAPHIC AND BIOLOGICAL'' and inserting ''PROJECT''; and

(2) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

''(3) Remaining funds shall be awarded for—

''(A) projects (with priority given to community-based local action strategies) that address emerging priorities or threats, including international and territorial priorities, or threats identified by the Administrator in consultation with the United States Coral Reef Task Force; and

''(B) other appropriate projects, as determined by the Administrator, including monitoring and assessment, research, pollution reduction, education, and technical support.''.

(b) APPROVAL CRITERIA.—Section 204(g) (16 U.S.C. 6403(g)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''or'' after the semicolon in paragraph (9);

(2) by striking paragraph (10); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (9) the following:

''(10) promoting activities designed to minimize the likelihood of vessel impacts on coral reefs, particularly those areas identified under section 210(b), including the promotion of ecologically sound navigation and anchorages near coral reefs; or

''(11) promoting and assisting entities to work with local communities, and all appropriate governmental and nongovernmental organizations, to support community-based planning and management initiatives for the protection of coral reef ecosystems.''.

SEC. 102. EMERGENCY RESPONSE.

Section 206 (16 U.S.C. 6405) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 206. EMERGENCY RESPONSE ACTIONS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator may undertake or authorize action necessary—

''(1) to minimize the destruction of or injury to a coral reef, or loss of an ecosystem function of a coral reef, from—

''(A) vessel impacts, derelict fishing gear, vessel anchors, and anchor chains; and

''(B) from unforeseen or disaster-related circumstances as a result of human activities; and

''(2) to stabilize, repair, recover, or restore a coral reef that is destroyed or injured, or that has incurred the loss of an ecosystem function, as described in paragraph (1).

''(b) VESSEL REMOVAL; STABILIZATION.—Action authorized by subsection (a) includes vessel removal and emergency stabilization of the vessel or any impacted coral reef.

''(c) PARTNERING WITH OTHER FEDERAL AND STATE AGENCIES.—When possible, action by the Administrator under this section should—

''(1) be conducted in partnership with other government agencies as appropriate, including—

''(A) the Coast Guard, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Army Corps of Engineers, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Department of the Interior; and

''(B) agencies of States; and

''(2) leverage resources of other agencies.

''(d) EMERGENCY RESPONSE ASSISTANCE BY OTHER FEDERAL AND STATE AGENCIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of any other Federal or State agency may assist the Administrator in emergency response actions under this section, using funds available for operations of the agency concerned.

''(2) REIMBURSEMENT.—The Administrator, subject to the availability of appropriations, may reimburse a Federal or State agency for assistance provided under paragraph (1).

''(e) LIABILITY FOR COSTS AND DAMAGES TO CORAL REEFS.—

''(1) TREATMENT OF CORAL REEFS UNDER NATIONAL MARINE SANCTUARIES ACT.—For purposes of the provisions set forth in paragraph (2), and subject to paragraph (5), each of the terms 'sanctuary resources', 'resource', 'sanctuary resource managed under law or regulations for that sanctuary', 'national marine sanctuary', 'sanctuary resources of the national marine sanctuary', and 'sanctuary resources of other national marine sanctuaries' is deemed to include any coral reef that is subject to the jurisdiction of the United States or any State, without regard to whether such coral reef is located in a national marine sanctuary.

''(2) APPLICABLE PROVISIONS OF NATIONAL MARINE SANCTUARIES ACT.—The provisions referred to in paragraph (1) are the following provisions of the National Marine Sanctuaries Act:

''(A) Paragraphs (6) and (7) of section 302 (16 U.S.C. 1432).

''(B) Paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4) of section 306 (16 U.S.C. 1436).

''(C) Section 307 (16 U.S.C. 1437).

''(D) Section 312 (16 U.S.C. 1443).

''(3) EXEMPTIONS.—The destruction, loss, or injury of a coral reef or any component thereof is not unlawful if it was—

''(A) caused by the use of fishing gear in a manner that is not prohibited under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) or other Federal or State law; or

''(B) caused by an activity that is authorized by Federal or State law, including any lawful discharge from a vessel of graywater, cooling water, engine exhaust, ballast water, or sewage from a marine sanitation device, unless the destruction, loss, or injury is a result of a vessel grounding, a vessel scraping, anchor damage, or excavation that is not authorized by a Federal or State permit;

''(C) the necessary result of bona fide marine scientific research (including marine scientific research activities approved by Federal, State, or local permits), other than—

''(i) sampling or collecting; and

''(ii) destruction, loss, or injury that is a result of a vessel grounding, a vessel scraping, anchor damage, or excavation that is not authorized by a Federal or State permit; or

''(D)(i) caused by a Federal Government agency in—

''(I) an emergency that posed an unacceptable threat to human health or safety or to the marine environment;

''(II) an emergency that posed a threat to national security; or

''(III) an activity necessary for law enforcement purposes or search and rescue; and

''(ii) could not be avoided.

''(4) CLARIFICATION OF LIABILITY.—A person is not liable under this subsection if that person establishes that—

''(A) the destruction or loss of, or injury to, the coral reef or coral reef ecosystem was caused solely by an act of God, an act of war, or an act of omission of a third party, and the person acted with due care;

''(B) the destruction, loss, or injury was caused by an activity authorized by Federal or State law; or

''(C) the destruction, loss, or injury was negligible.

''(5) STATE CONSENT REQUIRED.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—This subsection shall not apply to any coral reef that is subject to the jurisdiction of a State unless the Governor of that State notifies the Secretary that the State consents to that application.

''(B) REVOCATION OF CONSENT.—The governor of a State may revoke consent under subparagraph (A) by notifying the Secretary of such revocation.

''(6) CONSISTENCY WITH INTERNATIONAL LAWS AND TREATIES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Any action taken under the authority of this subsection must be consistent with otherwise applicable international laws and treaties.

''(B) ACTIONS AUTHORIZED WITH RESPECT TO VESSELS.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), actions authorized under this subsection include vessel removal, and emergency re-stabilization of a vessel and any coral reef that is impacted by a vessel.

''(7) LIABILITY UNDER OTHER PROVISIONS.—Nothing in this title shall alter the liability of any person under any other provision of law.''.

SEC. 103. NATIONAL PROGRAM.

(a) PURPOSE OF ACT.—Section 202 (16 U.S.C. 6401) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (6) as paragraphs (3) through (7), respectively, and by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

''(2) to promote the resilience of coral reef ecosystems;''.

(2) by amending paragraph (4), as so redesignated, to read as follows:

''(4) to develop sound scientific information on the condition of coral reef ecosystems and the threats to such ecosystems including large-scale threats related to climate change, such as ocean acidification, to benefit local communities and the Nation, and to the extent practicable to support and enhance management and research capabilities at local management agencies and local research and academic institutions;''; and

(3) by striking ''and'' after the semicolon at the end of paragraph (6), as so redesignated, by striking the period at the end of

paragraph (7), as so redesignated, and inserting ''; and'', and by adding at the end the following:

''(8) to recognize the benefits of healthy coral reefs to island and coastal communities and to encourage Federal action to ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, the continued availability of those benefits.''.

(b) GOALS AND OBJECTIVES OF NATIONAL CORAL REEF ACTION STRATEGY.—Section 203(b)(8) (16 U.S.C. 6402(b)(8)) is amended to read as follows:

''(8) conservation, including resilience and the consideration of island and local traditions and practices.''.

(c) AMENDMENTS RELATING TO ACTIVITIES TO CONSERVE CORAL REEFS AND CORAL REEF ECOSYSTEMS.—Section 207(b) (16 U.S.C. 6406(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3) by striking ''and'' after the semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (4)—

(A) by striking ''cooperative conservation'' and inserting ''cooperative research, conservation,''; and

(B) by striking ''partners.'' and inserting ''partners, including academic institutions located in States;''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(5) improving and promoting the resilience of coral reefs and coral reef ecosystems; and

''(6) activities designed to minimize the likelihood of vessel impacts or other physical damage to coral reefs, including those areas identified in section 210(b).''.

(d) CRITERIA FOR APPROVAL OF PROJECT PROPOSALS.—Section 204(g) (16 U.S.C. 6403(g)) is further amended by striking ''or'' after the semicolon at the end of paragraph (10), by redesignating paragraph (11) as paragraph (12), and by inserting after paragraph (10) the following:

''(11) improving and promoting the resilience of coral reefs and coral reef ecosystems; or''.

(e) DATA ARCHIVE, ACCESS, AND AVAILABILITY.—Section 207 (16 U.S.C. 6406) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b) (as amended by subsection (b) of this section) by striking ''and'' after the semicolon at the end of paragraph (5), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (6) and inserting ''; and'', and by adding at the end the following:

''(7) centrally archiving, managing, and distributing data sets and providing coral reef ecosystem assessments and services to the general public with local, regional, or international programs and partners.''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(c) DATA ARCHIVE, ACCESS, AND AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary, in coordination with similar efforts at other Departments and agencies shall provide for the long-term stewardship of environmental data, products, and information via data processing, storage, and archive facilities pursuant to this title. The Secretary may—

''(1) archive environmental data collected by Federal, State, local agencies and tribal organizations and federally funded research;

''(2) promote widespread availability and dissemination of environmental data and information through full and open access and exchange to the greatest extent possible, including in electronic format on the Internet;

''(3) develop standards, protocols and procedures for sharing Federal data with State and local government programs and the private sector or academia; and

''(4) develop metadata standards for coral reef ecosystems in accordance with Federal Geographic Data Committee guidelines.''.

SEC. 104. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

Section 208 (16 U.S.C. 6407) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 208. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

''Not later than March 1, 2010, and every 5 years thereafter, the Administrator shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report describing all activities undertaken to implement the strategy, including—

''(1) a description of the funds obligated by each participating Federal agency to advance coral reef conservation during each fiscal year of the 5-fiscal-year period preceding the fiscal year in which the report is submitted;

''(2) a description of Federal interagency and cooperative efforts with States and nongovernmental partner organizations to prevent or address overharvesting, coastal runoff, or other anthropogenic impacts on coral reef ecosystems, including projects undertaken with the Department of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Army Corps of Engineers;

''(3) a summary of the information contained in the vessel grounding inventory established under section 210, including additional authorization or funding, needed for response and removal of such vessels;

''(4) a description of Federal disaster response actions taken pursuant to the National Response Plan to address damage to coral reefs and coral reef ecosystems; and

''(5) an assessment of the condition of United States coral reefs, accomplishments under this Act, and the effectiveness of management actions to address threats to coral reefs, including actions taken to address large-scale threats to coral reef ecosystems related to climate change.''.

SEC. 105. FUND; GRANTS; GROUNDING INVENTORY; COORDINATION.

The Act (16 U.S.C. 6401 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 205(a) (16 U.S.C. 6404(a)), by striking ''organization solely'' and all that follows and inserting ''organization—

''(1) to support partnerships between the public and private sectors that further the purposes of this Act and are consistent with the national coral reef strategy under section 203; and

''(2) to address emergency response actions under section 206.'';

(2) by adding at the end of section 205(b) (16 U.S.C. 6404(b)) the following: ''The organization is encouraged to solicit funding and in-kind services from the private sector, including nongovernmental organizations, for emergency response actions under section 206 and for activities to prevent damage to coral reefs, including areas identified in section 210(b)(2).'';

(3) in section 205(c) (16 U.S.C. 6404(c)), by striking ''the grant program'' and inserting ''any grant program or emergency response action'';

(4) by redesignating sections 209 and 210 as sections 217 and 218, respectively; and

(5) by inserting after section 208 the following:

''SEC. 209. COMMUNITY-BASED PLANNING GRANTS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator may make grants to entities that are eligible to receive grants under section 204(c) to provide additional funds to such entities to work with local communities and through appropriate Federal and State entities to prepare and implement plans for the increased protection of coral reef areas identified by the community and scientific experts as high priorities for focused attention. The plans shall—

''(1) support attainment of one or more of the criteria described in section 204(g);

''(2) be developed at the community level;

''(3) utilize where applicable watershed-based or ecosystem-based approaches;

''(4) provide for coordination with Federal and State experts and managers;

''(5) build upon local approaches or models, including traditional or island-based resource management concepts; and

''(6) complement local action strategies or regional plans for coral reef conservation.

''(b) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The provisions of subsections (b), (d), (f), and (h) of section 204 apply to grants under subsection (a), except that, for the purpose of applying section 204(b)(1) to grants under this section, '75 percent' shall be substituted for '50 percent'.

''SEC. 210. VESSEL GROUNDING INVENTORY.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator, in coordination with other Federal agencies, may maintain an inventory of all vessel grounding incidents involving coral reefs, including a description of—

''(1) the impacts to such resources;

''(2) vessel and ownership information, if available;

''(3) the estimated cost of removal, mitigation, or restoration;

''(4) the response action taken by the owner, the Administrator, the Commandant of the Coast Guard, or other Federal or State agency representatives;

''(5) the status of the response action, including the dates of vessel removal and mitigation or restoration and any actions taken to prevent future grounding incidents; and

''(6) recommendations for additional navigational aids or other mechanisms for preventing future grounding incidents.

''(b) IDENTIFICATION OF AT-RISK REEFS.—The Administrator may—

''(1) use information from any inventory maintained under subsection (a) or any other available information source to identify all coral reef areas that have a high incidence of vessel impacts, including groundings and anchor damage;

''(2) identify appropriate measures, including action by other agencies, to reduce the likelihood of such impacts; and

''(3) develop a strategy and timetable to implement such measures, including cooperative actions with other Government agencies and non-governmental partners.

''SEC. 211. REGIONAL, STATE, AND TERRITORIAL COORDINATION.

''(a) REGIONAL COORDINATION.—The Secretary and other Federal members of the United States Coral Reef Task Force shall work in coordination and collaboration with other Federal agencies and States to implement the strategies developed under section 203, including regional and local strategies, to address multiple threats to coral reefs and coral reef ecosystems such as coastal runoff, vessel impacts, and overharvesting.

''(b) RESPONSE AND RESTORATION ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary shall enter into written agreements with any States in which coral reefs are located regarding the manner in which response and restoration activities will be conducted within the affected State's waters. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to limit Federal response and restoration activity authority before any such agreement is final.

''(c) COOPERATIVE ENFORCEMENT AGREEMENTS.—All cooperative enforcement agreements in place between the Secretary and States affected by this title shall be updated to include enforcement of this title where appropriate.

''SEC. 212. AGREEMENTS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator may execute and perform such contracts, leases, grants, or cooperative agreements as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

''(b) FUNDING.—Under an agreement entered into under subsection (a), the Secretary may fulfill the terms of the agreement by reimbursing or providing appropriated funds to, and may receive funds or reimbursements from, Federal agencies, instrumentalities and laboratories; State and local governments; Native American tribes and organizations; international organizations; foreign governments; universities and research centers; educational institutions; nonprofit organizations; commercial organizations; and other public and private persons or entities, as necessary for purposes identified in section 202 and actions taken under subsections (a) through (d) of section 206.

''(c) MULTIYEAR COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—The Administrator may enter into multiyear cooperative agreements with the heads of other Federal agencies, States, local governments, academic institutions, including marine laboratories and coral reef institutes, and nongovernmental organizations to carry out the activities of the national coral reef action strategy developed under section 203 and to implement regional strategies developed pursuant to section 211.

''(d) USE OF OTHER AGENCIES' RESOURCES.—For purposes related to the conservation, preservation, protection, restoration, or replacement of coral reefs or coral reef ecosystems and the enforcement of this title, the Administrator is authorized to use, with their consent and with or without reimbursement, the land, services, equipment, personnel, and facilities of any Department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States, or of any State, local government, or Indian tribal government, or of any political subdivision thereof, or of any foreign government or international organization.

''SEC. 213. INTERNATIONAL CORAL REEF CONSERVATION STRATEGY.

''(a) INTERNATIONAL CORAL REEF ECOSYSTEM STRATEGY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Coral Reef Conservation Act Reauthorization and Enhancement Amendments of 2009, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and publish in the Federal Register, an international coral reef ecosystem strategy, consistent with the purposes of this title and the national strategy required pursuant to section 203(a). The Secretary shall periodically review and revise this strategy as necessary.

''(2) CONTENTS.—The strategy developed by the Secretary under paragraph (1) shall—

''(A) identify coral reef ecosystems throughout the world that are of high value for United States marine resources, that support high-seas resources of importance to the United States such as fisheries, or that support other interests of the United States;

''(B) summarize existing activities by Federal agencies and entities described in subsection (b) to address the conservation of coral reef ecosystems identified pursuant to subparagraph (A);

''(C) establish goals, objectives, and specific targets for conservation of priority international coral reef ecosystems;

''(D) describe appropriate activities to achieve the goals and targets for international coral reef conservation, in particular those that leverage activities already conducted under this title;

''(E) develop a plan to coordinate implementation of the strategy with entities described in subsection (b) in order to leverage current activities under this title and other conservation efforts globally;

''(F) identify appropriate partnerships, grants, or other funding and technical assistance mechanisms to carry out the strategy; and

''(G) develop criteria for prioritizing partnerships under subsection (c).

''(b) COORDINATION.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall consult with the Secretary of State, the Administrator of the Agency for International Development, the Secretary of the Interior, and other relevant Federal agencies, and relevant United States stakeholders, and shall take into account coral reef ecosystem conservation initiatives of other nations, international agreements, and intergovernmental and nongovernmental organizations so as to provide effective cooperation and efficiencies in international coral reef conservation. The Secretary may consult with the United States Coral Reef Task Force in carrying out this subsection.

''(c) INTERNATIONAL CORAL REEF ECOSYSTEM PARTNERSHIPS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may establish an international coral reef ecosystem partnership program to provide support, including funding and technical assistance, for activities that implement the strategy developed pursuant to subsection (a).

''(2) MECHANISMS.—The Secretary shall provide such support working in collaboration with the entities described in subsection (b).

''(3) CRITERIA FOR APPROVAL.—The Secretary may not approve a partnership proposal under this section unless the partnership is consistent with the international coral reef conservation strategy developed pursuant to subsection (a), and meets the criteria specified in that strategy.

''(d) PRIORITY FOR CERTAIN PROJECTS CONDUCTED BY STATES.—In implementing this section, the Secretary shall give priority consideration to regional initiatives and projects that States are participating in with other nations.

''SEC. 214. PERMITS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator may, in accordance with this section and regulations issued under this title, issue a permit authorizing the conduct of bona fide research.

''(b) EXEMPT ACTIVITIES.—No permit under this section is required for an activity that is exempt from liability under section 206(e).

''(c) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Administrator may place any terms and conditions on a permit issued under this section that the Administrator deems reasonable.

''(d) FEES.—

''(1) ASSESSMENT AND COLLECTION.—Subject to regulations issued under this title, the Administrator may assess and collect fees as specified in this subsection.

''(2) AMOUNT.—Any fee assessed shall be equal to the sum of—

''(A) all costs incurred, or expected to be incurred, by the Administrator in processing the permit application, including indirect costs; and

''(B) if the permit is approved, all costs incurred, or expected to be incurred, by the Administrator as a direct result of the conduct of the activity for which the permit is issued.

''(3) USE OF FEES.—Amounts collected by the Administrator in the form of fees under this section shall be collected and available for use only to the extent provided in advance in appropriations Acts and may be used by the Administrator for issuing and administering permits under this section.

''(4) WAIVER OR REDUCTION OF FEES.—For any fee assessed under paragraph (2) of this subsection, the Administrator may—

''(A) accept in-kind contributions in lieu of a fee; or

''(B) waive or reduce the fee.

''(e) FISHING.—Nothing in this section shall be considered to require a person to obtain a permit under this section for the conduct of any fishing activity that is not prohibited by this title or regulations issued under this title.

''SEC. 215. REGULATIONS; APPLICATION IN ACCORDANCE WITH INTERNATIONAL LAW.

''(a) REGULATIONS.—The Administrator may issue such regulations as are necessary and appropriate to carry out the purposes of sections 206 and 214.

''(b) RELATIONSHIP TO INTERNATIONAL LAW.—This title and any regulations promulgated under this title shall be applied in accordance with international law. No restrictions shall apply to or be enforced against a person who is not a citizen, national, or resident alien of the United States (including foreign flag vessels) unless in accordance with international law.''.

SEC. 106. CLARIFICATION OF DEFINITIONS.

Section 218, as redesignated by section 105 of this Act (relating to definitions; 16 U.S.C. 6409), is further amended—

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

''(2) CONSERVATION.—The term 'conservation' means the use of methods and procedures that are necessary to preserve or sustain coral reefs and associated species as resilient diverse, viable, and self-perpetuating coral reef ecosystems, including—

''(A) all activities associated with resource management, such as assessment, conservation, protection, restoration, sustainable use, and management of habitat;

''(B) mapping;

''(C) monitoring of coral reef ecosystems;

''(D) development and implementation of management strategies for marine protected area or networks thereof and marine resources consistent with the National Marine Sanctuaries Act (16 U.S.C. 1431 et seq.) and the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.);

''(E) law enforcement;

''(F) conflict resolution initiatives;

''(G) community outreach and education; and

''(H) activities that promote safe and ecologically sound navigation.'';

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

''(3) CORAL.—The term 'coral' means species of the phylum Cnidaria, including—

''(A) all species of the orders Antipatharia (black corals), Scleractinia (stony corals), Gorgonacea (horny corals), Stolonifera (organ-pipe corals and others), Alcyonacea (soft corals), and Helioporacea (blue coral), of the class Anthozoa; and

''(B) all species of the families Milleporidae (fire corals) and Stylasteridae (stylasterid hydrocorals), of the class Hydrozoa.'';

(3) by amending paragraph (4) to read as follows:

''(4) CORAL REEF.—The term 'coral reef' means a limestone structure, in the form of a reef or shoal, comprised in whole or in part by living coral, skeletal remains of coral, and other associated sessile marine plants and animals.'';

(4) by amending paragraph (5) to read as follows:

''(5) CORAL REEF ECOSYSTEM.—The term 'coral reef ecosystem' means a system of coral reefs and geographically associated species, habitats, and environment, including mangroves and seagrass habitats, and the processes that control its dynamics.''; and

(5) by redesignating paragraphs (7) and (8) in order as paragraphs (8) and (9), respectively, and by inserting after paragraph (6) the following:

''(7) CORAL REEF COMPONENT.—The term 'coral reef component' means any part of a

coral reef, including individual living coral, skeletal remains of coral, and other associated sessile marine plants and animals, and any adjacent or associated seagrasses.''.

SEC. 107. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 217, as redesignated by section 105 of this Act (relating to authorization of appropriations; 16 U.S.C. 6408), is further amended—

(1) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce to carry out this title $30,000,000 for fiscal year 2010, $32,000,000 for fiscal year 2011, $34,000,000 for fiscal year 2012, and $35,000,000 for fiscal years 2013 and 2014.'';

(2) in subsection (b) by striking ''$1,000,000'' and inserting ''$2,000,000'';

(3) by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

''(c) COMMUNITY-BASED PLANNING GRANTS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator to carry out section 209, $8,000,000 for fiscal years 2010 through 2014, to remain available until expended.''; and

(4) by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following:

''(d) DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior to carry out this title $10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2010 through 2014.''.

TITLE II—UNITED STATES CORAL REEF TASK FORCE

SEC. 201. UNITED STATES CORAL REEF TASK FORCE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is hereby established the United States Coral Reef Task Force.

(b) GOAL.—The goal of the Task Force shall be to lead, coordinate, and strengthen Federal Government actions to better preserve and protect coral reef ecosystems.

(c) DUTIES.—The duties of the Task Force shall be—

(1) to coordinate, in cooperation with State and local government partners, academic partners, and nongovernmental partners if appropriate, activities regarding the mapping, monitoring, research, conservation, mitigation, restoration of coral reefs and coral reef ecosystems;

(2) to monitor and advise regarding implementation of the policy and Federal agency responsibilities set forth in Executive Order 13089 and the national coral reef action strategy developed under section 203 of the Coral Reef Conservation Act of 2000, as amended by this Act; and

(3) to work with the Secretary of State and the Administrator of the Agency for International Development, and in coordination with the other members of the Task Force, to—

(A) assess the United States role in international trade and protection of coral species; and

(B) encourage implementation of appropriate strategies and actions to promote conservation and sustainable use of coral reef resources worldwide.

(d) MEMBERSHIP, GENERALLY.—The Task Force shall be comprised of—

(1) the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and the Secretary of the Interior, who shall be co-chairs of the Task Force;

(2) the Administrator of the Agency of International Development;

(3) the Secretary of Agriculture;

(4) the Secretary of Defense;

(5) the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Corps of Engineers;

(6) the Secretary of Homeland Security;

(7) the Attorney General;

(8) the Secretary of State;

(9) the Secretary of Transportation;

(10) the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency;

(11) the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration;

(12) the Director of the National Science Foundation;

(13) the Governor, or a representative of the Governor, of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands;

(14) the Governor, or a representative of the Governor, of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico;

(15) the Governor, or a representative of the Governor, of the State of Florida;

(16) the Governor, or a representative of the Governor, of the State of Hawaii;

(17) the Governor, or a representative of the Governor, of the Territory of Guam;

(18) the Governor, or a representative of the Governor, of the Territory of American Samoa; and

(19) the Governor, or a representative of the Governor, of the Virgin Islands.

(e) NONVOTING MEMBERS.—The President, or a representative of the President, of each of the Freely Associated States of the Federated States of Micronesia, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and the Republic of Palau may appoint a nonvoting member of the Task Force.

(f) RESPONSIBILITIES OF FEDERAL AGENCY MEMBERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Federal agency members of the Task Force shall—

(A) identify the actions of their agencies that may affect coral reef ecosystems;

(B) utilize the programs and authorities of their agencies to protect and enhance the conditions of such ecosystems; and

(C) assist in the implementation of the National Action Plan to Conserve Coral Reefs, the national coral reef action strategy developed under section 203 of the Coral Reef Conservation Act of 2000, as amended by this Act, the local action strategies, and any other coordinated efforts approved by the Task Force.

(2) CO-CHAIRS.—In addition to their responsibilities under paragraph (1), the co-chairs of the Task Force shall administer performance of the functions of the Task Force and facilitate the coordination of the Federal agency members of the Task Force.

(g) WORKING GROUPS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The co-chairs of the Task Force may establish working groups as necessary to meet the goals and duties of this title. The Task Force may request the co-chairs to establish such a working group.

(2) PARTICIPATION BY NONGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS.—The co-chairs may allow a nongovernmental organization or academic institution to participate in such a working group.

(h) FACA.—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to the Task Force.

(i) DEFINITIONS.—The definitions in section 218 of the Coral Reef Conservation Act of 2000, as amended by this Act, shall apply to this section.

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR CORAL REEF AUTHORITIES

SEC. 301. AMENDMENTS RELATING TO DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR PROGRAM.

(a) AMENDMENTS AND CLARIFICATIONS TO DEFINITIONS.—

(1) FISH AND WILDLIFE COORDINATION ACT.—Section 8 of the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 U.S.C. 666b) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', including coral reef ecosystems (as such term is defined in section 218 of the Coral Reef Conservation Act of 2000) located in any unit of the National Park System, any unit of the National Wildlife Refuge System, or any Marine National Monument designated under the Act of June 8, 1906 (34 Stat. 225; 16 U.S.C. 431) (popularly known as the 'Antiquities Act')''.

(2) FISH AND WILDLIFE ACT OF 1956 AND FISH AND WILDLIFE IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1978.—With respect to the authorities under the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 (16 U.S.C. 742a et seq.) and the authorities under the Fish and Wildlife Improvement Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 7421), references in such Acts to ''wildlife'' and ''fish and wildlife'' shall be construed to include coral reef ecosystems (as such term is defined in section 218 of the Coral Reef Conservation Act of 2000, as amended by this Act) located in any unit of the National Park System, any unit of the National Wildlife Refuge System, or any Marine National Monument designated under the Act of June 8, 1906 (34 Stat. 225; 16 U.S.C. 431) (popularly known as the ''Antiquities Act'').

(b) CORAL REEF CONSERVATION ASSISTANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior may provide technical assistance and, subject to the availability of appropriations, financial assistance for the conservation of coral reefs.

(2) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection each of the terms ''conservation'' and ''coral reef'' has the meaning that term has under section 218 of the Coral Reef Conservation Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 6409), amended by this Act.

SEC. 302. CLARIFICATION OF DEFINITIONS.

Section 218, as redesignated by section 105 of this Act (relating to definitions; 16 U.S.C. 6409), is further amended—

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

''(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term 'Administrator'—

''(A) except as provided in subparagraph (B), means the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; and

''(B) in sections 206, 209, 212, 214, and 215, means the Secretary of the Interior for purposes of application of those sections to national park units and national wildlife refuges.''; and

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

''(7) SECRETARY.—The term 'Secretary'—

''(A) except as provided in subparagraphs (B) and (C), means the Secretary of Commerce;

''(B) in section 206(e), means—

''(i) the Secretary of the Interior, with respect to any coral reef or component thereof that is located in—

''(I) any unit of the National Park System;

''(II) any unit of the National Wildlife Refuge System; or

''(III) any Marine National Monument designated under any of the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 U.S.C. 661 et seq.), the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 (16 U.S.C. 742a et seq.), the Fish and Wildlife Improvement Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 695j–1 et seq.) and the provisions of law enacted by that Act, and the Act of June 8, 1906 (34 Stat. 225; 16 U.S.C. 431) (popularly known as the 'Antiquities Act') and that is under the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior; and

''(ii) the Secretary of Commerce, with respect to any other coral reef or component thereof that is located in any Marine National Monument designated under a law referred to in clause (i)(III); and

''(C) in sections 203, means the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of the Interior.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Guam.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, last year the release of the Monaco Declaration made it apparent that ocean acidification is inevitable and will cause severe damage to coral reef ecosystems. This consensus of over 150 scientists from 26 nations is a clear statement that we must take action now to reduce and eliminate stresses on corals so that they can be conserved for future generations. H.R. 860, the Coral Reef Conservation Act Reauthorization and Enhancement Amendments of 2009, enhances the Federal Government's ability to respond to emergency situations and to protect reefs from damage caused by vessel groundings. It also codifies the U.S. Coral Reef Task Force, which has worked tirelessly to build partnerships and strategies for on-the-ground and in-the-water actions to conserve these ecosystems.

There is an urgent need to pass H.R. 860 to improve our ability to reduce and eliminate the stresses on these precious coral reef ecosystems. Mr. Speaker, my district of Guam is one of the several U.S. Coral Reef Task Force jurisdictions. The health of coral reefs in the waters surrounding the island jurisdictions and off the State of Florida is key to our economic standing and to the protection of our environment. H.R. 860 is, therefore, of particular importance to my district. Reauthorizing the law will afford the territories the opportunity and the resources necessary to continue to develop and implement local action strategies for the conservation of our coral reefs in partnership with the Federal Government. So with that, Mr. Speaker, I ask Members on both sides to support its passage and look forward to the opportunity of working with leaders in the other body to enact this bill into law in this Congress.

I reserve the balance of my time.

I submit for the RECORD the following exchange of letters between the Committee on Natural Resources and the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Science and Technology concerning H.R. 860.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, July 9, 2009.

Hon. NICK J. RAHALL II,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you concerning H.R. 860, the Coral Reef Conservation Act Reauthorization and Enhancement Amendments of 2009.

H.R. 860 contains provisions within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. In the interest of permitting your Committee to proceed expeditiously to floor consideration of this important bill, I am willing to waive this Committee's right mark up these bills. I do so with the understanding that by waiving consideration of H.R. 860, the Committee on Foreign Affairs does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bills which fall within its Rule X jurisdiction.

Further, I request your support for the appointment of Foreign Affairs Committee conferees during any House-Senate conference convened on this legislation. I would ask that you place this letter into the committee report on H.R. 860 and insert the letters in the Congressional Record when the House has this bill under consideration.

I look forward to working with you as we move these important measures through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

HOWARD L. BERMAN,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, July 9, 2009.

Hon. HOWARD BERMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Washington, DC.

DEAR HOWARD: Thank you for your willingness to expedite floor consideration of H.R. 860, the Coral Reef Conservation Act Reauthorization and Enhancement Amendments of 2009.

I appreciate your willingness to waive rights to further consideration of H.R. 860, even though your Committee has a jurisdictional interest in the matter and would receive a sequential referral. Of course, this waiver does not prejudice any further jurisdictional claims by your Committee over this legislation or similar language. Furthermore, I agree to support your request for appointment of conferees from the Committee on Foreign Affairs if a conference is held on this matter.

This exchange of letters will be placed in the committee report and inserted in the Congressional Record as part of the consideration of the bill on the House floor. Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you have worked regarding this matter and others between our respective committees.

With warm regards, I am

Sincerely,

NICK J. RAHALL II,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY,
Washington, DC, September 22, 2009.

Hon. NICK RAHALL,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN RAHALL: I am writing to you concerning the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on Science and Technology in H.R. 860, To reauthorize the Coral Reef Conservation Act of 2000, and for other purposes.

Our committee recognizes the importance of H.R. 860 and the need for the legislation to move expeditiously. Therefore, while we have a valid claim to jurisdiction over the bill, I do not intend to request a sequential referral. This, of course, is conditional on our mutual understanding that nothing in this legislation or my decision to forego a sequential referral waives, reduces or otherwise affects the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science and Technology, and that a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest in the bill will be included as part of the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill by the House.

The Committee on Science and Technology also asks that you support our request to be conferees on the provisions over which we have jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

BART GORDON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, September 22, 2009.

Hon. BART GORDON,
Chairman, Committee on Science and Technology, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your willingness to expedite floor consideration of H.R. 860, the Coral Reef Conservation Act Reauthorization and Enhancement Amendments of 2009.

I appreciate your willingness to waive rights to further consideration of H.R. 860, even though your Committee has a jurisdictional interest in the matter and would receive a sequential referral. Of course, this waiver does not prejudice any further jurisdictional claims by your Committee over this legislation or similar language. Furthermore, I agree to support your request for appointment of conferees from the Committee on Science and Technology if a conference is held on this matter.

This exchange of letters will be inserted in the Congressional Record as part of the consideration of the bill on the House floor. Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you have worked regarding this matter and others between our respective committees.

With warm regards, I am

Sincerely,

NICK J. RAHALL II,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources.

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

H.R. 860 reauthorizes the Coral Reef Conservation Act of 2000. That act provided grants for locally based actions to address locally identified threats to coral reefs. While H.R. 860, as introduced, was not a bill that Ranking Member HASTINGS could support, I appreciate the efforts by subcommittee Chair Ms. BORDALLO to address the concerns on our side of the aisle and to make this a much better piece of legislation than it was before. This legislation has a long way to go and faces hurdles in the Senate. I hope that we will be able to continue to work cooperatively across the aisle to make sure this legislation does not create new regulatory burdens on those activities that only indirectly affect coral reefs and does not create a new industry for litigation based on coral reef conservation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional requests for time and would inquire of the minority whether they have any additional speakers.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I thank my good friend for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 860, the reauthorization of the

Coral Reef Conservation Act. In addition to having the tremendous honor of representing the Florida Keys here in the United States Congress, I'm also pleased to boast that my district is home to one of the most diverse ecosystems in the Nation, if not the world. The waters surrounding my district, Florida's 18th Congressional District, is home to America's only living barrier coral reef, which is also the second-largest coral reef tract in the world. The bill before us today, H.R. 860, would continue the Federal Government's efforts to protect and preserve the coral reef systems in the Florida Keys as well as in Hawaii and in Guam.

Coral reefs provide many economic, environmental and cultural benefits, particularly in my home district, where tourism brings in hundreds of millions of dollars every year. As the reefs sustain more damage every day, the tourism and ecosystem they help to maintain are threatened. This bill, in particular, will increase Federal oversight over the monitoring and rehabilitation efforts of our coral reef system while also promoting community-based conservation initiatives. In effect, local stakeholders and Federal agencies will work together to develop regionally approved and appropriate management plans.

One of the most important ways that this bill will help to protect coral reefs is by authorizing emergency responses to the physical damages that are sustained by coral reefs due to vessel groundings and impacts from derelict fishing gear. Having the distinct pleasure of taking part in two scuba diving missions to the Aquarius Undersea Laboratory in the Florida Keys, I witnessed just how important our coral reefs are not only to the environment but also for the education of our young people. In today's hyperlinked world, elementary students from Idaho can tune in to educational broadcasts on the dangers of coral bleaching and offshore drilling by the aquanauts working in the Aquarius. During one of my two visits to Aquarius, I had the pleasure of participating in a live question-and-answer session with local elementary school students on the issue of coral reef preservation.

Coral reefs are important to all Americans, not just to those of us who are fortunate enough to live in coastal areas. That is why I join my colleagues here today in strong support of H.R. 860, a bill which reaffirms the role of our Federal Government in protecting these precious coral resources for today and tomorrow's generations. Thank you for the time, my good friend from Utah, and I thank my wonderful friend from Guam, once again, for fighting for our Nation's environment.

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

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues, the gentlelady from Florida, Congresswoman ROS-LEHTINEN, for her very strong words in support of this bill and, of course, from the opposite side of the aisle, the manager of the bill here, Mr. CHAFFETZ of Utah. I want to thank them for their support.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 860, legislation to reauthorize the Coral Reef Conservation Act of 2000. I want to commend the gentlelady from Guam who is my good friend and Chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Insular Affairs, Oceans and Wildlife, Congresswoman BORDALLO, for her leadership on this important issue. I also want to commend Chairman RAHALL and members of the Natural Resources Committee for bringing this important bill before the House for consideration.

Mr. Speaker, much has been said about how our coral reefs are in a critical state but it must be reemphasized that the conservation of coral reef is a national priority, especially given its ecological, social, economic and scientific value.

Known also as the "rainforests of the sea," coral reefs provide support to about 4,000 documented fish species, 800 species of hard corals, and hundreds of other species, which is more species per unit area compared to any other marine ecosystem.

Economically, coral reefs provide the basis for an estimated $400 billion global fishing and tourism industry. For the Territories in the South Pacific Region, the economic value of coral reefs is even steeper. For example, estimates of annual economic value of coral reefs in Guam ($127.3 million), the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands ($61.7 million), and American Samoa ($5.8 million), demonstrate the importance of this resource to island economies.

But even more significant, there is increasing interest in research on corals for possible cures for cancer, arthritis, human bacterial infections, viruses and other diseases. In addition, corals which live 300 years or more may contain environmental data that can assist scientists to better understand climate change and also improve studies on ocean acidification.

Yet, more than 28 percent of the world's coral reefs have been lost forever. The list of environmental threats facing coral reefs is long including overfishing and destructive fishing practices; ship groundings and debris; impacts of human population growth and shoreline development; polluted runoff and degraded water quality; and siltation and impaired water clarity.

In addition, more studies have revealed climate change also poses serious threats, including ocean acidification and warming of tropical and subtropical coastal waters. Such is the seriousness of threat on coral reefs that the global community declared 2008 as the International Year of the Reef. This was even recognized by the House in the last Congress through the unanimous passage of House Resolution 1112.

To address these many threats to coral reefs, Congress passed the Coral Reef Conservation Act which established the Coral Reef Conservation Program within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) to fund coral reef conservation activities. H.R. 860 follows this successful model in place and provides additional tools and mechanisms to better protect our coral reefs.

In addition, I am especially encouraged that this bill also recognizes the importance of providing funding and resources to institutes that are directly impacted and also pursuing further exploration and research of coral reefs. Under this bill, universities and research centers, such as coral reef institutes or other educational institutions such as the University of Guam or American Samoa Community College, will be given resources and support to conduct ecological research and monitoring that builds capacity for more effective resource management.

I cannot reemphasize enough the importance of coral reefs to our nation and the rest of the world. I urge my colleagues to vote yes on H.R. 860 and help protect our coral reefs.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, today I offer my strong support for the Coral Reef Conservation Act Reauthorization and Enhancement Amendments. Coral reefs are unique ecosystems that support over one million species globally, offer essential protection from hurricanes, typhoons, and tsunamis, and attract millions of vacationers each year. Unfortunately, these reefs face unparalleled dangers today from pollution, overfishing, coastal development, disease, habitat fragmentation, ship groundings, and warming waters.

Ten percent of coral reefs have already disappeared from U.S. waters alone while over seventy percent of the world's reefs are threatened. If this trend continues, more than forty percent of global coral reefs will be lost in the next two to ten years.

The Coral Reef Conservation Act Reauthorization addresses the coral reef crisis by taking strong actions in response to physical damages to reefs by developing scientific management strategies to promote reef resilience. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this legislation critical to conserving our oceans' greatest treasures.

Ms. BORDALLO. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, having no other speakers, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I again urge Members to support this bill. I thank them for their support on the floor here.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ILLEGAL, UNREPORTED, AND UNREGULATED FISHING ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2009

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1080) to strengthen enforcement mechanisms to stop illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1080

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 ''Illegal, Unreported, and Unregulated Fishing Enforcement Act of 2009''.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO THE HIGH SEAS DRIFTNET FISHING MORATORIUM PROTECTION ACT.

(a) ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT.—Section 606 of the High Seas Driftnet Fishing Moratorium Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 1826g) is amended by inserting before the first sentence the following:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary and the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall enforce this title, and the Acts to which this section applies, in accordance with this section. Each such Secretary may, by agreement, on a reimbursable basis or otherwise, utilize the personnel services, equipment (including aircraft and vessels), and facilities of any other Federal agency, and of any State agency, in the performance of such duties.

''(b) ACTS TO WHICH SECTION APPLIES.—This section applies to—

''(1) the Pacific Salmon Treaty Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3631 et seq.);

''(2) the Dolphin Protection Consumer Information Act (16 U.S.C. 1385);

''(3) the Tuna Conventions Act of 1950 (16 U.S.C. 951 et seq.);

''(4) the North Pacific Anadromous Stocks Act of 1992 (16 U.S.C. 5001 et seq.);

''(5) the South Pacific Tuna Act of 1988 (16 U.S.C. 973 et seq.);

''(6) the Antarctic Marine Living Resources Convention Act of 1984 (16 U.S.C. 2431 et seq.);

''(7) the Atlantic Tunas Convention Act of 1975 (16 U.S.C. 971 et seq.);

''(8) the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Convention Act of 1995 (16 U.S.C. 5601 et seq.); and

''(9) the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Convention Implementation Act (16 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.).

''(c) ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT.—The Secretary shall prevent any person from violating this title, or any Act to which this section applies, in the same manner, by the same means, and with the same jurisdiction, powers, and duties as though sections 308 through 311 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1858 through 1861) were incorporated into and made a part of and applicable to this title and each such Act.

''(d) SPECIAL RULES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the incorporation by reference of certain sections of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act under subsection (c), if there is a conflict between a provision of this subsection and the corresponding provision of any section of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act so incorporated, the provision of this subsection shall apply.

''(2) ADDITIONAL ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY.—In addition to the powers of officers authorized pursuant to subsection (c), any officer who is authorized by the Secretary, or the head of any Federal or State agency that has entered into an agreement with the Secretary under subsection (a), to enforce the provisions of any Act to which this section applies may, with the same jurisdiction, powers, and duties as though section 311 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1861) were incorporated into and made a part of each such Act—

''(A) search or inspect any facility or conveyance used or employed in, or which reasonably appears to be used or employed in, the storage, processing, transport, or trade of fish or fish products;

''(B) inspect records pertaining to the storage, processing, transport, or trade of fish or fish products;

''(C) detain, for a period of up to 5 days, any shipment of fish or fish product imported into, landed on, introduced into, exported from, or transported within the jurisdiction of the United States, or, if such fish or fish product is deemed to be perishable, sell and retain the proceeds therefrom for a period of up to 5 days;

''(D) make an arrest, in accordance with any guidelines which may be issued by the Attorney General, for any offense under the laws of the United States committed in the person's presence, or for the commission of any felony under the laws of the United States, if the person has reasonable grounds to believe that the person to be arrested has committed or is committing a felony;

''(E) search and seize, in accordance with any guidelines that are issued by the Attorney General; and

''(F) execute and serve any subpoena, arrest warrant, search warrant issued in accordance with rule 41 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, or other warrant or civil or criminal process issued by any officer or court of competent jurisdiction.

''(3) DISCLOSURE OF ENFORCEMENT INFORMATION.—The Secretary may disclose, as necessary and appropriate, information, including information collected under joint authority of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) and the Atlantic Tunas Convention Act of 1975 (16 U.S.C. 71 et seq.) or the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Convention Implementation Act (16 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.) or other statutes implementing international fishery agreements, to any other Federal or State government agency, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the secretariat or equivalent of an international fishery management organization or arrangement made pursuant to an international fishery agreement, or a foreign government, if—

''(A) such government, organization, or arrangement has policies and procedures to protect such information from unintended or unauthorized disclosure; and

''(B) such disclosure is necessary—

''(i) to ensure compliance with any law or regulation enforced or administered by the Secretary;

''(ii) to administer or enforce any international fishery agreement to which the United States is a party;

''(iii) to administer or enforce a binding conservation measure adopted by any international organization or arrangement to which the United States is a party;

''(iv) to assist in any investigative, judicial, or administrative enforcement proceeding in the United States; or

''(v) to assist in any law enforcement action undertaken by a law enforcement agency of a foreign government, or in relation to a legal proceeding undertaken by a foreign government.

''(e) PROHIBITED ACTS.—It is unlawful for any person—

''(1) to violate any provision of this title or any regulation or permit issued pursuant to this title;

''(2) to refuse to permit any officer authorized to enforce the provisions of this title to board, search, or inspect a vessel, aircraft, vehicle, or shoreside facility subject to such person's control for the purposes of conducting any search, investigation, or inspection in connection with the enforcement of this title, any regulation promulgated under this title, or any Act to which this section applies;

''(3) to forcibly assault, resist, oppose, impede, intimidate, or interfere with any such authorized officer in the conduct of any search, investigation, or inspection described in paragraph (2);

''(4) to resist a lawful arrest for any act prohibited by this section or any Act to which this section applies;

''(5) to interfere with, delay, or prevent, by any means, the apprehension, arrest, or detection of an other person, knowing that such person has committed any act prohibited by this section or any Act to which this section applies; or

''(6) to forcibly assault, resist, oppose, impede, intimidate, sexually harass, bribe, or interfere with—

''(A) any observer on a vessel under this title or any Act to which this section applies; or

''(B) any data collector employed by the National Marine Fisheries Service or under contract to any person to carry out responsibilities under this title or any Act to which this section applies.

''(f) CIVIL PENALTY.—Any person who commits any act that is unlawful under subsection (e) shall be liable to the United States for a civil penalty, and may be subject to a permit sanction, under section 308 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1858).

''(g) CRIMINAL PENALTY.—Any person who commits an act that is unlawful under subsection (e)(2), (e)(3), (e)(4), (e)(5), or (e)(6) is deemed to be guilty of an offense punishable under section 309(b) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1859(b)).

''(h) UTILIZATION OF FEDERAL AGENCY ASSETS.—''.

(b) ACTIONS TO IMPROVE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF INTERNATIONAL FISHERY MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATIONS.—Section 608 of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1826i) is amended by—

(1) inserting before the first sentence the following: ''(a) IN GENERAL.—'';

(2) in subsection (a) (as designated by paragraph (1) of this subsection) in the first sentence, inserting '', or arrangements made pursuant to an international fishery agreement,'' after ''organizations''; and

(3) adding at the end the following new subsections:

''(b) DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION.—The Secretary may disclose, as necessary and appropriate, information, including information collected under joint authority of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) and the Atlantic Tunas Convention Act of 1975 (16 U.S.C. 71 et seq.), the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Convention Implementation Act (16 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.), any other statute implementing an international fishery agreement, to any other Federal or State government agency, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, or the secretariat or equivalent of an international fishery management organization or arrangement made pursuant to an international fishery agreement, if such government, organization, or arrangement, respectively, has policies and procedures to protect such information from unintended or unauthorized disclosure.

''(c) IUU VESSEL LISTS.—The Secretary may—

''(1) develop, maintain, and make public a list of vessels and vessel owners engaged in illegal, unreported, or unregulated fishing or fishing-related activities in support of illegal, unreported, or unregulated fishing, including vessels or vessel owners identified by an international fishery management organization or arrangement made pursuant to an international fishery agreement, that—

''(A) the United States is party to; or

''(B) the United States is not party to, but whose procedures and criteria in developing and maintaining a list of such vessels and vessel owners are substantially similar to such procedures and criteria adopted pursuant to an international fishery agreement to which the United States is a party; and

''(2) take appropriate action against listed vessels and vessel owners, including action against fish, fish parts, or fish products from such vessels, in accordance with applicable United States law and consistent with applicable international law, including principles,

rights, and obligations established in applicable international fishery management agreements and trade agreements.

''(d) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary may promulgate regulations to implement this section.''.

(c) NOTIFICATION REGARDING IDENTIFICATION OF NATIONS.—Section 609(b) of such Act (166 U.S.C. 1826j(b)) is amended to read as follows:

''(b) NOTIFICATION.—The Secretary shall notify the President and that nation of such an identification.''.

(d) NATIONS IDENTIFIED UNDER SECTION 610.—Section 610(b)(1) of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1826k(b)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

''(1) notify, as soon as possible, the President and nations that have been identified under subsection (a), and also notify other nations whose vessels engage in fishing activities or practices described in subsection (a), about the provisions of this section and this Act;''.

(e) EFFECT OF CERTIFICATION UNDER SECTION 609.—Section 609(d)(3)(A)(i) of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1826j(d)(3)(A)(i)) is amended by striking ''that has not been certified by the Secretary under this subsection, or''.

(f) EFFECT OF CERTIFICATION UNDER SECTION 610.—Section 610(c)(5) of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1826k(c)(5)) is amended by striking ''that has not been certified by the Secretary under this subsection, or''.

(g) IDENTIFICATION OF NATIONS.—

(1) SCOPE OF IDENTIFICATION FOR ACTIONS OF FISHING VESSELS.—Section 609(a) of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1826j(a)) is amended—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking ''2 years'' and inserting ''3 years'';

(B) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''that undermines the effectiveness of measures required by an international fishery management organization, taking into account whether'' after ''(1)''; and

(C) in paragraph (1), by striking ''vessels of''.

(2) ADDITIONAL GROUNDS FOR IDENTIFICATION.—Section 609(a) of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1826j(a)) is further amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) in order as subparagraphs (A) and (B) (and by moving the margins of such subparagraphs 2 ems to the right);

(B) by inserting before the first sentence the following:

''(1) IDENTIFICATION FOR ACTIONS OF FISHING VESSELS.—''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) IDENTIFICATION FOR ACTIONS OF NATION.—Taking into account the factors described under section 609(a)(1), the Secretary shall also identify, and list in such report, a nation—

''(A) if it is violating, or has violated at any point during the preceding three years, conservation and management measures required under an international fishery management agreement to which the United States is a party and the violations undermine the effectiveness of such measures; or

''(B) if it is failing, or has failed at any point during the preceding three years, to effectively address or regulate illegal, unreported, or unregulated fishing in areas described under paragraph (1)(B).

''(3) APPLICATION TO OTHER ENTITIES.—Where the provisions of this Act are applicable to nations, they shall also be applicable, as appropriate, to other entities that have competency to enter into international fishery management agreements.''.

(3) PERIOD OF FISHING PRACTICES SUPPORTING IDENTIFICATION.—Section 610(a)(1) of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1826k(a)(1)) is amended by striking ''calendar year'' and replacing with ''three years''.

(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) Section 609(f) of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1826j) is amended by—

(A) striking ''2007'' and inserting ''2010''; and

(B) striking ''2013'' and inserting ''2015''.

(2) Section 610(f) of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1826k) is amended by—

(A) striking ''2007'' and inserting ''2010''; and

(B) striking ''2013'' and inserting ''2015''.

(i) TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.—

(1) Section 607(2) of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1826h(2)) is amended by striking ''whose vessels'' and inserting ''that''.

(2) Section 609(d)(1) of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1826j(d)(1)) is amended by striking ''of its fishing vessels''.

(3) Section 609(d)(1)(A) of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1826j(d)(1)(A)) is amended by striking ''of its fishing vessels''.

(4) Section 609(d)(2) of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1826j(d)(2)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''for certification'' and inserting ''to authorize'';

(B) by inserting ''the importation'' after ''or other basis'';

(C) by striking ''harvesting''; and

(D) by striking ''not certified under paragraph (1)'' and inserting ''issued a negative certification under paragraph (1)''.

(5) Section 610 of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1826k) is amended as follows:

(A) In subsection (a)(1), by striking ''practices;'' and inserting ''practices—''.

(B) In subsection (c)(1)(A), by striking '', and which, in the case of pelagic longline fishing, includes mandatory use of circle hooks, careful handling and release equipment, and training and observer programs''.

(C) In subsection (c)(4), by striking all preceding subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

''(4) ALTERNATIVE PROCEDURE.—The Secretary may establish a procedure to authorize, on a shipment-by-shipment, shipper-by-shipper, or other basis the importation of fish or fish products from a vessel of a nation issued a negative certification under paragraph (1) if the Secretary determines that such imports were harvested by practices that do not result in bycatch of a protected marine species, or were harvested by practices that—

''(A) are comparable to those of the United States, taking into account different conditions; and''.

SEC. 3. AMENDMENTS TO THE HIGH SEAS DRIFTNET FISHERIES ENFORCEMENT ACT.

(a) NEGATIVE CERTIFICATION EFFECTS.—Section 101 of the High Seas Driftnet Fisheries Enforcement Act (16 U.S.C. 1826a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2), by striking ''recognized principles of'' after ''in accordance with'';

(2) in subsection (a)(2)(A), by inserting ''or, as appropriate, for fishing vessels of a nation that receives a negative certification under section 609(d) or section 610(c) of the High Seas Driftnet Fishing Moratorium Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 1826)'' after ''(1)'';

(3) in subsection (a)(2)(B), by inserting before the period the following: '', except for the purposes of inspecting such vessel, conducting an investigation, or taking other appropriate enforcement action'';

(4) in subsection (b)(1)(A)(i), by striking ''or illegal, unreported, or unregulated fishing'' after ''driftnet fishing'';

(5) in subsection (b)(1)(B) and subsection (b)(2), by striking ''or illegal, unreported, or unregulated fishing'' after ''driftnet fishing'' each place it appears;

(6) in subsection (b)(3)(A)(i), by inserting ''or a negative certification under section 609(d) or section 610(c) of the High Seas Driftnet Fishing Moratorium Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 1826j(d), 1826k(c))'' after ''(1)(A)'';

(7) in subsection (b)(4)(A), by inserting ''or issues a negative certification under section 609(d) or section 610(c) of the High Seas Driftnet Fishing Moratorium Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 1826j(d), 1826k(c))'' after ''paragraph (1)'';

(8) in subsection (b)(4)(A)(i), by striking ''or illegal, unreported, or unregulated fishing'' after ''driftnet fishing''; and

(9) in subsection (b)(4)(A)(i), by inserting '', or to address the offending activities for which a nation received a negative certification under section 609(d) or 610(c) of the High Seas Driftnet Fishing Moratorium Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 1826j(d), 1826k(c))'' after ''beyond the exclusive economic zone of any nation''.

(b) DURATION OF NEGATIVE CERTIFICATION EFFECTS.—Section 102 of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1826b) is amended by—

(1) striking ''or illegal, unreported, or unregulated fishing''; and

(2) inserting ''or effectively addressed the offending activities for which the nation received a negative certification under 609(d) or 610(c) of the High Seas Driftnet Fishing Moratorium Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 1826j(d), 1826k(c))'' before the period at the end.

SEC. 4. AMENDMENTS TO THE TUNA CONVENTIONS ACT OF 1950.

Section 8 of the Tuna Conventions Act of 1950 (16 U.S.C. 957) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by striking ''knowingly'';

(2) by striking subsections (d) through (g) and inserting the following:

''(d) ADDITIONAL PROHIBITIONS AND ENFORCEMENT.—For additional prohibitions relating to this Act and enforcement of this Act, see section 606 of the High Seas Driftnet Fishing Moratorium Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 1826g).''; and

(3) by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (e).

SEC. 5. AMENDMENTS TO NORTH PACIFIC ANADROMOUS STOCKS ACT OF 1992.

(a) UNLAWFUL ACTIVITIES.—Section 810 of the North Pacific Anadromous Stocks Act of 1992 (16 U.S.C. 5009) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5), by inserting '', investigation,'' after ''search''; and

(2) in paragraph (6), by inserting '', investigation,'' after ''search''.

(b) ADDITIONAL PROHIBITIONS AND ENFORCEMENT.—Section 811 of the Northern Pacific Anadromous Stocks Act of 1992 (16 U.S.C. 5010) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 811. ADDITIONAL PROHIBITIONS AND ENFORCEMENT.

''For additional prohibitions relating to this Act and enforcement of this Act, see section 606 of the High Seas Driftnet Fishing Moratorium Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 1826g).''.

SEC. 6. AMENDMENTS TO THE PACIFIC SALMON TREATY ACT OF 1985.

Section 8 of the Pacific Salmon Treaty Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3637) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2)—

(A) by inserting '', investigation,'' after ''search''; and

(B) by striking ''this title;'' and inserting ''this Act;'';

(2) in subsection (a)(3)—

(A) by inserting '', investigation,'' after ''search''; and

(B) by striking ''subparagraph (2) ;'' and inserting ''paragraph (2);'';

(3) in subsection (a)(5), by striking ''this title; or'' and inserting ''this Act;'';

(4) by striking subsections (b) through (f) and inserting the following:

''(b) ADDITIONAL PROHIBITIONS AND ENFORCEMENT.—For additional prohibitions relating to this Act and enforcement of this Act, see section 606 of the High Seas Driftnet Fishing Moratorium Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 1826g).''.

SEC. 7. AMENDMENTS TO THE WESTERN AND CENTRAL PACIFIC FISHERIES CONVENTION IMPLEMENTATION ACT.

The Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Convention Implementation Act (title V of Public Law 109–479) is amended—

(1) in section 503(a) (16 U.S.C. 6902(a)), by striking ''one of whom shall be the chairman or a member of the Western Pacific Fishery Management Council and the Pacific Fishery Management Council'' and inserting ''one of whom shall be a member of the Western Pacific Fishery Management Council, and one of whom shall be a member of the Pacific Fishery Management Council'';

(2) in section 503(c)(1) (16 U.S.C. 6902(c)(1)), by striking ''shall be considered to be Federal employees'' and all that follows through the end of the sentence and inserting ''shall not be considered Federal employees except for purposes of injury compensation and tort claims liability as provided in chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code, and chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code.'';

(3) in section 503(d)(2)(B) (16 U.S.C. 6902(d)(2)(B)), by amending clause (ii) to read as follows:

''(ii) shall not be considered Federal employees while performing service except for the purposes of injury compensation and tort claims liability as provided in chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code, and chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code.'';

(4) by amending section 506(c) (16 U.S.C. 6905(c)) to read as follows:

''(c) ADDITIONAL PROHIBITIONS AND ENFORCEMENT.—For additional prohibitions relating to this Act and enforcement of this Act, see section 606 of the High Seas Driftnet Fishing Moratorium Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 1826g).''; and

(5) in section 507(a)(2) (16 U.S.C. 6906(a)(2)) by striking ''suspension, on'' and inserting ''suspension, of''.

SEC. 8. AMENDMENTS TO THE SOUTH PACIFIC TUNA ACT OF 1988.

The South Pacific Tuna Act of 1988 is amended—

(1) in section 5(a) (16 U.S.C. 973c(a))—

(A) in paragraph (8), by inserting '', investigation,'' after ''search''; and

(B) in paragraph (10), by inserting '', investigation,'' after ''search''; and

(2) by striking sections 7 and 8 (16 U.S.C. 973e and 973f) and inserting the following:

''SEC. 7. ADDITIONAL PROHIBITIONS AND ENFORCEMENT.

''For additional prohibitions relating to this Act and enforcement of this Act, see section 606 of the High Seas Driftnet Fishing Moratorium Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 1826g).''.

SEC. 9. AMENDMENTS TO THE ANTARCTIC MARINE LIVING RESOURCES CONVENTION ACT.

The Antarctic Marine Living Resources Convention Act of 1984 is amended—

(1) in section 306 (16 U.S.C. 2435)—

(A) in paragraph (3), by striking ''which he knows, or reasonably should have known, was'';

(B) in paragraph (4), by inserting '', investigation,'' after ''search''; and

(C) in paragraph (5), by inserting '', investigation,'' after ''search'';

(2) in section 307 (16 U.S.C. 2436)—

(A) by inserting ''(a) IN GENERAL.—'' before the first sentence; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(b) REGULATIONS TO IMPLEMENT CONSERVATION MEASURES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsections (b), (c), and (d) of section 553 of title 5, United States Code, the Secretary of Commerce may publish in the Federal Register a final regulation to implement any conservation measure for which the Secretary of State notifies the Commission under section 305(a)(1)—

''(A) that has been in effect for 12 months or less;

''(B) that is adopted by the Commission; and

''(C) with respect to which the Secretary of State does not notify Commission in accordance with section 305(a)(1) within the time period allotted for objections under Article IX of the Convention.

''(2) ENTERING INTO FORCE.—Upon publication of such regulation in the Federal Register, such conservation measure shall enter into force with respect to the United States.''; and

(3) by striking sections 308 and 309 (16 U.S.C. 2437 and 2438) and inserting the following:

''SEC. 308. ADDITIONAL PROHIBITIONS AND ENFORCEMENT.

''For additional prohibitions relating to this Act and enforcement of this Act, see section 606 of the High Seas Driftnet Fishing Moratorium Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 1826g).''.

SEC. 10. AMENDMENTS TO THE ATLANTIC TUNAS CONVENTION ACT.

The Atlantic Tunas Convention Act of 1975 is amended—

(1) in section 6(c)(2) (16 U.S.C. 971d(c)(2)(2))—

(A) by striking ''(A)'' and inserting ''(i)'';

(B) by striking ''(B)'' and inserting ''(ii)'';

(C) by inserting ''(A)'' after ''(2)''; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) Notwithstanding the requirements of subparagraph (A) and subsections (b) and (c) of section 553 of title 5, United States Code, the Secretary may issue final regulations to implement Commission recommendations referred to in paragraph (1) concerning trade restrictive measures against nations or fishing entities.'';

(2) in section 7 (16 U.S.C. 971e) by striking subsections (e) and (f) and redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (e);

(3) in section 8 (16 U.S.C. 971f)—

(A) by striking subsections (a) and (c); and

(B) by inserting before subsection (b) the following:

''(a) For additional prohibitions relating to this Act and enforcement of this Act, see section 606 of the High Seas Driftnet Fishing Moratorium Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 1826g).'';

(4) in section 8(b) by striking ''the enforcement activities specified in section 8(a) of this Act'' each place it appears and inserting ''enforcement activities with respect to this Act that are otherwise authorized by law''; and

(5) by striking section 11 (16 U.S.C. 971j) and redesignating sections 12 and 13 as sections 11 and 12, respectively.

SEC. 11. AMENDMENTS TO THE HIGH SEAS FISHING COMPLIANCE ACT OF 1965.

Section 104(f) of the High Seas Fishing Compliance Act of 1995 (16 U.S.C. 5503(f)) is amended to read as follows:

''(f) VALIDITY.—A permit issued under this section for a vessel is void if—

''(1) any other permit or authorization required for the vessel to fish is expired, revoked, or suspended; or

''(2) the vessel is no longer documented under the laws of the United States or eligible for such documentation.''.

SEC. 12. AMENDMENTS TO THE PACIFIC WHITING ACT OF 2006.

(a) SCIENTIFIC EXPERTS ON JOINT TECHNICAL COMMITTEE.—Section 605(a)(1) of the Pacific Whiting Act of 2006 (16 U.S.C. 7004)(a)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall appoint no more than two individuals to serve as scientific experts on the joint technical committee, at least one of whom shall be an official of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.''; and

(b) TREATMENT AS FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.—Section 609(a) of the Pacific Whiting Act of 2006 (16 U.S.C. 7008(a)) is amended by striking ''shall be considered to be Federal employees while performing such service, only for purposes of—'' and all that follows and inserting ''shall not be considered Federal employees while performing such service, except for purposes of injury compensation or tort claims liability as provided in chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code, and chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code.''.

SEC. 13. AMENDMENTS TO THE DOLPHIN PROTECTION CONSUMER INFORMATION ACT.

The Dolphin Protection Consumer Information Act (16 U.S.C. 1385) is amended by amending subsection (e) to read as follows:

''(e) ADDITIONAL PROHIBITIONS AND ENFORCEMENT.—For additional prohibitions relating to this Act and enforcement of this Act, see section 606 of the High Seas Driftnet Fishing Moratorium Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 1826g).''.

SEC. 14. AMENDMENTS TO THE NORTHERN PACIFIC HALIBUT ACT OF 1982.

(a) PROHIBITED ACTS.—Section 7 of the Northern Pacific Halibut Act of 1982 (16 U.S.C. 773e) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (a) by redesignating subparagraphs (1) through (6) as subparagraphs (A) through (F);

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (a) and (b) as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively;

(3) by in paragraph (1)(B), as so redesignated, by inserting '', investigation,'' before ''or inspection'';

(4) by in paragraph (1)(C), as so redesignated, by inserting '', investigation,'' before ''or inspection'';

(5) in paragraph (1)(E), as so redesignated, by striking ''or'' after the semicolon; and

(6) in paragraph (1)(F), as so redesignated, by striking ''section.'' and inserting ''section; or''.

(b) ENFORCEMENT POWERS.—Section 11 of the Northern Pacific Halibut Act of 1982 (16 U.S.C. 773i) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g) In addition to the powers of officers authorized pursuant to subsection (b), any officer who is authorized by the Secretary, or by the head of any Federal or State agency that has entered into an agreement with the Secretary under subsection (a), to enforce the Convention, this Act, or any regulation adopted under this Act, may—

''(1) search or inspect any facility or conveyance used or employed in, or which reasonably appears to be used or employed in, the storage, processing, transport, or trade of fish or fish products;

''(2) inspect records pertaining to the storage, processing, transport, or trade of fish or fish products; and

''(3) detain, for a period of up to 5 days, any shipment of fish or fish product imported into, landed on, introduced into, exported from, or transported within the jurisdiction of the United States, or, if such fish or fish product is deemed to be perishable, sell and retain the proceeds therefrom for a period of up to 5 days.''.

SEC. 15. AMENDMENTS TO THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES CONVENTION ACT OF 1995.

Section 207 of the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Convention Act of 1995 (16 U.S.C. 5606) is amended—

*(1) in the section heading, by striking ''**AND PENALTIES**'' and inserting ''**AND ENFORCEMENT**'';*

(2) in subsection (a)(2), by inserting '', investigation,'' before ''or inspection'';

(3) in subsection (a)(3), by inserting '', investigation,'' before ''or inspection''; and

(4) by striking subsections (b) through (f) and inserting the following:

''(b) ADDITIONAL PROHIBITIONS AND ENFORCEMENT.—For additional prohibitions relating to this Act and enforcement of this Act, see section 606 of the High Seas Driftnet Fishing Moratorium Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 1826g).''.

SEC. 16. AMENDMENT TO THE MAGNUSON-STEVENS FISHERY CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT ACT.

Section 307(1)(Q) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1857(1)(Q)) is amended by inserting before the semicolon the following: ''or any treaty or in contravention of any binding conservation measure adopted by an international agreement or organization to which the United States is a party''.

SEC. 17. INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AND ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AND ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—The Secretary of Commerce, acting through the National Marine Fisheries Service, may establish an international cooperation and assistance program, including grants, to provide assistance for sustainable fishery management capacity building efforts.

(b) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.—In carrying out the program, the Secretary may—

(1) provide funding and technical expertise to other nations to assist them in addressing illegal, unreported, or unregulated fishing activities;

(2) provide funding and technical expertise to other nations to assist them in reducing the loss and environmental impacts of derelict fishing gear, reducing the bycatch of living marine resources, and promoting international marine resource conservation;

(3) provide funding, technical expertise, and training to other nations to aid them in building capacity for enhanced fisheries management, fisheries monitoring, catch and trade tracking activities, enforcement, and international marine resource conservation;

(4) establish partnerships with other Federal agencies or non-governmental organizations, as appropriate, to ensure that fisheries development assistance to other nations is directed toward projects that promote sustainable fisheries; and

(5) conduct outreach and education efforts in order to promote public and private sector awareness of international fisheries sustainability issues, including the need to combat illegal, unreported, or unregulated fishing activity and to promote international marine resource conservation.

(c) GUIDELINES.—The Secretary may establish guidelines necessary to implement the program.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary $5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2010 through 2015 to carry out this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Guam.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my bill, H.R. 1080, the Illegal, Unreported, and Unregulated Fishing Enforcement Act of 2009. The United States demonstrates strong leadership in fisheries management both nationally and internationally. However, despite these efforts, many marine fish stocks around the world are exploited or depleted, which is driven, in part, by the persistence of illegal, unreported, and unregulated (or IUU) fishing. With an annual global value of over $10 billion, IUU fishing undermines the United States' fisheries management efforts and its fishermen, as well as efforts to sustainably manage fisheries in other countries.

IUU fishing in recent years has impinged, for example, the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone surrounding my district of Guam and our neighboring Mariana Islands. This is a problem, Mr. Speaker, that has increasingly evidenced itself elsewhere in the U.S. EEZ and must be addressed. H.R. 1080 would strengthen and improve the enforcement authorities of various U.S. fisheries acts and would authorize a cooperation-and-assistance program to help other countries develop the technical expertise to confront IUU fishing. The bill is strongly supported by the U.S. fishing industry, the administration, and marine conservation interests.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I ask Members on both sides to support its passage.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

H.R. 1080 will give the United States more tools to combat illegal, unregulated, and unreported (or IUU) fishing. This pirate fishing has had a negative impact on important fisheries and has hurt those fishermen and fishing nations that play by the rules. The only concern I have with this legislation is that we need to make sure our government, in setting the example to the world for transparency, does not sacrifice proprietary information from our domestic industries that would erode our competitiveness in the world's seafood market. This legislation walks that fine line, but we need to keep an eye on those who will implement this legislation.

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

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) as much time as he may consume.

Mr. BAIRD. I thank the gentlelady. I rise in strong support of H.R. 1080, and I also would like to speak in support of the prior bill on coral reefs. In the marine sciences, there is a phenomenon known as the shifting baseline, which is where you look today and say, What's the status of this ecosystem?

You tend to look 10 years back, on the assumption that that's a good window of time. The fact, however, is that the 10-years-back window may be substantially degraded from 10 years prior, which was degraded from 10 years prior, et cetera. So as we try to restore these ecosystems, we need to understand that many of them have been profoundly degraded over time, this shifting baseline is going in a negative direction, and it's very hard to know where we're at.

This legislation, H.R. 1080, and the prior legislation regarding coral reefs, is a shift in a positive direction. We are actually improving the protection of our marine resources, which are so critical. I would say to my colleagues that if they learn and remember nothing else about our marine ecosystems, it would be the following number: 50 percent. As we speak today, 50 percent of the oxygen we are breathing comes from the oceans—every other breath. Yet the oceans are subject to assault, ranging from ocean acidification to temperature increase, to overfishing, which this legislation deals with, to runoff, to harmful algal blooms, to hypoxia, et cetera.

I commend the gentlelady and gentleman for their leadership on this. I urge passage. We must make preservation of our oceans a much higher priority, not only for this body but for this country. I urge passage of both this and the prior bill.

□ 1430

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1080, legislation to strengthen enforcement mechanisms to stop illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing. I thank the Chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Insular Affairs, Wildlife, and Oceans for her leadership on this important issue. I also want to thank Chairman RAHALL and members of the Natural Resources Committee for bringing this important bill for House consideration

Mr. Speaker, the practice of illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing (IUU) poses serious threats to our marine ecosystems and undermines our efforts to conserve and manage our ocean resources, and our fishing industry. Estimated at an annual global value of $10 to $23.5 million, IUU affects fish migration between the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) and the high seas, and adversely impact the catch for our own fishing boats and subsequently restricts our fish supply. Overall the increasing problem of IUU clearly compromises any benefits from our domestic fisheries management efforts.

This bill, H.R. 1080, provides the framework to better track and monitor IUU. On an international level, the publication of vessels who have engaged in IUU and identifying and listing nations who have not complied with terms of the international fisheries agreements, will ensure that nations will make it a high priority to improve their efforts in the conservation and management of fisheries resources. It also strengthens the cooperation between the U.S. and the international fisheries organizations throughout the world by providing the necessary technical expertise and funding in collaborative efforts to build capacity and to better enforcement. Importantly, this legislation authorizes and provides funding for a stronger enforcement mechanism to ensure that the U.S. complies with the many international fisheries treaties and agreements that the U.S. is a part of.

I know for a fact that this has had great impact on the island nations in the Pacific where fishing vessels from other nations or pirate ships who illegally entered their waters and fished and then transport and exchanged their catch in the high seas. Illegal fishing as such has had a great impact on the local communities and the cultures that heavily rely on subsistence fishing. I have personally witnessed in my District the fact that more and more local fishermen have returned from long trips without any catch. This depletion is evident in the short supply of fish for our struggling local canneries which is the largest private employer in American Samoa. This is a clear example of the impacts of IUU and without the strong enforcement and regulation of our fisheries treaties and agreements, we will lose our fish stocks, thus, impacting our marine ecosystems and for most in the Pacific, their way of life.

This legislation reinforces the fact that U.S. will not tolerate the ongoing onslaught of illegal fishing on our fisheries worldwide. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1080.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1080, the Illegal, Unreported,

and Unregulated Fishing Enforcement Act of 2009.

This act provides much-needed, new tools to law enforcement to protect our fisheries and other marine resources and increases the penalties for environmental crimes.

Unfortunately, we continue to see illegal fishing in the Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) around the Mariana Islands. Just last month NOAA and the coast guard apprehended a Taiwanese vessel illegally fishing in the EEZ of the Mariana Islands with ten tons of shark on board.

The owner was fined $500,000 dollars, but only had to pay $200,000 now. After three years, if the owner can show an inability to pay the remaining $300,000, NOAA may waive the fine.

More amazing, the owner was allowed to keep the illegal catch.

This is neither a punishment nor a deterrent.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairwoman BORDALLO for her extraordinary leadership on this legislation and ensuring our fisheries and marine resources are protected. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1080. Let's send a strong message to high seas criminals that their actions will have real consequences. And let's help our enforcement personnel with the tools they need to do their jobs.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I again urge Members to support the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1080, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN ADAMS MEMORIAL FOUNDATION AUTHORITY EXTENSION

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2802) to provide for an extension of the legislative authority of the Adams Memorial Foundation to establish a commemorative work in honor of former President John Adams and his legacy, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2802

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

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY FOR MEMORIAL ESTABLISHMENT.

(a) LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY.—Section 1(c) of Public Law 107–62 is amended by striking ''accordance with'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following: ''accordance with chapter 89 of title 40, United States Code, except that any reference in section 8903(e) of that chapter to the expiration at the end of or extension beyond a seven-year period shall be considered to be a reference to an expiration on or extension beyond December 2, 2013.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—Public Law 107–62 is amended—

(1) in section 1(e), by striking ''(40 U.S.C. 1001, et seq.)'' and inserting ''(40 U.S.C. 8901, et seq.)''; and

(2) in section 2, by striking ''(40 U.S.C. 1002)'' and inserting ''(40 U.S.C. 8902(a))''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Guam.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may 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 gentlewoman from Guam?

There was no objection.

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

Among the many statues and monuments in this city, there are none that honor our second President, John Adams, nor the contributions made by his family to our Nation's history.

In 2001, Congress authorized the Adams Memorial Foundation to establish a memorial in the District of Columbia and its environs. This authority will expire on December 2, 2009, but several more years are required to complete fundraising, final design, and construction.

H.R. 2802, introduced by our distinguished colleague from Massachusetts, Representative DELAHUNT, would extend the legislative authority necessary for this important endeavor for 4 additional years, as recommended by the administration.

Mr. Speaker, we commend Representative DELAHUNT for his efforts in this legislation. We support passage of H.R. 2802 and urge its adoption by the House today.

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

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

H.R. 2802 has been adequately explained by the majority, and we support the legislation. We commend the work of Mr. DELAHUNT and the gentleman that he is.

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

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I again urge Members to support the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2802, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UPPER ELK RIVER WILD AND SCENIC STUDY ACT

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3113) to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate a segment of the Elk River in the State of West Virginia for study for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3113

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 ''Upper Elk River Wild and Scenic Study Act''.

SEC. 2. DESIGNATION FOR STUDY.

Section 5(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1276(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''( ) ELK RIVER, WEST VIRGINIA.—The approximate 5-mile segment of the Elk River from the confluence of the Old Field Fork and the Big Spring Fork in Pocahontas County to the Pocahontas and Randolph County line.''.

SEC. 3. STUDY AND REPORT.

Section 5(b) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1276(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''( ) ELK RIVER, WEST VIRGINIA.—Not later than 3 years after funds are made available to carry out this paragraph, the Secretary of Agriculture shall complete the study of the 5-mile segment of the Elk River, West Virginia, designated for study in subsection (a), and shall submit to Congress a report containing the results of the study. The report shall include an analysis of the potential impact of the designation on private lands within the 5-mile segment of the Elk River, West Virginia, or abutting that area.''.

SEC. 4. EFFECT.

(a) EFFECT ON ACCESS FOR RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES.—Consistent with section 13 of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1284), nothing in the designation made by the amendment in section 2 shall be construed as affecting access for recreational activities otherwise allowed by law or regulation, including hunting, fishing, or trapping.

(b) EFFECT ON STATE AUTHORITY.—Consistent with section 13 of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C 1284), nothing in the designation made by the amendment in section 2 shall be construed as affecting the authority, jurisdiction, or responsibility of the several States to manage, control, or regulate fish and resident wildlife under State law or regulations, including the regulation of hunting, fishing, and trapping.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Guam.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

H.R. 3113, introduced by the chairman of the Committee on Natural Resources, Mr. NICK RAHALL, reflects the continuing efforts by the people of Pocahontas County, West Virginia, to preserve and protect the most significant natural and historic resources that they are blessed with in that area.

The pending legislation would have the National Forest Service conduct a study on a segment of the Elk River within the county to determine its eligibility for designation under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

On behalf of Chairman RAHALL, I would like to commend the Pocahontas County Commission for its leadership in this matter.

With that, I ask Members on both sides to support passage of this measure.

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

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

We believe that the bill has been adequately explained and studied, and we commend the efforts of Mr. RAHALL in his working with the Members on both sides of the aisle.

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

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, the pending legislation would provide for a study to determine the feasibility and suitability of including a segment of the Elk River as a component of the Wild and Scenic River System.

The Elk River is one of West Virginia's premier natural resource assets. It is the longest river in West Virginia with its boundaries entirely within the State. The study that would be authorized by this legislation, however, would focus only on that segment of the Elk where it begins at the confluence of two streams—Old Field Fork and Big Spring Fork—at the community of Slatyfork and flows North for approximately five miles to the Pocahontas/Randolph County line. The study would be conducted by the U.S. Forest Service.

I would point out that this legislation was initiated by the Pocahontas County Commission which unanimously voted on February 4, 2009, to request that a study be conducted on the segment of the Elk River within their county. In this regard I commend Commissioners Martin V. Saffer, David M. Fleming and Reta J. Griffith for their initiative.

The "Slaty" segment of the Elk River that would be the subject of the study authorized by this bill, named in reference to the community of Slatyfork where the river begins, was described in a January 2009 letter written by local resident Tom Shipley to the Pocahontas County Commission as follows: "History abounds around, near and on the banks of the Elk River. She is, in a literal sense, very much as she was back in the early 1800s . . . one of the last rivers on the East Coast that has three naturally reproducing species of wild trout . . . Brook, Brown and Rainbow. As Big Spring Fork and Old Field merge, they form an impressive gateway to the Upper Elk . . . a gift from God to Pocahontas County."

Indeed, the Slaty segment is a superb fishery, and the West Virginia Division of Natural Resources does a good job in the area. While what is being proposed is a study—not a designation—and while the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act is very clear that nothing in the statute "shall affect the jurisdiction or responsibilities of the State with respect to fish and wildlife," I am including in the legislation being introduced today a reaffirmation that the mere act of studying this segment of the Elk River will not change the status quo with respect to State jurisdiction.

In my view, most people associated with this segment of the Elk River want to keep it the way it is. As Mr. Shipley wrote, the river is "a gift of God to Pocahontas County" and I would add, to the State of West Virginia and the Nation as a whole.

I urge the adoption of the pending legislation.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I again urge Members to support the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3113.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAGNA WATER DISTRICT WATER REUSE AND GROUNDWATER RECHARGE ACT OF 2009

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2265) to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the Magna Water District water reuse and groundwater recharge project, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2265

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 "Magna Water District Water Reuse and Groundwater Recharge Act of 2009".

SEC. 2. MAGNA WATER DISTRICT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act (43 U.S.C. 390h et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 16___. MAGNA WATER DISTRICT WATER REUSE AND GROUNDWATER RECHARGE PROJECT, UTAH.

"(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary, in cooperation with the Magna Water District, Utah, may participate in the design, planning, and construction of permanent facilities needed to establish recycled water distribution and wastewater treatment and reclamation facilities that will be used to provide recycled water in the Magna Water District.

"(b) COST SHARING.—

"(1) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the capital cost of the project described in subsection (a) shall not exceed 25 percent of the total cost of the project.

"(2) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—Each cost incurred by the Magna Water District after January 1, 2003, relating to any capital, planning, design, permitting, construction, or land acquisition (including the value of reallocated water rights) for the project described in subsection (a) shall be credited towards the non-Federal share of the costs of the project.

"(c) LIMITATION.—Funds provided by the Secretary shall not be used for operation or maintenance of the project described in subsection (a).

"(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $12,000,000.".

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections in section 2 of the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992 (43 U.S.C. prec. 371) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 16___ the following:

"Sec. 16___. Magna Water District water reuse and groundwater recharge project, Utah.".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Guam.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

H.R. 2265, introduced by my colleague who is assisting me in managing the bills on the floor today, Representative CHAFFETZ from the State of Utah, would direct the Bureau of Reclamation to participate in the planning, the design, and the construction of the Magna Water District water reuse and groundwater recharge project. When constructed, this project will remove perchlorate from the contaminated groundwater and create a new water supply for the community. Title XVI water recycling projects like H.R. 2265 allow local communities to stretch their limited water supplies.

I ask my colleagues to support the passage of this bill.

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

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

I appreciate the kind words and comments from my colleague Ms. BORDALLO, and I thank my Democratic colleagues for supporting this bill to help the Magna Water District meet unfunded Federal mandates.

My legislation authorizes limited Federal assistance to help a community remove arsenic and perchlorate while producing more high-quality

drinking water. We have very limited water supplies in the West, and we need every tool in the water toolbox to help meet our water supply needs. This and similar legislation before us today will help stretch our supplies to meet the growing needs of our communities.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I again urge Members to support this very important bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2265.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RAISING FEDERAL COST SHARE OF CALLEGUAS WATER DISTRICT RECYCLING PROJECT

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2522) to raise the ceiling on the Federal share of the cost of the Calleguas Municipal Water District Recycling Project, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2522

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1631(d) of the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act (43 U.S.C. 390h–13(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking ''paragraph (2)'' and inserting ''paragraphs (2) and (3)''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) In the case of the Calleguas Municipal Water District Recycling Project authorized by section 1616, the Federal share of the cost of the Project may not exceed the sum determined by adding—

''(A) the amount that applies to the Project under paragraph (1); and

''(B) $40,000,000.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Guam.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

H.R. 2522, introduced by our colleague Representative ELTON GALLEGLY, would raise the existing authorization ceiling to authorize funds for phases 2 and 3 of the Calleguas Municipal Water District Recycling Project. When these phases are completed, it is expected that the project will produce 43,000 acre-feet of water annually.

At a time when reported water is unreliable, the title XVI water recycling program is a tool that communities can use to create a reliable local supply to meet all of the future demands.

I ask my colleagues to support passage of this legislation.

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

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

I rise today to support H.R. 2522, legislation introduced by my Natural Resources Committee colleague, ELTON GALLEGLY, and cosponsored by Congresswoman LOIS CAPPS.

This legislation extends limited Federal participation in the Calleguas Municipal Water District Water Recycling Project. This project is already underway to help over 600,000 water consumers with their water supply needs by recycling wastewater. The residents of the region are entirely dependent on imported water, and this bill will help alleviate that dependence by extending the Federal financial cap on the project.

Because he's flying back to Washington, DC, from his California district, Congressman GALLEGLY is unable to be here for debate on this bill; therefore, his statement will be included in the RECORD.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

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

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my strong support for H.R. 2522, which is a bill introduced earlier this year that would raise the ceiling on the Federal share of the cost of completing the Calleguas Municipal Water District Recycling Project.

I believe most of the country knows about the water shortage plaguing the state of California. In my district, maintaining adequate water supplies has also become increasingly problematic, especially as the traditional sources of imported water have become unreliable. For this reason, I introduced H.R. 2522, which will assist the Calleguas Municipal Water District with the development of new water sources.

Specifically, this legislation would authorize an additional $40 million in funding for the Bureau of Reclamation to support the completion of a salinity management pipeline, also known as a brine line. This pipeline will collect salty water generated by desalting facilities and excess recycled water and then transport that water for reuse elsewhere. The result will be both improved water quality and an enhanced supply of local groundwater.

The increased use of recycled water will expand the water available for approximately 600,000 of my constituents and, at the same time, reduce dependence on water from the sensitive Bay-Delta ecosystem. In an era of drought and water shortages throughout California, local water districts need to do all they can to reduce their dependence on increasingly scarce supplies of imported water.

I want to thank Chairman RAHALL and Ranking Member HASTINGS, along with their staffs, for their assistance with moving this important legislation.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I again urge Members to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2522.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING INTERIOR DEPARTMENT PARTICIPATION IN OREGON WATER RECYCLING PROJECT

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2741) to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the City of Hermiston, Oregon, water recycling and reuse project, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2741

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

SECTION 1. PROJECT AUTHORIZATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act (Public Law 102–575, title XVI; 43 U.S.C. 390h et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 16____ the following:

''SEC. 16____. CITY OF HERMISTON, OREGON, WATER RECYCLING AND REUSE PROJECT.

''(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary, in cooperation with the City of Hermiston, Oregon, is authorized to participate in the design, planning, and construction of permanent facilities to reclaim and reuse water in the City of Hermiston, Oregon.

''(b) COST SHARE.—The Federal share of the costs of the project described in subsection (a) shall not exceed 25 percent of the total cost.

''(c) LIMITATION.—The Secretary shall not provide funds for the operation and maintenance of the project described in subsection (a).''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections in section 2 of the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 16____ the following:

''Sec. 16____. City of Hermiston, Oregon, water recycling and reuse project.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Guam.

□ 1445

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2741, introduced by our colleague, Representative GREG WALDEN, would authorize the Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Reclamation, to participate in the planning, the design, and the construction of the city of Hermiston water recycling and reuse project.

This legislation is a good example of how the Title 16 water recycling program can be used in a predominantly agriculture community to meet water quality standards, create a new water supply for irrigation, and help endangered species in the Umatilla River.

I ask my colleagues to support passage of this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise to support legislation offered by our colleague, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN). This bill authorizes limited Federal participation in a water recycling project for the city of Hermiston, Oregon. The goal of the bill is to help the city recycle wastewater, to provide extra water for endangered salmon, and deliver water for irrigated crops. It also helps the city meet unfunded Federal mandates.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

Mr. WALDEN. I want to thank my colleagues from Utah and Guam, as well as the chairwoman of the subcommittee, GRACE NAPOLITANO from California, and the ranking member, TOM MCCLINTOCK from California, and their staffs for working with me and the folks from the city of Hermiston, Oregon, to move this bill through the committee process in a rather expedited way where it was unanimously approved and now awaits floor action today.

As the author of the bill, I stand in strong support of H.R. 2741, which authorizes the Bureau of Reclamation to work with the city in the planning, design, and construction of the city of Hermiston's new water recycling and reuse project.

In short, this is one of those bills that is good for farmers and it is good for fish. It helps meet the Endangered Species Act, a requirement for a listed salmon species in the Umatilla River, and addresses long-term community growth in the process. It has strong local support from very diverse interests and is exactly the type of partnership and project that deserves investment from the Federal Government.

The existing wastewater facilities in Hermiston are 30 years old; and after 30 years, those facilities have served the community well and outlived their usefulness. With new environmental requirements and needs, the community has come together with many parties to come up with this proposal, and this legislation will help move that forward with a nice cost share between the Federal Government at 25 percent and the local community at 75 percent.

This project will achieve a list of objectives important to both the local community and Federal environmental obligations.

First, it will enable the city to reliably meet new pollution reduction requirements for the next 20-plus years.

Second, it will increase wastewater treatment capacity to match the growth in the region's economy and the human population.

Third, 3,400 acre feet of top quality, class A water will return to the Umatilla River and provide additional protections for threatened salmon species. This is one of the key reasons that the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation support the legislation. I thank them for that and would like to enter into the RECORD their letter of support for H.R. 2741.

CONFEDERATED TRIBES OF THE UMATILLA INDIAN RESERVATION,
Pendleton, OR, July 15, 2009.

ED BROOKSHIER,
City Manager, City of Hermiston, Hermiston, OR.

DEAR MR. BROOKSHIER: the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR) thank you for the opportunity to review the proposed improvements to the Hermiston waste water treatment plant. We understand that in addition to upgrades at the plant itself this project includes moving the location of effluent discharge to the Umatilla River and a new discharge to the West Extension Irrigation District. We appreciate the City's coordination with us on this important project that will improve the water quality of the Umatilla River over time.

As you know the CTUIR has treaty fishing rights in the Umatilla River. The Tribes value the health of Umatilla fisheries and the Umatilla River that is enjoyed by all residents of the Umatilla Basin. We are aware that Hermiston is working with the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality and other resource protection agencies to minimize negative impacts to the river and maximize the benefits of the project. We also understand that the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality has requested a priority pollutant scan of the facility's effluent and that the new discharge locations be characterized for toxic contaminants. We ask that you share the results of those studies with the Confederated Tribes so that we can advance our mutual interest in better understanding the conditions of the Umatilla River.

We understand that the City of Hermiston is also seeking to obtain federal funding that might offset the costs of this substantial project. We support the City's efforts and hope your request will be successful.

While the new summer discharge to the West Extension Irrigation District will result in a decrease in summer Umatilla River flows, the Tribes are working with Umatilla basin partners including the City of Hermiston to restore Umatilla River stream flows to natural levels. The CTUIR appreciates your consultation with us and looks forward to the successful completion of the improvements to Hermiston's waste water treatment plant.

Sincerely,

ANTONE C. MINTHORN,
Chairman, Board of Trustees.

The final component of the project is the drought-resistant water delivery of recycled water to the diverse agriculture community in the west extension irrigation district. This water will supplement current allocations. We all know a little extra water in a dry climate can help our farmers and their crops in a big way.

The proposed project will comply with all applicable laws and regulations, and the city has already completed the required supporting environmental and biological assessments.

The Federal partnership in the local investment will be of enormous assistance as the project moves forward from drawing board to construction.

I thank you for your support and the opportunity to speak in favor of H.R. 2741, and I look forward to continuing to work with you and the city of Hermiston to ensure that this project of great importance becomes a reality.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional requests for time and would inquire of the minority whether they have any additional speakers.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, we have no additional speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2741.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING MINUTE MAN HISTORICAL PARK ON 50TH ANNIVERSARY

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 599) honoring the Minute Man National Historical Park on the occasion of its 50th Anniversary.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 599

Whereas, since September 21, 1959, Minute Man National Historical Park has preserved key sites where the first battles of the American Revolutionary War occurred, and educated millions of Americans about the extraordinary events that led to the birth of

the Nation and the ideals embodied in those courageous actions;

Whereas Minute Man National Historical Park encompasses more than 1,000 acres in the historic communities of Lexington, Lincoln, and Concord that were at the center of the American Revolution;

Whereas the events, places, and people recognized by the Minute Man National Historical Park have become enduring testaments to American values and are among the most celebrated and cherished symbols in the history of the Nation;

Whereas the Minute Man National Historical Park includes multiple sites and landscapes along the route from Boston to Concord, known as the Battle Road, where American Militia and British soldiers fought numerous times on April 19, 1775;

Whereas American militia were first ordered to return British fire at Concord's North Bridge, a heroic action commemorated by American poet Ralph Waldo Emerson in his poem ''The Concord Hymn'' as the ''shot heard 'round the world'';

Whereas the park celebrates Paul Revere's legendary ''midnight ride'' of April 18, 1775, to warn American colonists that British soldiers were marching to Concord to destroy key military stores; and

Whereas more than one million Americans from States across the Nation and people from around the globe visit Minute Man National Historical Park every year to learn about the role that these New England communities played in the American Revolution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) Minute Man National Historical Park serves an essential role in preserving the sites and landscapes in New England where the American Revolution began, and in educating the public about these historic events;

(2) Minute Man National Historical Park honors and commemorates the ideals of democracy, liberty, and freedom that are the foundation of the Nation and sources of inspiration for people everywhere; and

(3) the creation of Minute Man National Historical Park 50 years ago represents a remarkable achievement that continues to benefit Americans around the Nation, to preserve the proud legacy of the American Revolution, and to serve as an enduring resource for future generations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Guam.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 599 was introduced by our colleague from Massachusetts, Representative ED MARKEY, and would recognize the 50th anniversary of the establishment of Minute Man National Historical Park in Concord, Massachusetts.

Minute Man National Historical Park was established 50 years ago yesterday. It preserves for Americans and the world the places and the landscapes along the route from Boston to Concord, known as the Battle Road, where the first battles of our War of Independence were fought. The park also memorializes the renowned American soldiers, the Minutemen, trained volunteers who were always ready to march at a minute's notice.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 599 commemorates the enduring legacy of this Nation's fight for freedom, liberty and democracy and pays tribute to a park that celebrates the birthplace of American independence.

I commend Representative MARKEY and his cosponsor, Representative NIKI TSONGAS, for their timely and diligent work on this resolution. I ask my colleagues to support passage of this measure.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

On April 19, 234 years ago, the British commander in Boston sent a detachment of troops to nearby Lexington and Concord to impose what I am sure he thought was a perfectly reasonable gun control measure. After all, there wasn't any reason to allow people to possess guns in the park-like green commons of those pleasant little towns.

Unfortunately for General Howe, the patriots disagreed. Fortunately for us, the men who stood their ground at Lexington, at Concord, and later at Trenton, at Saratoga and at Yorktown are the men who wrote our Constitution.

And when they met in Philadelphia a decade later to form a more perfect Union, they still believed that we are endowed by our Creator with certain inalienable rights. They therefore set out to devise a government with only limited, enumerated powers so that they and their descendants would, they hoped, be citizens of a free Republic, not submissive subjects of an ever-expanding government.

Our Constitution was written and ratified by the very Minutemen and patriots who fought for freedom in New England, the Middle Atlantic States and the South. That is why we have the Bill of Rights. They knew that private property rights, free exercise of religion, the individual right to keep and bear arms, and State's rights will always have opponents. That's why they are in the Constitution.

So it is appropriate that we take time to honor the Minutemen who left us a legacy of freedom on this, the 50th anniversary of the Minute Man National Historical Park.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional requests for time and would inquire of the minority whether they have any additional speakers.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, with no additional speakers, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution, which I have introduced with the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, Ms. TSONGAS, to honor the Minute Man National Historical Park on its 50th anniversary. Since its inception on September 21, 1959, the park has played a vital role in protecting and preserving the sites in the towns of Lexington, Lincoln, and Concord where the American Revolution began. For 50 years, the park has educated millions of Americans about the extraordinary events that led to the birth of our Nation.

On April 19, 1775, American colonists in ''every Middlesex village and farm'' rose up to throw off the yoke of the English king and claim their inherent right to govern themselves. The Minute Man National Park preserves not just the sites, buildings, and landscapes where these momentous events took place but also the ideals of liberty, democracy, and self-determination that they embodied. The beliefs held in the actions of those spring days in April 1775 remain the cornerstone of our Nation and an inspiration to people everywhere.

The Minute Man National Historical Park is comprised of 1,038 acres, which include 8 miles of trails and 136 historic structures. The park preserves multiple sites along the ''Battle Road,'' the 22-mile route from Boston to Concord where British soldiers and American militia first clashed on April 19, 1775.

The park includes the famed North Bridge, in Concord, where American militia were first ordered to return the fire of the British regulars. Down the road, in Lexington, is the Lexington green, where the first shot was fired that morning and where eight American patriots lost their lives in the opening battle of the Revolutionary War.

The park commemorates Paul Revere's ''midnight ride'' of April 18, 1775, to raise the alarm that the British were marching to destroy military stockpiles and includes the site where Paul Revere was captured by a British patrol. Paul Revere's message was carried on to Concord by his colleagues, William Dawes and Dr. Samuel Prescott, and that message resonates to this day—taught to school children everywhere—''A cry of defiance, and not of fear, a voice in the darkness, a knock at the door, and a word that shall echo for evermore!'' in the verse of the famous poem by Henry Wadsworth Longfellow.

The park contains the Barrett farm in Concord, which was the home of Colonel James Barrett, and contained the militia weapons and munitions that British soldiers were marching on Concord to destroy. The park also includes the Wayside, which was once home to Nathaniel Hawthorne and Louisa May Alcott, and celebrates the writings of the first great American authors, whose voices were those of a free people.

More than 1 million people visit the park every year to learn about these events that have become iconic symbols to every American. Thomas Boylston Adams, a descendent of President John Quincy Adams and the former president of the Massachusetts Historical Society, described the Battle Road as ''a long road, leading even to the present.'' The Battle Road was the first road marched by a people in search of liberty and the road that continues to prove to all people everywhere to this day that freedom is possible.

The Minute Man National Historical Park continues to serve as a vital resource for future generations of Americans and a reminder

of the role that Massachusetts played in the creation of the most free and democratic nation in the world. I commend the fantastic work of the park in upholding these values that remain at the core of our American character and I urge my colleagues to adopt the resolution.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be speaking on behalf of H. Res. 599, a resolution honoring the Minute Man National Historical Park on the occasion of its 50th anniversary.

The park, located in Concord, Lexington, and Lincoln, Massachusetts, was established by Congress on September 21, 1959, and has enriched the lives of milions of visitors by preserving and sharing New England's seminal cultural and historical significance.

Home to Hartwell's Tavern and the recent addition of Colonel James Barrett's farm, the park is where the "shot heard 'round the world" was fired, commencing the first battle of the American Revolution in 1775. It is the inspiration for the creative work of Ralph Waldo Emerson and a priceless educational tool for students of all ages.

The success of the park is a true testament to the collaborative efforts of the local and Federal Government and countless volunteers that dedicate themselves to ensuring that the park remains a true national treasure. This past Sunday, I attended the 50th anniversary gala to celebrate the success of the park and the hard work of all involved. I want to especially recognize Superintendent Nancy Nelson whose dedication to this national treasure has helped preserve its integrity and make certain that its historical significance will inspire many future generations.

I would like to thank Mr. MARKEY for working with me on this important resolution and Chairman RAHALL for bringing it to the floor.

I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 599 to celebrate the past 50 years of one of our country's true historical riches and to recognize the park as valuable resource for future generations to enjoy.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I again urge Members to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 599.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING NATIONAL WILD HORSE AND BURRO ADOPTION DAY

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 688) expressing support for the goals and ideals of the first annual National Wild Horse and Burro Adoption Day taking place on September 26, 2009.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 688

Whereas in 1971, in Public Law 92–195 (commonly known as the "Wild Free-Roaming Horses and Burros Act") (16 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.), Congress declared that wild free-roaming horses and burros are living symbols of the historic and pioneer spirit of the West;

Whereas, under that Act, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture have responsibility for the humane capture, removal, and adoption of wild horses and burros;

Whereas the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service are the Federal agencies responsible for carrying out the provisions of the Act;

Whereas a number of private organizations will assist with the adoption of excess wild horses and burros, in conjunction with the first National Wild Horse and Burro Adoption Day; and

Whereas there are approximately 31,000 wild horses in short-term and long-term holding facilities, with 18,000 young horses awaiting adoption: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals of a National Wild Horse and Burro Adoption Day to be held annually in coordination with the Secretary of Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture;

(2) recognizes that creating a successful adoption model for wild horses and burros is consistent with Public Law 92–195 (commonly known as the "Wild Free-Roaming Horses and Burros Act") (16 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.) and beneficial to the long-term interests of the people of the United States in protecting wild horses and burros; and

(3) encourages citizens of the United States to adopt a wild horse or burro so as to own a living symbol of the historic and pioneer spirit of the West.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Guam.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution that is now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 688, introduced by the gentlewoman from Nevada, Representative DINA TITUS, expresses support for the goals and the ideals of the first annual National Wild Horse and Burro Adoption Day, which takes place on September 26, 2009.

In 1971, Congress passed the Wild Free Roaming Horse and Burro Act, which sought to prevent the disappearance of these horses and burros from the western range and created the Wild Horse and Burro Adoption Program.

H. Res. 688 supports the first annual National Wild Horse and Burro Adoption Day. It recognizes that a successful adoption program is vital to managing these animals, and that more must be done to promote the program and educate the public. I would also note that in support of the goals of that 1971 act, I am proud to be a cosponsor of H.R. 1018, the Restore our American Mustangs, or ROAM Act, introduced by House Natural Resources Committee Chairman RAHALL and passed by this House in July.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 688 is important in drawing attention to the vital role of adoption in saving America's wild horses and burros. I commend Representative TITUS for shining a light on this important event, and I ask my colleagues to support passage.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 688, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to commend the Nevada delegation for this resolution urging the public to adopt the 18,000 wild horses waiting for adoption. However, it is a little confusing. Just 2 months ago, both the Democratic sponsor and cosponsor of this bill voted in favor of H.R. 1018, a bill that even the Obama administration said would make the problem worse, not better.

I am also perplexed, with Nevada's unemployment rate at 13.2 percent, how both of our Democratic colleagues from that hard-hit State could vote for a bill that would spend close to a billion dollars to expand a failed welfare program for wild horses.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to Representative TITUS, the sponsor of this resolution.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman RAHALL and subcommittee Chairman GRIJALVA for bringing this timely resolution to the floor today.

I rise in strong support of H. Res. 688, a resolution I introduced with my colleagues from the Nevada congressional delegation in support of the goals and ideals of National Wild Horse and Burro Adoption Day.

Wild horses and burros are living symbols of the independent, free spirit of the American West. My State of Nevada is home to more than half the wild horses in the country, and our State quarter depicts a trio of wild mustangs.

The Wild Free Roaming Horses and Burros Act, which became law in 1971, gave the Secretaries of Agriculture and the Interior responsibility for the humane capture, removal, and adoption of wild horses and burros. The agencies ensure that healthy herds thrive on healthy rangelands. But because these animals have no natural predators, herd sizes can increase dramatically in very short periods of time.

In order to maintain balance on the rangelands, wild horses and burros are gathered and offered for adoption and sale. Currently, there are some 31,000 wild horses in short-term and long-term holding facilities, with 18,000 young horses available for adoption.

□ 1500

Although reasonable people might disagree on the appropriate number of

horses that should be allowed to roam free, ranchers, wild horse advocates, environmentalists, animal lovers, and taxpayers alike can agree that there is a pressing need to improve upon the adoption programs to remove horses from these holding facilities and place them in good adoptive homes.

On September 26, 2009, a number of private organizations will assist with the adoption of excess wild horses and burros in conjunction with the first National Wild Horse and Burro Adoption Day. State BLM offices, as well as rescue centers, wild horse groups, environmentalists, and volunteers from all walks of life will be engaged in activities leading up to and on this important day.

BLM, the American Horse Protection Association, the Mustang Heritage Foundation, the Humane Society of the United States, and Wild Horses 4Ever all support National Wild Horse and Burro Adoption Day, and more than 65 adoption and educational events will take place across the country in support of its goals. Wild horse advocates have set a 1,000 horse and burro adoption goal for National Wild Horse and Burro Adoption Day. This will save taxpayers $1.5 million. This process has already begun as we saw last weekend with a successful adoption event in Pahrump, Nevada.

The resolution we are considering today supports the goals of National Wild Horse and Burro Adoption Day to be held annually in coordination with the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture. It also recognizes that creating a successful adoption model for wild horses and burros is consistent with the Wild Free-Roaming Horse and Burros Act of 1971 and beneficial to the long-term interests of the people of the United States in protecting wild horses and burros.

Lastly, my resolution encourages Americans to adopt a wild horse or burro and own a living symbol of the historic and pioneer spirit of the American West, just as my sister, Rho Hudson, did when she adopted a wild burro, Sadie, who is a nice addition to her ranch in Pea Vine Canyon, Nevada.

More than 220,000 wild horses and burros have been adopted since 1973. By placing this renewed emphasis on the importance of wild horse adoption programs, we will protect the welfare of these majestic animals and save taxpayer dollars at the same time.

I urge passage of this important resolution.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of H. Res. 688.

Having no additional speakers on this topic, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I again urge Members to support this important bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 688.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF HAWK MOUNTAIN SANCTUARY

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 670) congratulating and saluting the Hawk Mountain Sanctuary for celebrating its 75th anniversary, commending the Hawk Mountain Sanctuary for its contributions to the preservation of wildlife and the native ecology of the Appalachian Mountains and eastern Pennsylvania, and commending the Hawk Mountain Sanctuary for its dedication to educating the public and the international community about wildlife conservation.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 670

Whereas Hawk Mountain Sanctuary is a year-round wildlife sanctuary that introduces students and visitors to the natural beauty of the central Appalachian Mountains of eastern Pennsylvania;

Whereas the 2,600 acres of woodland in the sanctuary and more than 13,000 acres of private and public lands in the area comprise one of the largest protected tracts of contiguous forest in eastern Pennsylvania;

Whereas the sanctuary consists of 8 miles of ridge and valley trails for visitors to hike and explore;

Whereas Hawk Mountain Sanctuary was the first refuge for birds of prey in the world;

Whereas over 12,000 raptors of various species find refuge in the Hawk Mountain Sanctuary every year;

Whereas during the autumn months, visitors have the unique opportunity to view numerous raptors of various species participating in a yearly migration through Pennsylvania;

Whereas Hawk Mountain Sanctuary is internationally known as a global information hub and a leader in the field of raptor biology and raptor conservation;

Whereas the sanctuary has a full-time staff of 16 employees and a volunteer workforce of more than 200 dedicated members;

Whereas the sanctuary staff works continually with world-class raptor scientists, conservationists, graduate students, and international interns to collaborate, collect, and analyze information and to formulate and test new conservation strategies;

Whereas Hawk Mountain Sanctuary offers weekend programs for local residents, guided programs for students and groups, and fully accredited college-level courses in cooperation with Cedar Crest College, located in Allentown, Pennsylvania;

Whereas the sanctuary makes a concerted effort to work with local and regional conservationists in researching and preserving the ecology of the Appalachian Mountains;

Whereas the springs, ephemeral streams, vernal pools, and four small ponds of the mountains, as well as the nearby Little Schuylkill River and Kettle Creek, provide a crucial habitat for rare plants, invertebrates, and amphibians;

Whereas amateur ornithologist Richard Pough first noticed the area as an important location for raptor activity and brought attention to the area and its rich population of raptors by photographing the controversial hunting of hawks for sport;

Whereas in 1934, national conservationist Rosalie Edge visited Hawk Mountain after viewing photographs taken by Richard Pough, and with the guidance of bird conservationists Maurice and Irma Broun, advocated for an end to the sport hunting of hawks on the land before purchasing the land and opening it as a sanctuary for public use;

Whereas Rosalie Edge deeded the 1,400 acres to the Hawk Mountain Sanctuary Association, which was incorporated in Pennsylvania in 1938 as a nonprofit organization;

Whereas in 1965, the Secretary of the Interior designated the Hawk Mountain Sanctuary as a registered natural landmark;

Whereas in 1976, the Conservation Internship Program of the sanctuary was initiated, and the program has since trained 280 young conservationists representing 52 countries on 6 continents;

Whereas in 1987, Hawk Mountain Sanctuary received the prestigious Chevron Conservation Award; and

Whereas in 2002, the Acopian Center for Conservation Learning opened and the Wings of Wonder Gallery was dedicated: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) congratulates and salutes the Hawk Mountain Sanctuary for celebrating its 75th anniversary;

(2) commends the Hawk Mountain Sanctuary for its contributions to the preservation of wildlife, especially birds of prey, and the native ecology of the Appalachian Mountains and eastern Pennsylvania; and

(3) commends the Hawk Mountain Sanctuary for its dedication to educating the public and the international community about wildlife conservation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Guam.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 75th anniversary of the Hawk Mountain Sanctuary, a critical wildlife sanctuary, a research area, and environmental education center. Established in 1934 as the first refuge for birds of prey in the world, the sanctuary, which is located in eastern Pennsylvania, provides a rest area for over 12,000 raptors every year during their migrations. It also attracts scientists and students to explore new conservation strategies for birds of prey. The sanctuary's 2,600 acres also provides year-round public access to pristine woodland trails, overlooks,

and education programs that give students an up close and personal view of these majestic birds.

I commend Congressman DENT from Pennsylvania for introducing this resolution, and I urge its passage.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 670 would congratulate the Hawk Mountain Sanctuary on the 75th anniversary of its establishment as the world's first refuge for birds of prey.

From its humble beginnings in 1934 when Miss Rosalie Edge deeded 1,400 acres to the private nonprofit Hawk Mountain Sanctuary Association, more than 60,000 people visit this sanctuary each year to enjoy the majestic flights of more than 12,000 eagles, falcons and hawks that live there.

This resolution also commends the sanctuary for its dedication to the conservation of wildlife and for its efforts to educate the public and the international community on the vital role that birds of prey play in the ecosystems throughout the world.

I would like to compliment Congressman CHARLIE DENT of Allentown, Pennsylvania, for his outstanding leadership in proposing this legislation. I am happy to join with him in congratulating the Hawk Mountain Sanctuary on its 75th birthday.

I urge an ''aye'' vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. I would like to thank those supporting this legislation today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this resolution, which I introduced with my colleague from Pennsylvania, TIM HOLDEN.

This fall, Hawk Mountain Sanctuary, located in beautiful Berks County, Pennsylvania, is celebrating its 75th anniversary. Located at the boundary of three counties—Berks, Schuylkill and Lehigh—and as the world's first refuge for birds of prey, Hawk Mountain has an extremely rich history in eastern Pennsylvania and has become one of the preeminent wildlife sanctuaries in the United States.

In 1934, noted wildlife conservationist Rosalie Edge was drawn to Hawk Mountain after learning large numbers of hawks were being killed as they migrated along the Appalachian Mountains' Kittatinny Ridge. After this initial visit, Edge leased 1,400 acres of the ridge for a mere $500 and opened it to the public as a place for local residents to view birds of prey in their natural habitat. Later, the property was deeded to the Hawk Mountain Sanctuary Association, which oversaw the preservation of the land and protection of its wildlife.

Since its modest beginnings in the 1930s, Hawk Mountain has remained a year-round wildlife sanctuary that introduces students and visitors to the natural beauty of the Appalachian Mountains and the many birds of prey that call the range home. Today, 16 full-time employees and a volunteer workforce of over 200 dedicated members help educate thousands of visitors each year about the value of preserving the native ecology of eastern Pennsylvania.

With the goal of providing a unique and engaging educational experience for its visitors, Hawk Mountain offers weekend programs for local residents, guided programs for students and groups, and fully accredited college-level courses in cooperation with Cedar Crest College located in my congressional district.

In addition to educating the public, the employees and volunteers at Hawk Mountain have contributed greatly to the development of effective conservation practices that help preserve vital ecosystems throughout the world. The sanctuary staff works with world-class raptor scientists, conservationists, graduate students, and international interns to collect and analyze important information as well as formulate and test new conservation strategies.

The natural beauty and value of Hawk Mountain and the achievements of the sanctuary's devoted staff have not gone unnoticed over the years. In 1965, Hawk Mountain was designated a Registered National Natural Landmark by the U.S. Department of Interior, ranking it as one of the best examples of biological and geological features in America. Over 20 years later, the sanctuary received the prestigious Chevron Conservation Award, North America's oldest private conservation honor, which recognizes significant contributions to the preservation of natural resources in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, today's consideration of the resolution couldn't come at a more appropriate time. During the autumn months, visitors to Hawk Mountain have the unique opportunity to view numerous raptors of various species participate in their yearly migration through Pennsylvania. Currently, the sanctuary is in the midst of its annual Hawk Watch, which runs from August 15 to December 15. In this period, the sanctuary records the number of raptors migrating past its scenic north lookout. Yesterday, visitors spotted over 600 hawks of varying species, 26 ospreys, four bald eagles, and a single falcon in the skies over Berks County. Clearly, Hawk Mountain provides a remarkable chance for bird enthusiasts and novices alike to view the migration of critical and sometimes rare bird species.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Hawk Mountain Sanctuary for its contributions to the preservation of wildlife, especially birds of prey, as well as the native ecology of the Appalachian Mountains and eastern Pennsylvania. I also applaud the sanctuary for its dedication to educating the American public and international community about wildlife conservation. In fact, a celebration of Hawk Mountain's 75th anniversary just occurred a week ago on Saturday, September 12. It was a joyous occasion for all who attended. I know I enjoyed it thoroughly, as did many hundreds of others who came to celebrate time at Hawk Mountain.

Finally, I would encourage my colleagues to join me in officially congratulating and saluting Hawk Mountain on its 75th anniversary and wish the sanctuary and its staff many, many more years of achievement. And I wish the visitors all happy and engaging times there.

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 670, congratulating and saluting the Hawk Mountain Sanctuary for celebrating its 75th anniversary, commending the Hawk Mountain Sanctuary for its contributions to the preservation of wildlife and the native ecology of the Appalachian Mountains and eastern Pennsylvania, and commending the Hawk Mountain Sanctuary for its dedication to educating the public and the international community about wildlife conservation.

Hawk Mountain Sanctuary is a wild bird sanctuary near Kempton, Pennsylvania, in my district. Hawk Mountain is located along the Appalachian flyway, which is one of several very important flyways located in the U.S. It has been called the ''center of the universe'' for hawk watchers along the Appalachian flyway, bringing an average of 20,000 hawks, eagles, and falcons past the lookouts during late summer and fall every year.

Visitors to the sanctuary, who number about 60,000 annually, learn about conservation of the raptor population. Hawk Mountain Sanctuary is the world's oldest wildlife sanctuary exclusively committed to the protection and observation of birds of prey. The sanctuary's annual count of hawks, eagles and falcons, which is the world's longest record of raptor populations, provides valuable information on changes in raptor numbers in northeastern North America.

Hawk Mountain Sanctuary plays an important role in conserving birds of prey worldwide, providing leadership in raptor conservation science and education, and maintaining a model observation, research and education facility. Therefore, I am pleased to honor the 75th anniversary of Hawk Mountain Sanctuary.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, with no additional speakers, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I again urge Members to support this bill.

I want to thank my colleague from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) for managing the bills on the floor today with me.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 670.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING CATHOLIC SISTERS

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 441) honoring the historical contributions of Catholic sisters in the United States, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 441

Whereas the social, cultural, and political contributions of Catholic sisters have played a vital role in shaping life in the United States;

Whereas such women have joined in unique forms of intentional communitarian life dedicated to prayer and service since the very beginnings of our Nation's history, fearlessly and often sacrificially committing their personal lives to teaching, healing, and social action;

Whereas the first Catholic sisters to live and work in the United States were nine Ursuline Sisters, who journeyed from France to New Orleans in 1727;

Whereas at least nine sisters from the United States have been martyred since 1980 while working for social justice and human rights overseas;

Whereas Maura Clark, MM, Ita Ford, MM, and Dorothy Kazel, OSU were martyred in El Salvador in 1980;

Whereas Joel Kolmer, ASC, Shirley Kolmer, ASC, Kathleen McGuire, ASC, Agnes Mueller, ASC, and Barbara Ann Muttra, ASC were martyred in Liberia in 1992;

Whereas Dorothy Stang, SNDdeN was martyred in Brazil in 2005;

Whereas Catholic sisters established the Nation's largest private school system and founded more than 110 United States colleges and universities, educating millions of young people in the United States;

Whereas there were approximately 32,000 Catholic sisters in the United States who taught 400,000 children in 2,000 parochial schools by 1880, and there were 180,000 Catholic sisters who taught nearly 4,500,000 children by 1965;

Whereas today, there are approximately 59,000 Catholic sisters in the United States;

Whereas Catholic sisters participated in the opening of the West, traveling vast distances to minister in remote locations, setting up schools and hospitals, and working among native populations on distant reservations;

Whereas more than 600 sisters from 21 different religious communities nursed both Union and Confederate soldiers alike during the Civil War;

Whereas Catholic sisters cared for afflicted populations during the epidemics of cholera, typhoid, yellow fever, smallpox, tuberculosis, and influenza during the 19th and early 20th centuries;

Whereas Catholic sisters built and established hospitals, orphanages, and charitable institutions that have served millions of people, managing organizations long before similar positions were open to women;

Whereas approximately one in six hospital patients in the United States were treated in a Catholic facility;

Whereas Catholic sisters have been among the first to stand with the underprivileged, to work and educate among the poor and underserved, and to facilitate leadership through opportunity and example;

Whereas Catholic sisters continue to provide shelter, food, and basic human needs to the economically or socially disadvantaged and advocate relentlessly for the fair and equal treatment of all persons;

Whereas Catholic sisters work for the eradication of poverty and racism and for the promotion of nonviolence, equality, and democracy in principle and in action;

Whereas the humanitarian work of Catholic sisters with communities in crisis and refuge throughout the world positions them as activists and diplomats of peace and justice for the some of the most at risk populations; and

Whereas the Women & Spirit: Catholic Sisters in America Traveling Exhibit is sponsored by the Leadership Conference of Women Religious (LCWR) in association with Cincinnati Museum Center and will open on May 16, 2009, in Cincinnati, Ohio: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) honors and commends Catholic sisters for their humble service and courageous sacrifice throughout the history of this Nation; and

(2) supports the goals of the Women & Spirit: Catholic Sisters in America Traveling Exhibit, a project sponsored by the Leadership Conference of Women Religious (LCWR) in association with Cincinnati Museum Center and established to recognize the historical contributions of Catholic sisters in the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I am pleased to present House Resolution 441 for consideration. This legislation honors and commends Catholic sisters for their humble service and courageous sacrifice throughout United States history and additionally supports the goals of the ''Women & Spirit: Catholic Sisters in America'' traveling exhibit.

The measure before us was introduced on May 14, 2009 by my colleague and friend, Representative MARCY KAPTUR of Ohio, and was favorably reported out of the Oversight Committee on September 10, 2009 by unanimous consent. Notably, this measure enjoys the support of over 60 Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 441 honors the altruistic Catholic sisters, whose passion for public service has helped shape our Nation's social and cultural landscape. Since arriving in the United States almost 300 years ago, Catholic sisters have established schools, colleges, hospitals, orphanages, homeless shelters, and various other institutions to provide for those in need. These unsung heroes have served millions of Americans as nurses, as teachers, social workers, and they continue to do so today. The Catholic sisters have also helped to educate countless young Americans by establishing the Nation's largest private school system and founding over 110 colleges and universities.

□ 1515

Moreover, in 2005 roughly one in six hospital patients in the United States was treated in a Catholic facility. There are many, many accomplishments which I could cite in support of this resolution and of this traveling exhibit, but I think it's important to note just a few:

The first Catholic sisters in our country to live and work here in the service of our people were nine Ursuline Sisters who journeyed from France to New Orleans in 1727. At least nine sisters of the United States' orders have been martyred since 1980 while working for social justice and for human rights overseas. Dorothy Stang, sister of Notre Dame, was martyred in Brazil in 2005.

There were 32,000 Catholic sisters in the United States who taught 400,000 children at 2,000 parochial schools by the year 1880. There were 180,000 Catholic sisters who taught nearly 4.5 million children in 1965. Today, there are approximately 59,000 Catholic sisters still serving in the United States.

I owe much of my own education to the good sisters of Notre Dame, who taught me the fear of God, and I am forever in their debt. I ask all of our Members to support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 441, honoring the Catholic sisters in the United States, who have contributed greatly to the Catholic church and to the communities where they have lived and worked.

The first Catholic sisters to live in the United States came from France in 1727 and settled in New Orleans. From this small beginning, their presence and contributions to society grew over the years. Today, there are about 59,000 Catholic sisters in the United States. Although their numbers have decreased over the years, their influence is strong and vital.

Catholic sisters founded, staffed and managed the largest private school system in the United States. They founded more than 110 colleges and universities in the United States, thus providing educational opportunity for millions of young people. In addition to schools, the Catholic sisters established hospitals, orphanages and other charitable institutions that have served millions of Americans.

Catholic sisters have long been recognized for their fair and equal treatment of all persons. They have worked tirelessly for the eradication of racism and poverty in the United States and around the world.

In recognition of the women who have added substantially to the lives of many of our citizens, I stand to recognize the Catholic sisters for their untiring dedication and for their many contributions to the fabric of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I ask my friends on both sides of the aisle to take a moment to recognize the priceless contributions of the Catholic sisters in America and to thank them for their humble service and courageous sacrifices throughout United States history by agreeing to House Resolution 441.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 441, 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. LYNCH. 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.

JOHN J. SHIVNEN POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2215) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 140 Merriman Road in Garden City, Michigan, as the ''John J. Shivnen Post Office Building''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2215

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

SECTION 1. JOHN J. SHIVNEN POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 140 Merriman Road in Garden City, Michigan, shall be known and designated as the ''John J. Shivnen Post Office Building''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''John J. Shivnen Post Office Building''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the subcommittee with jurisdiction over the United States Postal Service, I am pleased to present H.R. 2215 for consideration. This legislation will designate the United States Postal facility located at 140 Merriman Road in Garden City, Michigan, as the ''John J. Shivnen Post Office Building.''

Introduced on April 30, 2009, by my colleague, Representative THAD MCCOTTER of Michigan, H.R. 2215 was favorably reported out of the Oversight Committee on September 10, 2009, by unanimous consent. Additionally, this legislation enjoys the support of the entire sitting Michigan delegation.

Mr. Speaker, the dedication of the Garden City Post Office in honor of John J. Shivnen is particularly fitting in light of Mr. Shivnen's dedicated and unparalleled service to the United States Postal Service and to his beloved Garden City community.

Specifically, Mr. Shivnen served as the postmaster of Garden City for 30 years until his retirement in 1996. In addition, Mr. Shivnen was an active member of the National Association of Postmasters of the United States for over 40 years, during which time he served in multiple leadership capacities, including area and county director, legislative chairman, parliamentarian, and postmaster representative. Moreover, Mr. Shivnen played an instrumental role with respect to the site selection and construction of the current Garden City Post Office.

In addition to his professional contributions to the Garden City community, Mr. Shivnen also demonstrated a lifelong commitment to community service. During his stewardship of the Garden City Post Office, Mr. Shivnen established an annual Christmas Basket program through which disadvantaged local families received much needed gift and food donations. Mr. Shivnen was also a dedicated member of the Garden City Lions Club service organization. Following his retirement, he remained an active member of several other community groups until his health no longer allowed him to continue.

Notably, among Mr. Shivnen's last community service projects was the creation of a replica of a rural post office located at the Garden City Historical Museum. In support of this effort, Mr. Shivnen purchased a majority of the replica items, performed much of the restoration work himself, and even paid for a portion of the contract work.

In recognition of Mr. Shivnen's contributions to the project, which was completed shortly before his passing, the Garden City Historical Museum Board honored Mr. Shivnen's legacy by hosting his wake at the museum. Regrettably, Mr. Shivnen passed away in January of 2007.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that we can honor his lifelong commitment to public and community service through the passage of this legislation to designate the Garden City Post Office in his honor. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 2215.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2215, a resolution to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service, located at 140 Merriman Road in Garden City, Michigan, as the ''John J. Shivnen Post Office Building.'' I also commend Representative MCCOTTER for bringing this forward to this body.

A graduate of Garden City High School, John Shivnen believed in hard work, humility and community service, and he lived with these three qualities in mind throughout his life.

Appointed postmaster as a young man, Mr. Shivnen served for 30 years, making him the longest-serving postmaster in Garden City. As postmaster, he was actively involved in the site selection and construction of the current Garden City Post Office. He was also an active member of the National Association of Postmasters of the U.S. for 41 years, serving in numerous leadership positions.

Mr. Shivnen's passion for community service was shown through his many efforts to help the community where he spent most of his life. He established the Garden City Post Office annual Christmas Basket program, and was an active member of the Garden City Lions Club.

Generous and compassionate, Mr. Shivnen's deep commitment to his community did not end after his retirement in 1996. He volunteered at the local senior center as a handyman, and his last large community project was his creation of a replica of a rural post office for the Garden City Historical Museum. Purchasing most of the replica items and working with others, the project continued until his declining health prevented him from leaving his home.

His dedication and service for his community is exemplary, and it is fitting to name the post office in Garden City, Michigan, in his honor.

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

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I again urge my colleagues to support Mr. MCCOTTER and us in honoring Mr. John J. Shivnen through the passing of H.R. 2215. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2215.

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. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum

is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

NATIONAL JOB CORPS DAY

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 163) expressing support for designation of September 23, 2009, as ''National Job Corps Day''.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 163

Whereas over the course of 45 years, nearly 3,000,000 youth in the United States have been provided a safe living and learning environment on Job Corps campuses nationwide;

Whereas 123 Job Corps campuses educate and train 60,000 youth in the United States each year;

Whereas throughout its more than four decades of existence, Job Corps has successfully provided the Nation's economically disadvantaged youth with critical residential, academic, and vocational services;

Whereas Job Corps is considered the Nation's largest and most successful high school dropout recovery and youth empowerment program;

Whereas youth enrolled in Job Corps, receive intensive academic remediation, gain employability, learn life skills, and receive job placement assistance;

Whereas Job Corps builds the lives of youth, many of whom are high school dropouts, read slightly below the 8th grade reading level, and have never held a full-time job;

Whereas in an average 8 month stay at Job Corps the vast majority of youth leave with a high school diploma or equivalency, improve their literacy by more than two grade levels, and 75 percent of Job Corps graduates secure employment or enter the military;

Whereas Job Corps' successful model of preparing youth in the United States has included partnerships and linkages with employers and labor representatives;

Whereas this public-private partnership of American ingenuity has led to local and large employers and labor representatives providing Job Corps students hands-on, practical experience through internships and helping during the transition from student to employee;

Whereas Job Corps students and staff have contributed to their communities through millions of hours of community service, signaling the importance of giving back to the communities in which they live;

Whereas dedicated Job Corps staff invest their time and talents in the lives of students and without whom Job Corps could not fulfill its mission;

Whereas the economic benefits of a local Job Corps center generate 100 permanent jobs, thus producing 15,000 qualified and dedicated staff in 48 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico; and

Whereas September 23, 2009, would be an appropriate day to designate as ''National Job Corps Day'', in honor of the 45th anniversary of Job Corps: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) supports the designation of ''National Job Corps Day''; and

(2) encourages State and local governments to observe the day with appropriate activities that promote awareness of Job Corps.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Oversight Committee, I am pleased to present House Concurrent Resolution 163 for consideration. This legislation expresses support for the designation of September 23, 2009, as ''National Job Corps Day.''

The measure before us was introduced on July 8, 2009, by my colleague, Representative JERRY MORAN of Kansas, and it was favorably reported out of the Oversight Committee on September 10, 2009, by unanimous consent. Additionally, this legislation currently enjoys the support of over 65 Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 163 supports the designation of September 23 as ''National Job Corps Day.'' Administered by the United States Department of Labor, the Job Corps is the Nation's largest career technical training and educational program for young people over the age of 16. The Job Corps offers a wide array of services, including career planning, on-the-job training, job placement, residential housing, food services, and driver education.

Since its inception via the 1964 Economic Opportunity Act, the Job Corps has provided countless young Americans with the academic, vocational and social skills training needed to help them obtain meaningful jobs and to pursue further educational opportunities.

In light of the recent economic crisis, the various services and programs offered by the Job Corps have never been more important for America's youth and for the entire Nation. The Job Corps helps to ensure that America's workforce remains capable of handling the challenges of our rapidly changing world.

Notably, the Job Corps boasts 123 centers nationwide, including centers in the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico. Of these 123 centers, my own congressional district is the proud home of the Job Corps' Boston regional office. This terrific regional office oversees Job Corps centers in Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, and Vermont.

In closing, I am delighted to support House Concurrent Resolution 163, and I urge all of our friends and Members to join me in recognizing the continuing success of the Job Corps.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1530

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

I rise today to discuss House Concurrent Resolution 163, expressing support for the designation of September 23, 2009, as National Job Corps Day.

The Job Corps organization has been training young adults for careers since 1964. Job Corps's mission is to ''attract eligible young people, teach them the skills they need to become employable and independent, and place them in meaningful jobs or further education.'' By committing to this mission, Job Corps is able to successfully train thousands of youth in the United States each year.

Job Corps involves youth and a free career development program, which integrates the teaching of academic, vocational, employability skills and social competencies. This gives young people the opportunity to prepare themselves for a fruitful future, with help from the dedicated employees who ensure this program runs smoothly and effectively. These people should also be commended.

Keeping our Nation's youth in productive programs like Job Corps helps to steer the youth of the United States in the right direction. The staff and students have contributed to their communities millions of hours of community service, showing the importance of giving back to the United States of America.

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

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I again urge my colleagues to support the designation of September 23, 2009, as National Job Corps Day by agreeing to House Concurrent Resolution 163.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 163. This legislation designates tomorrow, September 23, 2009, as "National Job Corps Day." I introduced this resolution to commemorate the 45th anniversary of Job Corps and to recognize the program for its successes.

I firmly believe that the world is changed one person at a time. At Job Corps' 123 centers across the country, the program is changing lives each day. Close to three-quarters of the students who enroll in Job Corps are high school dropouts. Many have never held a full-time job. These young people come from difficult circumstances, with skills and abilities not yet discovered or fully developed.

Yet, Job Corps recognizes the potential in these individuals. It gives them the opportunity to improve their education and learn an employable skill. It provides the care, encouragement, and support these youths need to turn their lives around.

In an average 8 month stay at Job Corps, the majority of students leave with a high

school diploma or equivalency and improve their literacy by more than two grade levels. About 75 percent of Job Corps graduates secure employment or enter the military.

Young people need Job Corps now more than ever. While it can be difficult for a young person who lacks the proper skills and education to find work in good economic times, it becomes even more of a challenge in times of economic uncertainty. The unemployment rate in August for those ages 16 to 19 was a staggering 25.5 percent. For 20 to 24 year olds, the jobless rate was just over 15 percent.

While Job Corps reaches some 60,000 youths each year, it cannot serve all those in need. Sadly, many young people still fall through the cracks and the cost to these individuals and society is immense.

Studies tell us that over the course of the next decade, the 12 million students who are projected to drop out of high school will cost our economy more than $3 trillion.

Here on this floor, we have been talking a lot lately about health care. Studies show that each class of dropouts costs states $17 billion in publically-subsidized health care over the course of their lives.

In addition, individuals lacking more than a high school education make up close to the entirety of our Nation's prison population and account for 90 percent of incarceration spending.

But it's about more than dollars and cents. It's about more than employment statistics. It's about people. It's about helping people achieve a better life. And that is what Job Corps does.

Young people are our country's future. We have a responsibility to care for and educate them. Job Corps helps us do that.

So I urge my colleagues to support this resolution and join me in recognizing Job Corps for the work it does for young people who need it most.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleagues in celebrating the 45th anniversary of Job Corps. Since its inception in 1964, Job Corps has educated over 3 million people, helping them secure their high school diplomas, improve literacy and find secure employment.

Oregon has six Job Corps centers, one of which is in the Third Congressional District of Oregon. The Springdale Job Corps Center houses over 120 students and offers services to an additional fifty day students. The Center helps prepare students for careers in the culinary, administrative, security, automotive and health care fields, as well as assists students with their high school diplomas or equivalent. I am impressed by the energy, thoughtfulness and passion of those who work at the Springdale Center and the discipline and drive of the students they prepare.

On the 45th anniversary of Job Corps founding, I would like to acknowledge the great work being done in Springdale, Oregon and across the country.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong support for H. Con. Res. 163, a resolution expressing support for September 23 to be recognized as ''National Job Corps Day.''

In my home district of San Bernardino, California, we have an Inland Empire Job Corps center that has helped thousands of young people improve the quality of their lives through career, technical, and academic training.

These young people have been able to give back to their local communities by becoming productive members of society, and with countless hours of community service organized through Job Corps.

In fact, over the last 45 years, nearly 3 million youth across the Nation have been provided a safe living and learning environment on Job Corp campuses nationwide.

Job Corps is America's largest and most successful high school dropout recovery and youth empowerment program.

75 percent of Job Corps graduates secure either permanent employment or enter into military service.

It is only fitting that Congress moves to recognize this highly successful program—and continues to support it during these financially troubling times.

I urge my colleagues to express their support for the Job Corps Program; and for the hardworking men and women who make a positive difference in the lives of America's young people.

Vote in favor of H. Con. Res. 163.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 163, legislation commending Job Corps on their 45th Anniversary and declaring September 23, 2009 as ''National Job Corps Day.''

For 45 years, Job Corps has served our Nation's at-risk youth by providing desperately needed residential, academic and vocational services to help economically disadvantaged students secure a job and build critical life skills. As a co-chair of the Friends of Job Corps Caucus, I proudly support Job Corps and salute this unique program for helping nearly three million youth pursue their dreams of an independent life.

One of our country's most significant challenges is helping America's forgotten youth. Thirty percent of our youth do not graduate from high school and 40 percent of those who do complete high school are unprepared for work or higher education. Taken together, this means that an astounding three out of five American youth leave traditional schools without the skills they need to succeed in work or post-secondary education.

The Job Corps model remains out-of-school youths' best chance for success. For over four decades, Job Corps has been considered the Nation's largest and most successful dropout recovery program. Each year, more than 60,000 youths choose to enroll in Job Corps to receive the support they need. The vast majority of students leave with a GED or high school diploma and over 85 percent of Job Corps graduates obtain jobs, enlist in the military or pursue higher education.

In addition to helping students, Job Corps stimulates the economy through local economic activity. Job Corps funding is immediately invested in local economies across the nation through its 15,000 staff and the money local centers spend regionally on supplies and services. Every dollar invested in Job Corps stimulates $1.91 in local economic activity.

I have seen first-hand the difference the Job Corps program has made in my own district through my work with the Quentin Burdick Job Corps Center in Minot, North Dakota. This center serves approximately 250 students in the region, and has been one of the top performing centers in the country for over five years. I am proud of the work the Burdick Job Corps Center has done in my community, giving disadvantaged youths the skills they need to succeed in today's workforce—at no cost to them or their families.

For all of these reasons, I want to commend Job Corp students and staff on their 45th anniversary, and urge my colleagues to join me today in supporting this important resolution.

Mr. LYNCH. I yield back the balance of our time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res 163.

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

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. POST OFFICE

Mr LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2971) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 630 Northeast Killingsworth Avenue in Portland, Oregon, as the ''Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Post Office''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2971

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

SECTION 1. DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 630 Northeast Killingsworth Avenue in Portland, Oregon, shall be known and designated as the ''Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Post Office''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Post Office''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield time to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY) so that he may speak on the bill that just passed.

Mr. POMEROY. I thank my friend, because I wanted to say some words on behalf of Jobs Corps and missed by moments, apparently, the formal opportunity do that. I will add a statement to the RECORD.

But let me say as co-Chair of the Friends of Job Corps Caucus, I believe so strongly in the promise of Job Corps and admire its 45-year track record in providing at-risk youth the core job skills they need so that they might move forward and make something of their lives.

My statement will include data, including the 60,000 youth every year choosing to enroll in Job Corps, the 85 percent of Job Corps graduates that obtain the high school diploma or GED equivalent, graduate with jobs and job-related skills, pursuing service in the military, other alternatives.

I have seen firsthand in the Quentin Burdick Job Corps Center in Minot, North Dakota, youth that are getting after the business of turning their lives around and the new sense of self-esteem as they acquire skills, skills that will bring them jobs, jobs that will pay living wages so that they might have, for the first time, often, in the life of their family, a shot at breaking the cycle of poverty and leaving a better future for the children and grandchildren to follow.

There is a reason why for 45 years Republicans and Democrats alike have supported Job Corps: It works.

The President has told people contemplating walking away from school, not continuing their education, you are not only quitting on yourself, you are quitting on your country, because we need those skills. Well, for our country, I must say we must not quit on these young people, and that is why I look forward to the next 45 years of Job Corps support.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for this bill designating the post office located at 630 Northeast Killingsworth Avenue in Portland, Oregon, as the Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Post Office.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., became one of the most important public figures of our times. His leadership during the Civil Rights Movement helped to make America the country it is today. Because of Dr. King's many accomplishments in the pursuit of justice and liberty, it is clear that he deserves this honor and recognition.

Dr. King began his career as a Baptist minister who was also a leading civil rights leader during the 1950s and 1960s. It's hard to forget Dr. King's stirring and often quoted ''I Have a Dream'' speech that established him as one of the great American orators of all time.

Dr. King's lifelong crusade to end all forms of racial inequity was instrumental in turning the entire country towards civil rights for all citizens. His cry against segregation and other forms of discrimination brought this issue to the forefront of American culture.

Dr. King was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1964, which helped show the world that racial discrimination could be ended through nonviolent means. He was also awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom and Congressional Gold Medal. In recognition of his many accomplishments for our country, in 1983, Congress established a national holiday as a tribute to his memory.

As one of the most pivotal figures in the battle to end bigotry and discrimination on the basis of race, Dr. King led the Montgomery Bus Boycott in 1955, helped found the Southern Christian Leadership Conference in 1957, and was instrumental in orchestrating the famous Birmingham, Alabama, protests. Realizing that his message of freedom applied to all impoverished Americans, Dr. King expanded his crusade for fair treatment for all citizens. Dr. King expanded his message to apply to impoverished Americans.

Towards the end of his life, he expanded his outreach to all races and cultures. Dr. King dedicated his life to ensuring these principles this country holds so dear, those of liberty and justice for all citizens.

I would like to thank my respected colleague, EARL BLUMENAUER, for introducing this important legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present H.R. 2971 for consideration. This legislation, as my colleague noted, will designate the United States postal facility located at 630 Northeast Killingsworth Avenue, in Portland, Oregon, as the Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Post Office.

Introduced on June 19, 2009, by my colleague, Representative EARL BLUMENAUER of Oregon, H.R. 2971 was favorably reported out of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee on July 10, 2009, by unanimous consent. Additionally, this legislation enjoys the support of the entire Oregon House delegation.

My friend from Utah has articulated very well the events, the life and legacy of Dr. King, from his leadership in helping to organize the Montgomery Bus Boycott in 1955 to his riveting ''I Have a Dream'' speech in front of the Lincoln Memorial not far from this spot, and also the passion of his pursuit of nonviolent protest to change opinions, attitudes and opportunity in this country.

Dr. King served to remind this Nation of its fundamental responsibility to safeguard the natural, God-given rights of all men and women, so that all people in this country would be free to pursue our goals and aspirations without limit.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that we can further honor the great life and legacy of Dr. King by joining our colleague from the State of Oregon and supporting the passage of this legislation to designate the Northeast Killingsworth Avenue post office in his honor.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 2971.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I again urge my colleagues to join me in honoring Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., through the passage of H.R. 2971.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, in June, I introduced a bill to name a post office in my district, northeast Portland, Oregon, the ''Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Post Office.'' Located at 630 Northeast Killingsworth Avenue, this post office shall serve as a daily reminder of the civil rights leader who, even now, inspires our Nation and serves as a catalyst for change.

In fact, this bill itself is a result of a community-led effort, and the hard work of two local letter carriers. In 2007, Mr. Jamie Partridge and Mr. Isham Harris collected employee signatures supporting this naming, as well as letters of support from several neighborhood associations. I am pleased to carry this effort forward in D.C., with the full support of the entire Oregon congressional delegation.

I thank the Committee on Government Oversight and Reform for working with me to ensure speedy passage of this bill through the House. I look forward to equally expeditious consideration in the Senate.

Mr. LYNCH. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2971.

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 LYNCH. 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.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2009

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3548) to amend the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 to provide for the temporary availability of certain additional emergency unemployment compensation, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3548

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 ''Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2009''.

SEC. 2. ADDITIONAL EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4002 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) FURTHER ADDITIONAL EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If, at the time that the amount added to an individual's account under subsection (c)(1) (hereinafter 'additional emergency unemployment compensation') is exhausted or at any time thereafter, such individual's State is in an extended benefit period (as determined under paragraph (2)), such account shall be further augmented by an amount (hereinafter 'further additional emergency unemployment compensation') equal to the lesser of—

''(A) 50 percent of the total amount of regular compensation (including dependents' allowances) payable to the individual during the individual's benefit year under the State law; or

''(B) 13 times the individual's average weekly benefit amount (as determined under subsection (b)(2)) for the benefit year.

''(2) EXTENDED BENEFIT PERIOD.—For purposes of paragraph (1), a State shall be considered to be in an extended benefit period, as of any given time, if such a period would then be in effect for such State under the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 if—

''(A) section 203(d) of such Act—

''(i) were applied by substituting '6' for '5' each place it appears; and

''(ii) did not include the requirement under paragraph (1)(A) thereof; or

''(B) section 203(f) of such Act were applied to such State—

''(i) regardless of whether or not the State had by law provided for its application;

''(ii) by substituting '8.5' for '6.5' in paragraph (1)(A)(i) thereof; and

''(iii) as if it did not include the requirement under paragraph (1)(A)(ii) thereof.

''(3) COORDINATION RULE.—Notwithstanding an election under section 4001(e) by a State to provide for the payment of emergency unemployment compensation prior to extended compensation, such State may pay extended compensation to an otherwise eligible individual prior to any further additional emergency unemployment compensation, if such individual claimed extended compensation for at least 1 week of unemployment after the exhaustion of additional emergency unemployment compensation.

''(4) LIMITATION.—The account of an individual may be augmented not more than once under this subsection.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT TO NON-AUGMENTATION RULE.—Section 4007(b)(2) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended—

(1) by striking ''then section 4002(c)'' and inserting ''then subsections (c) and (d) of section 4002''; and

(2) by striking ''paragraph (2) of such section)'' and inserting ''paragraph (2) of such subsection (c) or (d) (as the case may be))''.

(c) TRANSFER OF FUNDS.—Section 4004(e)(1) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended by striking ''Act;'' and inserting ''Act and the Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2009;''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply as if included in the enactment of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008, except that no amount shall be payable by virtue of such amendments with respect to any week of unemployment commencing before the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. 0.2 PERCENT FUTA SURTAX.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3301 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to rate of tax) is amended—

(1) by striking ''through 2009'' in paragraph (1) and inserting ''through 2010'', and

(2) by striking ''calendar year 2010'' in paragraph (2) and inserting ''calendar year 2011''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to wages paid after December 31, 2009.

SEC. 4. REPORTING OF FIRST DAY OF EARNINGS TO DIRECTORY OF NEW HIRES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 453A(b)(1)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 653a(b)(1)(A)) is amended by inserting ''the date services for remuneration were first performed by the employee,'' after ''of the employee,''.

(b) REPORTING FORMAT AND METHOD.—Section 453A(c) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 653a(c)) is amended by inserting '', to the extent practicable,'' after ''Each report required by subsection (b) shall''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall take effect six months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) COMPLIANCE TRANSITION PERIOD.—If the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines that State legislation (other than legislation appropriating funds) is required in order for a State plan under part D of title IV of the Social Security Act to meet the additional requirements imposed by the amendment made by subsection (a), the plan shall not be regarded as failing to meet such requirements before the first day of the second calendar quarter beginning after the close of the first regular session of the State legislature that begins after the effective date of such amendment. If the State has a 2-year legislative session, each year of the session is deemed to be a separate regular session of the State legislature.

SEC. 5. COLLECTION IN ALL STATES OF UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION DUE TO FRAUD.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (f) of section 6402 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking paragraph (3) and redesignating paragraphs (4) through (8) as paragraphs (3) through (7), respectively.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to refunds payable on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 3548.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, across America, there are people who are hanging on by a thin, economic lifeline called unemployment insurance. Without the passage of this bill, that thread will break for over 1 million workers before the end of this year, plunging them and their families into an economic abyss and threatening to reverse the positive signs we are beginning to see in the economy. We can prevent that this afternoon by passing this bill.

This legislation will provide an additional 13 weeks of extended benefits to individuals in hard-hit States, specifically those with a 3-month average unemployment rate at or above 8.5 percent. It's important to note that this legislation is fully offset and does not increase the deficit.

At the beginning of this year, America felt the bare-knuckled brunt of what has already been called the Great Recession. Nearly three-quarters of a million jobs were lost in the month of January alone, and we met the crisis head on.

The steps we took earlier this year helped us turn away from an economic catastrophe and toward recovery. Don't take my word for it. Former JOHN MCCAIN economic adviser Mark Zandi said, ''Without the stimulus, job losses would be measurably worse.'' But even as economic indicators show improvement, we know we cannot replace 7 million lost jobs overnight.

□ 1545

Recovery will take time. There are still six unemployed workers for every available job, so extended unemployment compensation isn't a convenience; it's a necessity.

Since I introduced this legislation 2 weeks ago, my office phones have been ringing nonstop with calls from Americans all across the country who have exhausted or soon will exhaust their benefits, asking, When is it going to pass?

I heard it from paralegals who could not find a job because attorneys are competing against them for employment; from contractors who are still reeling from the collapse of the housing market; and from school teachers whose local school districts could not afford to keep them on the payroll.

Without quick action, they will become unable to afford their mortgages or health coverage. Providing these Americans with a modest economic lifeline is not only the humane thing to do, but it's in the economic interest of the country.

Every UI dollar generates $1.64 in positive impact in the economy. That supports existing jobs and our fragile housing market. In other words, UI, unemployment insurance, is a win for every American.

I urge all Members to support this bipartisan, budget-neutral bill to extend unemployment benefits.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3548, the Unemployment Compensation Extension Act. This legislation provides up to 3 months' additional Federal extended unemployment benefits to long-term unemployed individuals in States where the unemployment rate is 8.5 percent or higher.

That's on top of the 18 months of State and Federal unemployment benefits already available in places with unemployment at those levels. With the passage of this bill, folks who are unemployed could potentially receive up to 21 months of combined unemployment benefits.

Right now, more than half of the States will benefit from this bill. An incredible 29 States are struggling with unemployment rates of 8.5 percent or higher. In my home State of Kentucky, the unemployment rate is 11.1 percent, leaving more than one out of every 10 Kentuckians out of work.

That's a staggering number. The fact that we're here today discussing a measure that will provide Americans with nearly 2 years' worth of unemployment benefits is yet another sign of the failure of this administration's stimulus plan to create jobs. Nothing establishes that more clearly than the economic trends in States like the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

Since February, 2009, when the stimulus law was signed, almost 38,000 Kentuckians have been added to the unemployment rolls, and the unemployment rate has surged from 9.3 percent in February, to 11.1 percent today.

Over the past year, nearly 123,000 Kentuckians have claimed emergency unemployment benefits after their traditional benefit allowances expired. Every week, between 800 and 1,200 Kentucky residents are running out of unemployment benefits.

Earlier this month, Kentucky Governor Steve Beshear sent a letter to the Kentucky delegation stating that the loss of unemployment benefits would be devastating to many families. It will only sink Kentucky further behind in the race toward economic recovery. State and Federal unemployment accounts are already drained, and we are headed for more than $100 billion deficits in these supposed ''trust funds'' by the end of 2010, with $200 billion deficits by the end of 2012.

All of that spending will come at a huge price, which could require a doubling or more of State payroll taxes and possibly Federal tax hikes as well. Payroll tax hikes mean a tax on jobs—and ultimately on job creation—which brings us back to the real point: jobs.

In February, the administration promised its stimulus plan would create 3.5 million jobs. We're still waiting. While the administration claims to have ''created or saved'' 1 million jobs, in the real world, Americans have witnessed the continued destruction of 3 million jobs since the beginning of this year.

The administration promised with its stimulus bill that national unemployment would not exceed 8 percent. It's now 9.7 percent nationally, and the President has said he now expects it to exceed 10 percent by the end of the year.

Earlier this month, Larry Summers, Chair of the President's National Economic Council, said that the level of unemployment is unacceptably high and will remain so for a number of years.

It's time to provide much needed help and assistance to millions of Americans who are struggling in States with outrageous unemployment rates. They should not be made to suffer for the failure of this administration's policies that have failed to create the promised jobs.

I support these extended benefits in H.R. 3548 to help long-term unemployed workers in Kentucky and other States where jobs are hardest to find. But we need to move beyond this secondary debate to the primary task of creating jobs, instead of undermining job creation. Until we do that, we're missing the point. What Americans want are jobs, not handouts from the government. But that's sure not what they're getting right now.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. I yield 1 minute to the majority leader, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman from Washington, the Chair of the subcommittee, for yielding. I thank Mr. DAVIS for his support in facilitating this coming to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, 8 months into the 111th Congress and the Obama Presidency, it's clear to me, and I think others, that the economic policies that we've put in place are helping to pull our country out of the recession.

This month, the Blue Chip economic survey confirmed that 81 percent of leading economists believe that the recession is over. Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke recently stated that he agrees.

Nonpartisan economic analysts agree that the actions taken by the Obama administration and our Congress, including the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, were critical to stabilizing our economy and putting us back on a path to recovery.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, Moody's, and the Council of Economic Advisers all concluded that our economy has approximately 1 million more jobs than it would have had if the Recovery Act had not been passed.

Last week, Mr. Speaker, the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities found that the Recovery Act kept 6 million Americans from falling below the poverty line and reduced the severity of poverty for 33 million Americans.

Whether we're Republicans or Democrats, those are results we can all cheer because they mean economic security to the people we represent.

However, Mr. Speaker, it's clear to all of us that unemployment remains a problem for millions of American families. The headlines may say that our recession is over; but for those individuals who remain out of work, this is still a time of hardship and struggle.

According to the CBO, it has also become clear that the hole we are climbing out of was deeper than we knew. Now we know that the economy was in even worse shape than economists realized when President Obama took office in January.

Though unemployment continues to strain families in all of our districts, job losses have been steadily decreasing the last 3 months under this administration, with last month's figures the best in over a year.

But while job losses are slowing, it will take some time before we can reverse the losses that economists agree began nearly 2 years ago and start creating enough jobs for people who have been out of work.

Long-term unemployment, Mr. Speaker, remains at its highest rate since we began measuring in 1948. Over 33 percent of the total unemployed have been out of work for more than 26 weeks, thereby requiring this legislation.

Even as our country emerges from an economic crisis, hundreds of thousands of Americans and their families face a more personal crisis. At the end of this month, if we do not act, their unemployment insurance will run out, even though they continue to look for work. Many of these workers are middle class Americans. Many of them lost their jobs without notice.

According to a recent unemployment survey conducted by the Heldrich Center for Workforce Development at Rutgers: ''Six in 10 of those whose employer had let them go had no advanced warning, adding to the pain for many. Nearly four in 10 said they had been employed by their company for more than 3 years and one in 10 for more than a decade.''

In other words, Americans who had what they thought were stable jobs—and made commitments based on these jobs, like mortgages, college payments, auto payments—found themselves out of work without warning, leaving them and their families in dire straits.

For their sake, this bill extends for up to 13 weeks the unemployment benefits of more than 300,000 American workers. Our fellow citizens, through no fault of their own, find themselves without a job, without a livelihood, without a way to support themselves and their families.

I know that some argue that unemployment insurance can be an incentive not to seek a job at all. But that argument doesn't hold water for the workers who are the target of this bill: workers in the States with unemployment rates over 8.5 percent, the States in which an honest effort to find work is most likely to be frustrating.

We chose to target those workers who are still having difficulty finding a job, not because they're failing to give their best effort, but because the economic climate of their State is still difficult.

Very frankly, Mr. Speaker, my State will not qualify. That's the good news. But for those unemployed, the bad news, perhaps. But not only is supporting job-seeking workers the right

thing to do; extending unemployment insurance benefits all of us. That's because the money provided is quickly spent on necessities, which provides an immediate boost to local economies.

Mr. Speaker, an extension of unemployment insurance is supported by a bipartisan coalition of Governors, who understand its benefits for their economies and their families. They write that the unemployment benefits have ''offered relief each month to struggling families across the country and have played a critical role in stabilizing the economy,'' and that these benefits, they say, must be extended. I would also add that because this bill is fully paid for, it doesn't add to the deficit.

In 8 months, we have come a long way, a long way in recovering from the recession inherited by this administration. But we cannot forget, we must not forget those whom the recovery has not yet reached, which is why I urge my colleagues to support this important bill, and why I thank Mr. MCDERMOTT and Mr. DAVIS for their leadership in bringing this bill to the floor in an appropriate time frame so that we can get relief to those people before their benefits run out.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I will insert in the RECORD a recent article about an innovative and bipartisan Georgia program designed to help unemployed workers get back on the job quickly. The program is called Georgia Works. It allows unemployed workers to go to work for selected businesses for up to 24 hours a week for 8 weeks.

Unemployment benefits serve as the workers' salaries and the State pays an additional stipend of up to $300 a month to cover child care, transportation, and related work costs.

Employers win because they get to test out qualified workers they might hire. Workers get a solid foot in the door to a new job and maintain and build work skills. And taxpayers get lower taxes in the form of shorter unemployment benefits and a quicker return to work.

This is a win-win program that other States would do well to replicate to help workers get back to work more quickly.

GA. WORK PROGRAM GROWS, ATTRACTS FOLLOWERS

(By Christine Vestal)

As states struggle to help legions of jobless workers find employment, some are seeking advice from Georgia, where a growing number of people are landing jobs as a result of free tryouts sponsored by the state unemployment system. The program, dubbed Georgia Works, is so simple that experts say other states should have no problem replicating it.

''It's a brilliant little program. There's no cost to the employer and the only cost to the state is a small stipend for transportation,'' said Don Peitersen, workforce director for the American Institute for Full Employment, which advises states on employment issues. ''I go out and actively recruit states to recreate the Georgia model,'' he said. Officials from at least 15 states have told Georgia's labor department they are considering the option.

Started in 2003, Georgia Works allows people collecting unemployment benefits to work for selected businesses up to 24 hours a week for eight weeks at no cost to the employers. When not working, unemployment recipients are expected to search for other jobs.

Unemployment benefit checks serve as the workers' salaries and the state pays for workers' compensation insurance when needed. The state also gives job seekers as much as $240 to cover child-care, transportation or clothing costs—a stipend slated to increase to $300 this month.

All employers have to do is certify that they intend to immediately hire for the position and follow up with a performance evaluation, whether they hire the worker or not.

Georgia considers the program valuable on-the-job training, but unlike other training programs, it is not federally funded under the Workforce Investment Act. As a result, Georgia Works is open to all job seekers, not just low-income, disabled or dislocated workers who qualify under federal rules. In addition, there is no need for participating companies to fill out reams of paper to be certified. In Georgia, no legislation was required to launch the unique program.

Critics argue that the unemployment insurance system that funds Georgia Works was not intended to help businesses create jobs, but federal officials say they approve. ''It's an innovative program and it's a good one. We think it's a plus all the way around,'' said the U.S. Department of Labor's southeastern director Pete Fleming.

Under the program, job seekers get a chance to show employers their skills and businesses can test prospective workers before hiring them. So far, more than 3,000 Georgians have landed permanent jobs through the program.

With the recession creating a much larger pool of unemployed workers, Labor Commissioner Michael L. Thurmond aims to quadruple that number over the next year. ''Stimulus job creation is not sustainable. Georgia's economy will not rebound unless we jump-start private-sector hiring,'' Thurmond told Stateline.org.

He said plans are under way to make Georgia Works the state's lead re-employment strategy by aggressively recruiting businesses to get on board and offering job tryout options to every job seeker.

In its six years of operation, Georgia's program has grown primarily through word of mouth, with some job applicants proposing it to prospective employers as a way to get their foot in the door. Successful job seekers have also recommended Georgia Works to unemployed friends, and workforce agencies have proposed it to a small number of businesses and unemployment recipients.

Under the expansion, Thurmond says the state will post signs saying ''Ask me about Georgia Works'' at all workforce centers, frontline staff will offer the option in initial interviews with job seekers, and a marketing campaign will target some 6,000 small- and medium-sized businesses across a broad spectrum of industries, including retail, hospitality, construction, manufacturing, transportation and public utilities.

In the process, Thurmond says, the program will help struggling companies get back on their feet and start hiring.

As in the rest of the nation, layoffs have subsided in Georgia, but thousands of jobs remain unfilled, in part because employers are uncertain about their economic future. Even as the number of jobless workers soared to nearly 15 million nationwide last month, some 2.6 million jobs remained open, according to the U.S. Department of Labor.

By taking some of the risk and expense out of hiring, Thurmond says Georgia can leverage unemployment trust fund dollars to stimulate job growth. Instead of simply serving as income support, benefit checks become a job seeker's investment in new employment and an opportunity for companies to lower the cost of hiring and training. ''That's two for the price of one,'' Thurmond said.

But advocates for workers say the unemployment trust fund was not designed to subsidize jobs. Instead, the insurance is intended to support people while they search for the best possible work. ''I don't buy the idea that pushing unemployed workers to fill just any opening is better than searching for a suitable job,'' said Andrew Stettner, deputy director of the National Employment Law Center, which advocates for workers.

Still, some workers say they would rather get back to work quickly than live with the uncertainty and frustration of a drawn-out job search.

Randall Crenshaw was one of those people. At 41, he lost his job of 22 years last January at hair-products company Goody Products, in Columbus, Ga. After two months of job searching, he said, ''I was in shock because I was used to getting up and going to work every morning.'' So, when his adviser at the employment center suggested he enter the Georgia Works program, Crenshaw jumped at the opportunity.

''There were about 50 of us in the room when he invited us to stay after class if we were interested in hearing more about the program. Only two or three people took him up on it. So many people got up and walked out. I was just amazed by that,'' Crenshaw said.

Acknowledging the program is not for everyone, Thurmond says the soon-to-be announced expansion will set a goal of enrolling 10 percent of the state's approximately 200,000 jobless workers. With the program's historic success rate of placing more than 60 percent of participants in permanent positions, the program should result in new jobs for some 12,000 unemployed workers.

Crenshaw got the job he tried out for at a home health-care company in Columbus, and his salary of $35,000 is only $2,500 less than he was making in his last job. He said he'd recommend Georgia Works to anyone.

According to data from the state's department of labor, Georgia Works has helped lower the average amount of time it takes jobless workers to find new employment, reducing the draw on the trust fund by $6 million. After program expenses, including worker's compensation insurance and stipends, the net savings as of March 2009 was $3.7 million.

The U.S. Department of Labor maintains state-by-state data on the average length of time unemployed workers remain on benefits, but allows states to set their own rules limiting the number of weeks each worker can receive a check. While experts consider average duration of benefits a measure of state performance in helping people find work, the availability of jobs is a bigger factor.

Georgia currently requires participants in the Georgia Works program to have at least 14 weeks of state unemployment benefits left. That way, if they land a job during the eight-week trial, it will save the state money on benefits. But Thurmond says he plans to broaden the program to include people closer to the end of their state benefits and those already on federally funded extensions. In addition, the trial period may be shortened to six weeks, since most companies hire applicants they like in the fourth to sixth week, so they won't take a job somewhere else.

Although stanching the drain on the unemployment trust fund is still a goal, Thurmond said he is more concerned about spurring private-sector hiring and reviving the state's economy.

Georgia has been cited by two organizations—UWC Strategic Services on Unemployment & Workers' Compensation and the American Institute for Full Employment—for its innovative approach to helping people on unemployment benefits find work.

''We're in an unprecedented job market so it's a unique opportunity to see if we can make this work,'' Thurmond said. ''Oftentimes in government you have to step back and recalibrate. It's not so much a new idea, but an improvement on a good one. We're flying this airplane while we build it.''

The biggest objection Thurmond said he hears from other states and potential business partners is that the program sounds ''too good to be true.'' It involves scant paper work and a minimal investment.

But simple, low-cost ideas are often the best. ''One of the great strengths of the unemployment insurance system is that states provide 50 separate incubators of innovation and change,'' Fleming of the labor department said.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McDERMOTT. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

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

Mr. LEVIN. It is vital this bill be before us, and I congratulate our chairman and our ranking member for bringing it here. They and our leader have outlined the facts: almost 125 million unemployed, the highest since 1939, and about one-third have been long-term unemployed 6 months or more. In August, 27 States saw their unemployment rates increase, and 42 States saw losses in jobs.

So I urge we have three alternatives. We can say to the millions who are unemployed: get looking; get lost; or you're getting some help.

Get looking. They're looking. They're looking. It's a requirement of unemployment comp.

I want to read something that was said over the phone to us this morning. A gentleman by the name of Larry Szpanelewski from Madison Heights, Michigan, out of work since May of 2008. He has 10 weeks of benefits left, and if we don't extend it, he'll exhaust those benefits before the end of the year.

This was taken down by my office: ''You know, I never thought this would happen to me. I have never been unemployed before. This economy is unlike anything I could ever imagine. I am very grateful for each extension of benefits. But I really want to get back to work. There is this misconception that people like me are sitting back and waiting for the next unemployment check. I really, really want to get back to work. I want to get back to doing my part and earning a paycheck. This unemployment is agony; it really is. I'm just waiting for the right phone call, Come to work.''

□ 1600

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman.

Mr. LEVIN. Thank you. And I will repeat what he said to conclude, I am just waiting for the right phone call, Come to work.

So I don't think this first alternative, ''get looking,'' applies. He, like millions of others, are looking. Six for every job. I don't think we can say to Larry Szpanelewski or the millions of others, ''Get lost.'' That is not this country. So what we're saying today is, You're going to be getting some help. You've worked for it. He worked 20 years, a steelworker, and I think never unemployed before. I'm glad this is bipartisan. This needs a bipartisan response in the best traditions of this House and in the best traditions of our beloved country.

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman McDERMOTT for yielding. I also want to commend him and the ranking member for expeditiously getting this legislation to the floor. Mr. Speaker, when President Obama took office, we were in the middle of an economic recession which showed itself for real in December of 2007. Notwithstanding economic recovery activities, stimulus activities, green initiatives and other efforts that are beginning to take hold, we still hear the song. And I turned my radio on just the other day, and I heard a song from probably the seventies that said, Every morning about this time, she bring my breakfast to the bed crying, get a job.

It said, When I read the papers, I read it through and through, trying to see if there is any work for me to do.

Unfortunately for many people, there is no work for them to do at the moment, but we know that the time is coming. But in the meantime, they need help. And the help that we can give them today is the help of knowing that their unemployment benefits are extended. That's the very least that we can do while we continue to work to try to make sure that our economy regroups, re-energizes itself so that that song does not have to be played, ''Get a Job.''

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have no more speakers. So if Mr. DAVIS wants to speak to end, and I will speak, we will be done.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, as I said in my opening statement, I truly urge support for H.R. 3548, to extend benefits to help long-term unemployed workers in States with the highest unemployment rates, which include my home State of Kentucky. We also need to redouble our efforts to focus on the task of creating jobs, especially like those that would be coming from allowing Americans to take an all-of-the-above energy policy to create jobs across the board. As our Democratic majority leader in the State House says, If we were to do that, we could have a third industrial revolution across the heartland.

What Americans really want are jobs, not handouts. Even as we help those in places where jobs are the hardest to find, promoting job growth should be our broader goal and our number one priority as we move forward in this Congress.

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by thanking the minority on the subcommittee for being supportive of bringing this bill out here. We did not go through some of the usual procedures. We brought it out straight to the floor. I think that their cooperation should be recognized because it is a reflection of the fact that everybody in this House cares about the American people. We all want people to have a job, and we want them to have some way to sustain themselves until this economy begins to open up again.

One of the interesting things about this period in our economic history, as has been pointed out by some economists, there have been three real recessions. One was 1930, and in that recession, many workers never returned to the work they did before. Rather than going back to the farms, they moved to the cities, and that was a major shift in what was happening. In the 1980 recession, many workers were able to go back to the work that they had done before. The question that our country faces right now is: Will we be able to go back to what we had before, or will we create a new economy? And I think that this bill will give us a chance to get the industries, the new industries, the green industries and so forth, up and running so that we can return people to gainful employment.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, with record 12.2 percent unemployment, Oregon has one of the highest unemployment rates in the country. That translates into 236,000 Oregonians without work. In the Portland region, nearly 140,000 residents are out of work. For those without work, the average weekly unemployment benefit in Oregon is $310. Each week, I receive letters indicating how much of a lifeline these unemployment benefits are.

Tragically for many families, this benefit is running out. Without this legislation, 6,000 Oregonians will have exhausted their unemployment benefits by the end of September. Each week thereafter 500 more will lose their coverage. Unless we authorize this extension, federal aid for these Oregonians will end.

The economic losses from unemployment will last long after these workers—and the millions like them around the country—have

again found work. Income losses for workers who are let go in a recession can persist for as long as two decades, sometimes longer. During this recession, older workers' wages will likely fall farther than those of younger workers. Those without college degrees will likely do worse than those with.

These challenging economic conditions are only the tip of an economic iceberg. The typical American household made less money last year than the typical household made a full decade ago. Median household income fell to $50,303 last year; in 1998, the median income was $51,295. With six job seekers for every opening, these numbers are not likely to improve soon. Every year, our constituents have to do more with less.

Every day in America jobs are being created and jobs are being lost. The real question is the balance between job growth and job loss. Since 1940, Republicans have been in charge of the United States more years than Democrats, 36–33. But, despite that fact, in terms of actual job creation, you can go back and look at the Department of Labor's statistics, for those 33 years, Democrats created 64.2 percent of the jobs in this country. Republicans were responsible for 35.8 percent of the jobs.

The Obama administration has inherited the worst financial collapse in American history since the Great Depression, with the effects that are still being felt on the State and local level and will continue to ripple throughout the economy even after it is corrected. In response, President Obama produced a strong economic recovery package that the Congress passed in a few days. The current credit crisis facing the United States is one of the greatest economic challenges that the country has faced. It can be squarely traced to the ideology of economic deregulation, which left the government with few tools to address the reckless actions of many financial institutions until too late.

It is time to rebuild the foundations of our economy, to improve America's fiscal fitness. I'm proud that the Recovery Act has begun this process. I look forward to working with my colleagues to invest in good jobs, improve wages, and create a nation where every family is safe, healthy, and economically secure.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3548, the ''Unemployment Compensation Extension Act.'' This bill will provide much-needed relief to the millions of unemployed American workers who are struggling to find jobs today. With the adoption of this bill, Congress will provide up to 13 additional weeks of desperately needed unemployment benefits to workers who are about to run out of unemployment benefits, particularly focusing on those people who live in states where unemployment rates are highest.

California has the 4th highest unemployment rate in the Nation and in terms of my district the numbers are staggering:

Carson—12.6 percent
Compton—20.9 percent
Long Beach—13.7 percent
Signal Hill—9.4 percent

Mr. Speaker, although job losses have begun to decline more recently, unemployment is still too high, and the American people need relief now. With the national unemployment rate at 9.7 percent, we must enact legislation that will assist the American people during this precarious economic time of availability at an all-time low. At least 300,000 will run out of their unemployment benefits by the end of September and over 1 million people will run out of their benefits by the end of December.

It is very important that we pass H.R. 3548, but let us not forget that our real task in the coming months is to ensure that every American that wants a job has one. I have been working in Congress to continue to create and pass meaningful reform that will spur job growth and help communities in crisis. One of the most powerful pieces of legislation that we have already passed is the American Recovery & Reinvestment Act, which helped create and save 3.5 million American jobs.

The American people are struggling to make ends meet while they search for new jobs in this challenging economy. I urge my colleagues to support this necessary and timely legislation. If we do not pass this bill, we will not only face a financial crisis but a moral deficit in this country as well. We cannot allow that to happen. I urge all members to vote ''aye'' on H.R. 3548, the Unemployment Compensation Extension Act.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3548—the Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2009. In light of the devastating impact the recession has had on families and communities across the country, this legislation is critical to ensure that jobless workers continue to collect unemployment benefits while they rebuild their lives and try to find gainful employment. This is a very important bill, and I commend Representative JIM MCDERMOTT for bringing this measure before the floor.

Although Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke announced last week that the recession is very likely over, he and other members of the Obama administration caution that unemployment may continue to rise before we start to see significant job creation next year. And today, many people across the country remain jobless and are relying on their unemployment benefits to support their families.

Unless Congress acts, over 300,000 jobless workers living in high unemployment states are projected to exhaust their unemployment benefits by the end of September. California is ranked among the states leading in double digit unemployment rates. According to the U.S. Department of Labor, as of August 2009, California's unemployment rate reached 12.2 percent. Moreover, the Department of Labor reports the state has lost well over 700,000 jobs over the past year.

I have received countless distressing calls and letters from my constituents. I have heard horror stories about foreclosed homes, displaced families, and even death due to unforeseen illness because of an inability to pay for medical care. These stories give a face to the statistics.

This recession has been particularly devastating on communities of color. The unemployment rate for African Americans is 15.1 percent, and for our Hispanics and Latinos, the rate is 13.1 percent. When you consider the nationwide unemployment rate is 9.7 percent, our minority communities are clearly fairing far worse. These communities are in desperate need for further assistance as provided under this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to add my voice of support for H.R. 3548. And I look forward to working with my colleagues in Congress to ensure that our Federal government's economic recovery programs are effective and actually achieve their intended goals.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my strong support for H.R. 3548, the Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2009.

The unemployment rate in my state of Illinois is 10 percent. Illinois' unemployment rate is higher than the national average of 9.6 percent; and within Illinois, the rate in the Chicago area is higher still, at 10.6 percent.

It is true that there are signs the economy is beginning to recover: fewer jobs were lost in August than in previous months. But we still have a long way to go in terms of job creation, and in the meantime, we need to help those who are looking for work but can't find it.

Three hundred thousand Illinoisans have lost their jobs in the last year. Five million Americans have been out of work longer than six months. The bill before us would extend an additional 13 weeks of unemployment compensation for those individuals in high unemployment states who are exhausting their unemployment benefits. With nearly six people out of work for every available job, this assistance is imperative.

H.R. 3548 would help at least 20,000 Illinoisans who are exhausting their benefits by the end of September and more than 50,000 whose benefits would otherwise expire by the end of the year.

Extending unemployment compensation will help job-hunting Americans pay their bills and prevent more foreclosures, further bolstering the economy. According to Mark Zandi, chief economist of Moody's Economy.com, every $1 spent on unemployment benefits generates $1.63 in new economic demand.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3548.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, this legislation would extend unemployment benefits to as long as 21 months in States where the unemployment rate is 8.5 percent or higher. That's about half the country, and the number is likely to grow.

And we aren't even close to the end of the road. On September 11, 2009, Larry Summers, chair of the President's National Economic Council, said today's level of unemployment is ''unacceptably high'' and will remain so ''for a number of years.'' How high? Today's unemployment rate is 9.7 percent. The Administration's August Midsession Review foresees 10 percent at the end of 2009, 9.7 percent in late 2010, and 8.0 percent in late 2011.

It's highly unlikely Congress will stop paying extended benefits then. We need to ask how long can this go on, and what does any of this have to do with helping people get back to work? Since this extended benefits program was created in June 2008 and expanded twice, unemployment rose from 5.8 to 6.8 to 7.6 to now 9.7 percent, even though the Administration swore it wouldn't exceed 8 percent under their stimulus law. There are now 6 million more unemployed, including 3 million more long-term unemployed, than when this program was created.

We are perpetuating unemployment, not solving it. Larry Summers also has stated that unemployment benefits ''contribute to long-term unemployment . . . by providing an incentive, and the means, not to work. Each unemployed person has a 'reservation wage'—the minimum wage he or she insists on getting

before accepting a job. Unemployment insurance and other social assistance programs increase that reservation wage, causing an unemployed person to remain unemployed longer.''

A senior Labor official in the Clinton administration reflected on what that meant in terms of when unemployed workers find new jobs: ''There are large spikes in the escape rate from unemployment at 26 weeks and at 39 weeks for UI recipients. Spikes of similar magnitude at 26 and 39 weeks are not apparent for UI non-recipients.'' What happens after 26 and 39 weeks of unemployment? State and Federal unemployment benefits end, and there are ''large spikes'' in people finding new jobs.

Is ending a long spell of unemployment easy? Of course not. Does everyone quickly find a job? Unfortunately not. Do those who return to work always make what they did before? No. But government cannot solve all ills, and sometimes makes things worse by trying to. Recent articles have noted that a majority of the unemployed are willing to take a pay cut to get back to work, that ''there is a huge traveling workforce that follows the jobs,'' and that States have innovative options to get unemployed workers back on the job.

But extending benefits to 21 months undermines those return to work incentives, leaving workers worse off, and employment prospects more depressed going forward.

Just currently approved unemployment spending has drained the State and Federal unemployment accounts, and will lead to deficits totaling more than $100 billion by late 2010 and nearly $200 billion by late 2012. Further extensions and expansions will add massively to that tide of red ink. That undermines job creation by requiring even more massive tax hikes to pay for all the continued benefit spending. Already State unemployment taxes are poised to double in the coming years. Extending benefits even more will require even greater job-killing tax hikes, hurting especially the long-term unemployed we are trying to help.

We can and must do better. It's well past time for us to review how we can really increase jobs so laid off workers get paychecks, not unemployment checks.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the 300,000 workers who will lose unemployment benefits by the end of the month if we do not act.

The economic crisis that President Obama and this Congress inherited has caused unemployment to spike throughout the country. Competition for jobs is intense, with six jobless workers for each new job. The result is that an estimated 50 percent of unemployed individuals have been jobless for more than 6 months. The Unemployment Insurance system has done a good job of helping families make ends meet during the recession, but we must protect those who still cannot find work and whose benefits are about to run out.

The Unemployment Compensation Extension Act (H.R. 3548) would provide immediate relief to millions of workers by extending unemployment benefits for an additional 13 weeks in states with high unemployment rates. In my state, California, the unemployment rate is at 12.2 percent—a 70 year high. If Congress does not act, nearly 70,000 Californians will run out of benefits by the end of this month and a total of 154,000 Californians will exhaust benefits by the end of the year. In total, 1 million workers around the country will exhaust benefits by the end of the year. We cannot allow that to happen. While the economy begins to recover and the economic stimulus starts to take hold, Congress has an obligation to ensure that families can put food on their tables and pay their bills.

I am a co-sponsor of the Unemployment Compensation Extension Act and I urge all of my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong and full support of H.R. 3548, the Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2009. This legislation is sorely needed in my home State of Michigan and I urge all of my colleagues to lend their support.

This legislation comes before the House at a critical time for many of our families. By the end of this month more than 300,000 jobless workers are expected to run out of unemployment compensation. The National Employment Law Project estimates that by the end of the year nearly 1.5 million workers will have used up their benefits. In Michigan it is expected that more than 62,000 will run out of their benefits by the end of December.

For the families that I represent this loss of benefits comes at a time when Michigan is continuing to struggle with over 15 percent unemployment. In the metro Detroit area unemployment is even higher at 17.1 percent unemployment. These are not families looking for a handout, rather they are relying on these benefits to pay their mortgage and put dinner on the table. I can think of thousands of workers in my district alone who can confirm that $310 a week does not stretch far.

Although it is easy to lose sight of an individual family in the crowded pages of statistics and multi-colored graphs we use to try to quantify unemployment in this country, hearing the thousands of stories of my constituents struggling to stay afloat in these still-difficult times is enough to argue the necessity of this bill. One of those stories was told to me by a man named Dave from Taylor. Dave is 58 years old, but is unable to retire due to both a lengthy period of unemployment as well as being a victim of identity theft. He moved back to Michigan to be close to his daughter, but still struggles to find work despite, in his words, ''trying just about everything.'' Folks like Dave are not simply sitting around and idly hoping for a job. They are actively searching every day and we must give them more time to do so.

Another story highlighting the need for this extension was told to me by a man who introduced himself as Will at the Southeast Michigan Rehiring, Retraining, and Relief Fair I hosted in early September. Will was a Senior Information Technology Project Manager with GM for 19 years, but despite a great deal of time and effort to both network and go through traditional channels, he continues to struggle to find employment. Although Will is following leads on jobs he discussed with recruiters at the job fair, his situation is emblematic of the displaced auto workers from all sectors of the industry who will likely require retraining to find a new job as well as the continued unemployment benefits throughout that process to support themselves and their families.

Under this legislation States that have a three-month average of total unemployment rate of 8.5 percent will be eligible for up to 13 weeks of extended unemployment benefits. This would bring the total amount of potential Emergency Unemployment Compensation to 46 weeks for 29 States.

The additional 13 weeks of benefits included in this legislation is far from being enough to solve the problem of unemployment, however, it will provide some peace of mind for our families and give our workers additional time for their job search. And with six people looking for each available job, we know that this extension will be valuable.

For those that doubt the need for this extension, consider that both Moody's Economy.com and the Congressional Budget Office have found that such an extension is an effective economic stimulus. For every dollar of unemployment benefits, $1.64 is provided in economic stimulus.

Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of this legislation and as the federal representative for the State with the highest unemployment, I urge all of my colleagues to express their support for this extension and vote in favor of H.R. 3548. Please do not let Congress's holiday gift to our families in need be the exhaustion of their unemployment benefits.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation to temporarily extend unemployment insurance benefits.

Unemployment rates remain historically high. However, we are beginning to see signs of economic recovery. Though the August 2009 jobs report announced that 216,000 jobs were lost, it was the fewest jobs losses in a year. We are seeing rebounds in the housing and stock markets. The gross domestic product is stabilizing. It is becoming increasingly clear that the Recovery Act that Congress passed earlier this year prevented a severe economic collapse and is a success by putting money back into the economy, creating jobs, and providing tax relief to 95 percent of Americans. While this economic progress is welcome news, much work remains to be done in rebuilding our economy.

Too many Americans remain out of work at no fault of their own. They are still struggling to make ends meet. If we do not act to extend unemployment benefits, thousands of American workers will run out of unemployment compensation by the end of September, and over one million will exhaust benefits by the end of the year. These benefits help workers who have lost their jobs to buy basic necessities for their families as well as continue their mortgage payments.

Mr. Speaker, we must continue to help those in need during this economic recovery. I urge my colleagues to support this much-needed legislation.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of an emergency extension of unemployment benefits for states with high rates of unemployment like my home state of New Jersey.

I hear all the time from Central New Jersey residents who are working hard each day to find a new job. Recently, a Mercer County resident wrote me to say his wife had been out of work for 11 months. He wrote to say, ''The jobs are just not available for her to go back to work.'' This bill answers his plea and the pleas of countless other out of work New Jersey residents to extend unemployment benefits while they continue to search for employment.

In tough economic times, Congress and the President have worked together to extend unemployment benefits when needed. The previous extensions of unemployment insurance during this current recession has helped many New Jersey residents keep a roof over their head and food on the table when times were tough. In this tight job market and with the economy just starting to show signs of recovery, there are still six unemployed workers for each job opening and more than five million people who have been unemployed for more than six months.

The Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2009, H.R. 3548, would extend an additional 13 weeks of unemployment benefits to individuals who have exhausted their current benefits in states with unemployment rates above 8.5 percent. With New Jersey's unemployment rate at 9.4 percent, by the end of September it is estimated that 22,000 New Jerseyans will have exhausted their unemployment benefits and have nowhere else to turn. This bill will provide them with direct relief during a difficult time.

Our government must help those in need as they seek new work. Morally, it is the right thing to do and the economists tell us that unemployment benefits are one of the most cost-efficient and fast-acting forms of economic stimulus.

The bill does not add to the deficit, by offsetting its cost with a one year extension of an employment tax that has been in place for 30 years.

Once this bill is signed into law it is estimated that by December, this 13-week extension of unemployment would benefit 1 million Americans—including 42,000 New Jersey residents—who will be looking for work and have exhausted their existing unemployment benefits.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3548, the Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2009, which will provide an additional 13 weeks of unemployment benefits to individuals in states with unemployment rates of 8.5 percent or higher. This bill provides a critical boost to the many Rhode Islanders, and Americans across the nation, who are struggling to find employment. In order to receive these benefits, workers must have lost a job through no fault of their own, be actively searching for a job, be able to work, and must have worked twenty weeks prior to being laid off. Only unemployed workers who become eligible for the additional weeks of benefits before January 1, 2010, will qualify for this extension.

I am encouraged by reports that our country's recession is easing, but that is little consolation to the many people still suffering in my home state. In Rhode Island, the unemployment rate has reached 12.8 percent, which is the third highest rate in the country. It is also estimated that nearly 4,500 Rhode Islanders will exhaust their benefits before the end of this year. With recent reports estimating that there are six job seekers for every job opening, Congress must act to help workers through this challenging time.

I understand the hardships Rhode Islanders are facing, and that is why rebuilding our economy is the top priority for me and this Congress. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act has saved the jobs of teachers, police officers, and nurses across our state and has created jobs through new highway and infrastructure projects, with more coming online in the next few months. I am also pleased to see that the programs we have passed are being turned into smart investments in our future, such as the creation of clean energy jobs in our state through weatherization and offshore wind development.

As the President has stated, it may take some time before we see significant improvements in our unemployment rate, but I am confident that the programs we are putting into place will yield results over the next several months, while the longer-term investments we're making will ensure that our workforce and our job market are stronger in the years to come. While unemployment benefits and stimulus programs help jumpstart our economy in the short term, Congress must also work to build a new foundation for a lasting recovery. That is why we are making much needed reforms to our health care and financial systems and investing in our education and workforce training systems.

As Members of Congress, we have the power to give hard-working Americans another chance to continue their job search and provide for their families. I encourage my colleagues to pass this bill to help those who are most vulnerable during these trying times.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation and thank Chairman MCDERMOTT for his leadership on this bill. H.R. 3548 provides an extension of unemployment benefits for up to 13 weeks for Americans across the country in states with the highest unemployment rates.

As of August 2009, the unemployment rate in America is a staggering 9.7 percent. Jobs are continuing to be shipped overseas, with the manufacturing sector boasting the biggest losses. Over 216,000 jobs were lost just last month. Ohio is one of 15 states with an unemployment rate above the national average and the Economic Policy Institute is projecting that racial disparities in high unemployment states will continue to worsen in 2010.

In recent weeks, I have received numerous calls from constituents who have already run out of unemployment benefits or are on the verge of doing so. This legislation provides a critical, if temporary fix to their problems.

Twenty-nine states currently qualify for the 13 week unemployment extension under this legislation, with more states sure to follow suit. I strongly support this legislation and urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3548, 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. DAVIS of Kentucky. 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 4 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALTMIRE) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 324, SANTA CRUZ VALLEY NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA ACT

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111–263) on the resolution (H. Res. 760) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 324) to establish the Santa Cruz Valley National Heritage Area, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

House Resolution 441, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 2971, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 3548, by the yeas and nays.

Proceedings on H.R. 2215 and House Concurrent Resolution 163 will resume later in the week.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

HONORING CATHOLIC SISTERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 441, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 441, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 412, nays 0, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 720]

YEAS—412

Ackerman	Adler (NJ)	Alexander
Aderholt	Akin	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)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
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)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
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
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
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
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—20

Abercrombie
Barrett (SC)
Bishop (UT)
Capuano
Carney
Delahunt
Gerlach
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hastings (WA)
Jackson (IL)
Kirk
Loebsack
Matsui
Meek (FL)
Radanovich
Rohrabacher
Rush
Schock
Wu

□ 1856

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. POST OFFICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2971, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2971.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 411, nays 0, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 721]

YEAS—411

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)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
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)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
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
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
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
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
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar

Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—21

Abercrombie
Barrett (SC)
Bishop (UT)
Capuano
Carney
Delahunt
Gerlach
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hastings (WA)
Herseth Sandlin
Jackson (IL)
Kirk
Loebsack
Marshall
Meek (FL)
Murphy (CT)
Radanovich
Rohrabacher
Rush
Wu

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1903

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.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2009

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3548, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3548, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 331, nays 83, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 722]

YEAS—331

Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Bright
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cao
Capito
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Forbes
Foster
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Guthrie
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Heller
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E.B.
Jones
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meeks (NY)
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pence
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—83

Akin
Bachmann
Bachus
Barton (TX)
Berry
Boehner
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Burgess
Cantor
Carter
Chaffetz
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Courtney
Culberson
Deal (GA)
Duncan
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Hall (TX)
Hensarling
Hodes
Hunter
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Latta
Linder
Lucas
Lummis
Mack
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Matheson
McCaul
McClintock
Melancon
Miller (FL)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Perlmutter
Perriello
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Price (GA)
Roskam
Ross
Scalise
Sessions
Shadegg
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Sullivan
Teague
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Westmoreland

NOT VOTING—18

Abercrombie
Barrett (SC)
Bishop (UT)
Capuano
Carney
Delahunt
Gerlach
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hastings (WA)
Jackson (IL)
Kirk
Loebsack
Meek (FL)
Radanovich
Rohrabacher
Rush
Wu

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1911

Mr. TERRY changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 722, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Stated against:

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 722, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from this Chamber today. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall votes 720, 721 and 722.

HONORING SHANE HORNER

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today in sorrow over a young life lost in a tragic car accident. Shane Horner, son of Maria and G. Edward Horner of Brockway, Pennsylvania, passed away September 13 at age 18. Shane had completed his work to achieve the rank of Eagle Scout, which included a project cleaning, painting and restoring the Brockway Sportsmen's Club Pavilion.

This young man had been active in his Scout troop, holding various positions, including assistant senior patrol leader, chaplain's aide, and junior assistant scoutmaster. Shane had applied to continue with his troop as an assistant scoutmaster. He was also a youth representative to the Brockway Borough Council.

Shane was a multi-sport letter winner at his high school. He was part of the 2009 District 9 boys basketball team champions, but he was also involved in the spring musicals and a member of the student council. He planned to attend Pennsylvania State University and continue on to law school.

He was a member of St. Tobias Roman Catholic Church of Brockway and was active with youth ministry. My thoughts and prayers are with the Horner family as they seek solace in their memories of a son who gave them so many reasons to be proud.

□ 1915

IN HONOR OF MINNESOTA'S THIRD CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT'S BLUE RIBBON SCHOOLS

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Madam Speaker, I rise to congratulate two schools in my congressional district: Our Lady of Grace in Edina and Thomas Jefferson Senior High School in Bloomington. They were both recently named 2009 National Blue Ribbon Schools. They were just two of 314 schools nationwide to receive this honor.

The Blue Ribbon Schools Program honors elementary, middle, and high schools that display superior academic achievement or demonstrate dramatic gains in student achievement.

Both of these schools are carrying on a proud tradition we have in Minnesota. Our students consistently score at the top in national assessments and tests, and our educational experience from birth to adulthood rates among the best in the Nation.

The Blue Ribbon Schools designation is one of the highest awards the school can ever receive. I congratulate the students, the teachers, the administrators, and the parents who've earned this honor for both Our Lady of Grace and Thomas Jefferson Senior High School.

THE LITTLE FELLOW FROM THE DESERT AND HIS ITCHY FINGER

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, the little fellow in the desert has been at it again. Iran's usurper President Ahmadinejad that calls the Holocaust a myth has made it clear he wants nuclear weapons and intercontinental ballistic missiles to destroy Israel and the United States. And now the tiny tyrant is in New York City spreading hate at the U.N.

A leaked document says that Iran has all the elements they need to build a nuclear weapon. They have been working with North Korea on missiles, missiles with more distance and more accuracy.

The unstable situation demands that we put a complete missile defense system in place. We are leaving ourselves and our allies vulnerable, but the administration last week scrapped our missile defense system that's based in Poland, and they also cut our radar systems in the Czech Republic. Believe it or not, this country cannot stop a missile fired at us. One would think that would be a priority.

Why are the American people left vulnerable to any tin pot totalitarian with an itchy trigger finger? The government's main job is to defend the American people, even from gun-toting little thugs who are determined to have an international shoot-out with the United States.

And that's just the way it is.

LISTEN TO OUR COMMANDERS ON THE GROUND

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, our military men and women are fighting in Afghanistan to defeat terrorists overseas and protect families here at home. Having visited my former unit, the 218th Brigade of the South Carolina Army National Guard, during their year-long deployment, I know firsthand that our servicemembers in Afghanistan are doing incredible work along with the Afghani police and army units they train.

In March, when President Obama announced his strategy for Afghanistan, I commended the President for moving forward with the plan based on the counsel of military leadership on the ground. In light of the recent reports that General Stanley McChrystal has requested additional forces, I hope we continue to heed the advice of our commanders in Afghanistan. We must provide the level of force and resources necessary to help our brave military complete their mission. We cannot allow the terrorists to establish a safe haven from which to attack America and our allies.

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

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. TITUS). 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.

WE NEED AN EXIT PLAN FOR AFGHANISTAN—NOT AN ESCALATION PLAN

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, a report written by General McChrystal, the commander of American and NATO forces in Afghanistan, was leaked to the press yesterday. In this report, General McChrystal warns that the conflict in Afghanistan ''will likely result in failure'' if we don't send in more troops.

The leak was an apparent attempt to put pressure on the White House and the Presidency to escalate the conflict. But, to its credit, the administration didn't go there and did not cave in.

President Obama said that he is skeptical that sending in more troops will do any good. And he said, ''I'm certainly not somebody who believes in indefinite occupations of other countries.''

Madam Speaker, I'm relieved that we have somebody in the White House who will think long and hard before sending America's men and women into harm's way. But the President will certainly face a lot more pressure in the coming weeks to increase troop levels. I urge him to resist the idea for three very good reasons.

First, there is no military solution in Afghanistan. We tried it for over 8 years. Our troops have fought with incredible skill and courage. But sending in more troops will only fuel anti-Americanism, and it will convince the Afghan people that the United States is an occupying force that must be resisted.

Second, poll after poll shows that the American people are overwhelmingly opposed to sending more troops to Afghanistan, and the majority now believe that the war in Afghanistan is simply not worth fighting.

Third, Madam Speaker, we cannot afford to keep pouring hundreds of billions of dollars into this conflict. We need every one of those dollars to meet our urgent domestic needs here at home. We need to use our resources to dig out of the recession, not dig into a quagmire in Afghanistan.

For all these reasons, the President and his advisers must rethink our mission in Afghanistan and look at changing our strategy.

The Rand Corporation has produced a study of extremist groups that should help us develop the right strategy. Rand studied the history of 648 extremist groups, finding that military force was effective against these groups only 7 percent of the time. Two strategies that work better were negotiated political settlements and the use of intelligence and police agencies to dismantle extremist networks. Combined, these two strategies were effective 83—83 percent of the time. That's about 12 times better than the military option.

Rand also applied its analysis to the current situation in Afghanistan and

concluded that ''policing and intelligence should be the backbone of U.S. efforts'' against al Qaeda in that region.

That's why policing and intelligence are two key components of my national security plan, which is described in House Resolution 363, the Smart Security Platform for the 21st Century. My plan also emphasizes economic development, infrastructure, jobs, education, and better governance for Afghanistan.

Madam Speaker, by refusing to be rushed and sending more troops to Afghanistan, President Obama has shown that he is willing to change course. And we must change course. The American people want an exit strategy for Afghanistan, not an escalation strategy.

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 addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

REDESIGNATE THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY AS THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

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

Mr. JONES. Madam Speaker, in each Congress since 2001, I have introduced legislation aimed at giving the Marine Corps the recognition it deserves as one of the official branches of the military. This year, I introduced H.R. 24, a bill to redesignate the Department of the Navy as the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps. Then the Secretary of the Navy would be the Secretary of the Navy and the Marine Corps.

On June 25, 2009, the language of H.R. 24 was passed by the House as part of H.R. 2647, the House version of this year's National Defense Authorization Act.

In a matter of days, Members of the Senate and House Armed Services Committee will meet to work out a final version of this bill, and the language of H.R. 24 will become law if the Senate agrees to the House position. Right now, Madam Speaker, the Senate is opposed to this language.

With the help of Senator PAT ROBERTS, a former marine who introduced S. 504, a companion bill in the Senate, and the bill's 308 cosponsors in the House, I'm hopeful that this will be the year the Senate will support the House position and the Marine Corps will be recognized as an equal partner of the United States Navy and Marine Corps team.

During my 15 years in Congress, whenever a chief of naval operations or commandant of the Marine Corps has come to testify before the House Armed Services Committee, I have heard that the Navy and the Marine Corps are ''one fighting team.'' If this is true, then why should not the team bear the name of Navy and Marine Corps?

Changing the name of the Department of the Navy to the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps is a symbolic gesture, but it is important to the team. This change has received support from at least three former Navy Secretaries, the Marine Corps League, Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Fleet Reserve Association, MarineParents.com, and many other individuals and groups.

As a Chicago Tribune editorial titled, ''Step up for the Marines,'' noted: ''The Marines have not asked for complete autonomy. Nothing structurally needs to change in their relationship with the Navy, which has served both branches well. The Corps only asks for recognition. Having served their Nation proudly and courageously since colonial days, the leathernecks have earned a promotion.''

□ 1930

In closing, Madam Speaker, I would like to show what this change could mean to the members of the United States Marine Corps, including the 41,000 marines and nearly 3,000 sailors stationed in my district at Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune. On August 19, 2009, in the Jacksonville Daily News, an article titled ''Navy Secretary Visits Local Troops'' described Secretary Mabus' recent visit with Camp Lejeune marines and sailors deployed to Iraq. It was touching to read about the Secretary's visit to see firsthand the terrific work of the United States Navy and Marine Corps team in Iraq. Yet I couldn't help but think the team's unity would be better illustrated if the title could have read, ''Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps Visits Local Troops.''

Madam Speaker, right now I'm going to show that this is the actual news release. It says, Secretary of the Navy visits local troops, and it talks about the marines in Iraq and the Navy. If this should ever become law, what it would have said: ''Navy and Marine Corps Secretary Visits Local Troops in Iraq and Afghanistan.''

Madam Speaker, before I close, I regret that the Senate does not see the importance of giving this recognition to the Marine Corps. So if I can close by saying this, as I do every night on the floor, God, please bless our men and women in uniform. God, please bless the families of our men and women in uniform. God, in your loving arms, hold the families who have given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq. Dear God, I ask you to please bless the President of the United States with the wisdom and courage that he will do what's right for this country. And three times I will ask, God please, God please, God please continue to bless America.

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

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

TAXING MEDICAL DEVICE COMPANIES

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

Mr. SOUDER. In my district there is a wonderful little town of around 12,000 people called Warsaw, Indiana. It's in Kosciusko County, a county with 100 lakes, including our biggest natural lake in the State of Indiana and many other sizable lakes. Tippecanoe, Syracuse, Webster Lake, North Webster, Big and Little Chapman as well as many other lakes. At this point I would like to insert into the RECORD from The Wall Street Journal ''Sticks and Stones May Break Bones, but Warsaw, Indiana, Makes Replacements.''

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 26, 2006]

STICKS AND STONES MAY BREAK BONES, BUT WARSAW, IND., MAKES REPLACEMENTS

(By Timothy Aeppel)

WARSAW, IN.—When Don Running and his two partners decided to start up a company specializing in orthopedic plates and screws to mend broken wrists two years ago, it was a given that they would set up shop here.

Silicon Valley has computers. Detroit has cars. But in orthopedic devices, the undisputed world capital is Warsaw, a city of 12,500 with a silver-domed 19th-century courthouse and pickups angled into the curb on Main Street.

Three of the world's five largest makers of artificial joints and related surgical tools have their headquarters here amid the lakes and fields of northeastern Indiana. The local industry has grown so much that it's now a regional force, with orthopedics companies popping up in nearby farm towns and the suburbs of Fort Wayne, about 50 miles to the east.

''How many orthopedic-implant engineers do you find walking around most places?'' asks Mr. Running. ''Well around here, you bump into them in the supermarket.''

Memphis, Tenn., and northern New Jersey are other industry hotspots, but none rivals Warsaw for sheer concentration. And while major orthopedics companies are looking overseas for cheaper places to produce items such as basic bone screws and metal plates, the U.S. retains a firm grip on the industry.

A big reason is that the U.S., with its population of fast-aging baby boomers, injury-prone weekend athletes and overweight people, is by far the world's biggest market for artificial hips and knees. The U.S. represents an estimated $14 billion of the annual spending in a global market of $22.9 billion, according to Knowledge Enterprises Inc., a Chagrin Falls, Ohio, market research firm.

The U.S. also effectively protects manufacturers in the sector with strict regulations for devices that go inside the human body. Rather than risk problems—and crippling lawsuits—U.S. health-care providers buy their artificial joints from companies they know, which generally means buying American.

Profits are so good in the orthopedics industry that there isn't much pressure on suppliers to shave costs by going to low-cost

countries. ''The reason this business is in Warsaw and not Mexico is because margins are 70% or better,'' says Ron Clark, an orthopedic surgeon who founded his own company in Fort Wayne, which is on the other side of the state from his home in Valparaiso, in part so he could be closer to Warsaw. Dr. Clark says savings from going abroad just aren't worth it.

To be sure, the industry's dynamics may be starting to change. Health-care providers are starting to push back against the industry's steady price increases, raising concerns among investors about whether profits for Warsaw companies and others can keep up the brisk growth.

There are other shadows over Warsaw's future. The U.S. Justice Department has opened two probes of orthopedics makers in the past two years, including an antitrust investigation in which Smith & Nephew PLC, of the U.K., has confirmed that one of its independent sales representatives tried to initiate an industry-pricing strategy in response to a U.S. hospital's bid request. Other producers, including those in Warsaw, have said they didn't respond to the suggestion.

The big implant makers also received a separate batch of subpoenas in early 2005 regarding an investigation of any financial ties between them and surgeons who recommend their products. Doctors work closely with device makers to develop and refine artificial joints, and the companies have long paid surgeons as consultants and designers.

At least for now, though, Warsaw's orthopedics businesses continue to hum. The industry got its start here over a century ago, when a Canadian pharmacist, Revra DePuy, came up with the idea of making flexible splints to replace the wooden barrel staves then used to set broken bones.

The company he created thrived and exists today as DePuy Inc., a unit of Johnson & Johnson. It eventually spawned other companies, as people left to start competing operations. Indeed, Warsaw's largest employer is Zimmer Holdings Inc., founded by a DePuy salesman who broke out on his own in the 1920s. Today, about 60% of the workers who live within seven miles of Warsaw are directly or indirectly engaged in orthopedics manufacturing, says Joy McCarthy-Sessing, president of the local chamber of commerce.

Such a concentration of one industry in such a small town is unusual, but the larger phenomenon isn't unusual at all. Many of the strongest U.S. manufacturers set up production far away from urban centers, with their high taxes, labor, and utility costs, and instead look for locations in small towns, close to major highways and railways. Proximity to transportation hubs allows for smooth logistics in an age of just-in-time deliveries. Warsaw, for instance, sits astride a highway, U.S. 30, connecting Fort Wayne and Chicago.

Economists have long known that businesses thrive when they congregate in one place. Think of Hollywood movie studios, or the Route 128 technology ring around Boston. The same holds true in manufacturing. ''Companies that operate in clusters have greater access to talent,'' explains Jeffrey Grogan, partner at the Monitor Group, a Boston strategy consulting firm. They also serve as fertile ground for start-ups.

Mr. Running's company, Deo Volente Orthopaedics LLC, is a prime example. Mr. Running first met his partners, Rod Mayer and Jeff Ondrla, when the three were working together at DePuy in the early 1990s. Mr. Running and Mr. Ondrla are engineers and inventors, and Mr. Mayer's background is in sales.

Mr. Mayer got the idea for the company after seeing that the market for ''extremity'' devices, such as plates and screws for fixing broken wrists, wasn't then as developed as it was for major joints, such as hips and knees. The three were eager to get away from big-company bureaucracy.

And as often happens in the close confines of Warsaw, the partners' connections stretch into their personal lives: They were attending the same evangelical church in 2004 when they launched the company. Deo Volente means ''God willing'' in Latin.

The three men agree it is a hefty advantage to have so much of what they need at their fingertips. ''It's a lot easier to drive across town and visit a supplier then it is to pick up the phone and try to talk through some complicated issue,'' says Mr. Ondrla.

Warsaw is dotted with small support businesses, from packaging firms that specialize in super-clean processes to machine shops. There are even multiple manufacturers of the plastic trays and cases needed to pack orthopedic kits. A total hip replacement, for instance, can require up to 22 cases of equipment and each case and tray is specially designed.

The region surrounding Warsaw has long been home to the U.S. automotive and machinery industries, churning out a stream of skilled machinists, toolmakers and industrial engineers. Orthopedics makers opening up shop in Warsaw found a ready supply of skilled workers, particularly in recent years as the more-traditional sectors have slumped.

Whole companies in the region have switched over to serving the orthopedics industry in recent years, including the small factory contracted to do most of the production for Deo Volente: Three years ago, Micropulse Inc., of nearby Columbia City, Ind., stopped doing any work for the automotive and other old-line industries—which once accounted for over half of its business—to focus on orthopedics.

''Half of our customers were closing, so we divorced them all,'' says Brian Emerick, president of Micropulse. His company is now growing 25% a year, he says.

Mr. SOUDER. In 1895, in this small town—which at that point was a lot smaller—a man named Revra DePuy founded DePuy Manufacturing in Warsaw. The problem back then was that they were using wooden barrel stays to do hips. So he thought a fiber splint would be better. So DePuy went on—and now is part of Johnson & Johnson—to become a major player there. In 1926, Justin Zimmer, a sales manager for DePuy, felt that he had a better idea for different types of splints, and he broke off and developed Zimmer Manufacturing, now based in Warsaw. In 1997, Dr. Dane Miller and a small group of innovators and entrepreneurs formed Biomet in Warsaw.

Today these three companies are headquartered in Warsaw, Indiana, and are three of the five biggest orthopedic companies in the entire world. Zimmer, for example, employs 8,300 people and has $33.9 billion in sales in 100 countries around the world. In addition in Warsaw, other companies have come up—a division of Medtronic that does spinal research and production; Orthopediatrics specializes in anatomically appropriate, unique instrumentation and biologics for pediatric and small-stature patients because they're going to take different sized elbows, shoulders and knees.

In addition, we have many tier one and tier two suppliers who are centered in this region—Paragon Medical, Micropulse and Symmetry are tier one suppliers to the orthopedic industry. C&A Tool, one of the remaining large-sized machine tool manufacturers in America, makes highly detailed parts that go into your body, takes tremendous precision, as they also do for NASA and for defense contractors because they've managed to survive by upgrading and putting in million-dollar equipment.

Now Warsaw and Kosciusko County, along with the State of Indiana and the Lily Foundation, are proposing to develop a BioCrossroads project. This is the type of cluster that we need in America. We can't all be hamburger flippers. We can't all work in retail stores. You have to have R&D centers and clusters that you fight as a community, as a State and as a Nation to protect, just like other countries fight to protect those. Now the reason that all of a sudden this has become relevant is that last week, a health care proposal was floated in the other body that proposes to tax medical device companies 10 to 30 percent. I would like to insert into the RECORD from The Wall Street Journal ''The Innovation Tax'' editorial.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 8, 2009.]

THE INNOVATION TAX—HOW MAX BAUCUS KNIFED THE MEDICAL DEVICES INDUSTRY

Supposedly the Senate's version of ObamaCare was written by Finance Chairman Max Baucus, but we're beginning to wonder if the true authors were Abbott and Costello. The vaudeville logic of the plan is that Congress will tax health care to subsidize people to buy health care that new taxes and regulation make more expensive.

Look no further than the $40 billion ''fee'' that Mr. Baucus wants to impose on medical devices and diagnostic equipment. Device manufacturers would pay $4 billion a year in excise taxes, divvied up among them based on U.S. sales. This translates to an annual income tax surcharge anywhere from 10% to 30%, depending on the corporation.

Why $40 billion? No reason in particular, except that Mr. Baucus needs to finance nearly $900 billion in new spending and so he'll grab anything within arm's reach. While there are some exemptions, such as tongue depressors and eyeglasses, most of the devices tax will fall on hundreds of thousands of products that are basic components of modern medicine. Some are routine—surgical equipment, diabetes testing supplies—while others are cutting-edge technologies, like replacement joints, pacemakers, stents, and MRI and CT scanners.

This new tax will eventually be passed through to patients, increasing health-care costs. It will also harm innovation, taking a big bite out of the research and development that leads to medical advancements. The core of the industry (excluding a few conglomerates like Johnson & Johnson) spent about $9.6 billion on product development in 2007, according to Ernst and Young. The Baucus tax is nearly half that, and also exceeds $3.7 billion, the total venture capital invested in device makers that same year.

Even if consumers will ultimately pay one way or another, this tax also offers an instructive lesson in the perils of industry dealmaking in President Obama's Washington. Convinced by the White House that legislation was inevitable, most of the health-care lobbies decided to negotiate and

pay ransoms so Democrats would spare their industries greater harm. Sure enough, the device maker lobby, AdvaMed, was among the ''stakeholders'' that joined with Mr. Obama in a Rose Garden ceremony in May and pledged to ''save'' $2 trillion over 10 years to fund his program.

AdvaMed was nothing if not a team player. It endorsed Democratic inspirations like comparative-effectiveness research and value-based purchasing, despite the danger that under such centralized decision-making the government will decide that the most effective and valuable treatments also happen to be the cheapest—rather than those that are best for patients. It also suggested a variety of other taxes that would have resulted in a lower bottom line, much as Big Pharma promised $80 billion in drug discounts and the American Hospital Association agreed to $155 billion in Medicare and Medicaid reimbursement cuts.

But the word on Capitol Hill is that AdvaMed's tribute wasn't handsome enough for Mr. Baucus's tastes. The massive new tax—which wasn't a part of any of his policy blueprints released earlier this year—is in part retaliation. Partly, too, the device makers simply don't have the same political clout as the other big players, making them an easier mark. Old Washington hands are saying the device lobby made a ''strategic mistake'' by not offering Mr. Baucus more protection money, but the real mistake was trying to buy into the ObamaCare process, instead of trying to defeat its worst ideas outright.

And now it may be too late. As we've argued, liberal Democrats think that merely allowing an industry to continue to exist is a concession, and they're already taking the pharma and hospital concessions and running them higher. In the case of devices, patients will be left with higher costs for fewer life-saving technologies.

Mr. SOUDER. This proposed provision would tax these companies 10 to 30 percent. Medical devices are currently paid for by hospitals. You don't declare that individually in Medicare or in any other health—it goes through a hospital. The hospitals have already been asked to lower their costs and put money into the system. So this would be a direct tax based on the sales and profits of these companies.

Now there are three classes of medical devices. The joke that occurred around this was, in class one, Q-tips are called a medical device. Well, we heard today that Q-tips are going to be exempt, as are condoms, as are home pregnancy tests, as are scented Maxi Pads. So I guess that's the good news. The bad news is that what isn't exempt is class two and class three, which are going to have huge taxes on these companies and will restrict innovation. What are they? Heart valves, automatic cardiac defibrillators, heart imaging machines, insulin pumps, hearing aids, electric wheelchairs, and of course, all orthopedic joints—spine and neck implants included with that. They are going to be taxed.

What in the world is going on here? I think that a lot of people are of the impression that this kind of stuff just comes, that somehow it magically appears. In fact, I've heard people say, Well, why don't we all just get on Medicare? Besides the fact that Medicare is broke, Medicare hasn't invented anything for hips. They only cover variable costs. No research comes out of Medicare. No research comes out of Medicaid. No research comes out of the Veterans Administration. All that's funded by private pay. All that's funded by profits of corporations.

And if you take away the profits, they aren't going to be developing special hips for 18-year-old soldiers who are shot up. They now have body armor, but they are getting shot in their joints and now have to live for the rest of their lives with that. They aren't going to do it for the little kids. As people live longer and have this in their bodies longer, they aren't going to do all the variations. They aren't going to be able to do custom orders. R&D will tend to be shot. It may move offshore. It may totally disappear. This tax would be a disaster to America, and I hope it can be defeated.

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.)

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 Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

(Mr. PAUL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from 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 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.)

DEMOCRATIC FRESHMAN CLASS HOUR ON HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. TONKO. Madam Speaker, as you know, we have a very talented freshman class in the House of Representatives. And for the next hour, Members of the freshman class will be discussing health care. We would like to thank the Democratic leadership for giving us time to discuss this very important issue. Within the freshman class I believe is a diversity of work experience and work expertise, skill sets that have been brought to this Chamber to discuss various policies.

Well, nothing could be more pressing, Madam Speaker, than the need for health care reform. Just yesterday I was pleased to welcome President Obama to the 21st Congressional District of New York, which I represent, specifically to the city of Troy, New York. He had spoken about the innovation economy. He had spoken about the recovery from this recession, which has been deep and long. He made mention that there is no recovery without addressing health care costs for our businesses, to be able to go forward with a meaningful plan that will allow for employer-based coverage at an affordable price.

So this evening as we speak about health care reform, it is significant to our business community, it is significant to our families, the working families across America, and it is significant to government, as health care costs for government-provided health care in our local municipalities, in our school systems, is rising well beyond inflation.

In fact, just today a report was issued by the Office of the Vice President that spoke to, on average, 5.5 percent increases on family plans across America. That average of 5.5 percent came during this recession period that actually saw inflation dropping by 0.7 percent. So this is a remarkable statistic that we're seeing this growth continuing.

We have been joined, and we are joined by two of our colleagues right now. We have Representative GERRY CONNOLLY from Virginia's 11th District and Representative CHELLIE PINGREE from Maine's 1st Congressional District. Representative CONNOLLY, if you please.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I thank my friend and colleague from New York. I just wanted to amplify the point you just made, Mr. TONKO. Last week the Kaiser Family Foundation issued a report. This isn't coming from any committee in Congress. This is an independent analysis. It said that the average family of four in the United States is currently spending over $13,000 a year for health care coverage. If we do nothing, by 2018, in only 9 years, that $13,000 a year will be $30,000 a year, pushing health care affordability beyond the reach of millions of American families if we do nothing.

There are real costs to inaction when it comes to health care.

Mr. TONKO. Absolutely. And I think that the statistics speak for themselves. Representative PINGREE, you have long been a champion in your State for health care reform. Statistics in the Northeast and certainly in New England are what they are across America, where we see out-of-control costs and reduced opportunities for those who are holding an insurance policy in hand.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Absolutely. You're right. I come from the State of Maine. And like many State legislatures, when I was in the legislature and after I was there, the State implemented a lot of reforms around health care. They've done a tremendous amount to attempt to cover more citizens, to bring down the price of prescription drugs, to deal with the challenges of the insurance markets. But the fact is, even though that is a State that has done all it can, a State can't do it by itself. It can't do it one State at a time. What I hear from my constituents when I go back is, Please, do something about the health care system, and don't delay. Do it now. Get it done this year.

You talked about small businesses. Small businesses in my State and big businesses alike are really struggling under the cost of health care. It's a significant economic issue. It truly is. If we don't do something about the rising costs of health care, we're more uncompetitive as a Nation. More small businesses are finding that they're having to cut back on the coverage for their families or take away coverage completely. It's a huge economic issue in our State.

You know, one other factor we sometimes don't talk about around the economic issues is the number of people who might leave their job to start a business. I talk to a lot of constituents who say to me, You know, I would like to start up my own business. I have got an idea. I even might employ a couple of people, but I wouldn't dare leave my job because I don't think I could be without a safety net.

So you have older workers who might choose to retire, you know, go on to their next stage of their lives, but they don't want to leave that health care insurance that they currently have. Or people who have good ideas, who want to go do something, and they say, I just can't do it without the safety net of health care insurance. I don't dare be out there.

Mr. TONKO. Well, it's interesting because I'm sure we hear it all the time. We recommend to high school students that probably their work stops throughout their careers will be four, five in number. It will not be that sustained one bit of loyalty to the employer and reverse to the employee that goes through an individual's work life career. And that is an important thing. If we profess that to be true, and we share that with these young minds, where we see that happening today in today's society where there are more and more shifts in careers, where there are golden opportunities to enter into another work opportunity, or where people are displaced, tossed to the streets, if you will, and lose their jobs, there should be that stability.

While the discussion by some has been framed an issue for the uninsured or underinsured, it's equally about those of us who are insured with the policy in hand. And what is really driving the issue here for many is catastrophic illness, where there is perhaps a huge demand on a family for medical expenses, and we are seeing more and more bankruptcies due to medical expenses as part of an American outcome, unacceptable outcomes in a land of abundance, as is the case in America.

□ 1945

So reform here is what we need. Status quo is unsustainable, absolutely unsustainable, and we need to go forward with a progressive sort of policy reform that will enable us to prosper as a society, via business, via families, via individuals, via our local governments and school systems.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I would say to my friend from New York, Madam Speaker, that I think this whole issue of the distortions health care causes on the labor market really impede and constitute a significant barrier to the fostering of innovation and entrepreneurship in the United States because, as our friend from Maine just indicated, millions of Americans have to make decisions about where they will work and at what they will work, not because they think that's necessarily what they're going to be best at or not because they're willing to take a chance with a startup company, understanding it might fail but, on the other hand, it might be the next Microsoft, but because they can't afford to because they have a preexisting condition.

Forty-five percent of us who have health care insurance have a previous existing condition, and you may have a spouse or a child with a previous existing condition on that policy. And if you move to a smaller risk pool or, God forbid, no risk pool at all because that small startup or that small company can no longer afford health care coverage, you risk the catastrophic illness you just talked about, Mr. TONKO, which drives families into bankruptcy.

In my district, which is a relatively affluent district compared to many others, we had 1,430 families last year in the 11th Congressional District of Virginia who filed for bankruptcy because of health care costs. And no American family should have to face that kind of ''Sophie's choice'' over health care in America.

Mr. TONKO. Absolutely not.

As I mentioned, the President came to my district just yesterday and talked about the innovation economy and the emergence of innovation that is expressed through keen intellect out there, whiz kid ideas, if you will, that are fostered by these very sharp individuals who know with precision how we can enter into a high-tech sweepstakes and win that global race. Well, we can't saddle these people with the costs of health care that is unaffordable or deny their entry into the job creations that they want to provide by finding that the premium is going to be some $13,375, as the Vice President's released study indicates. That is unacceptable.

Status quo also means that insurance companies will be calling the shots, that they will control your destiny. They will step between you and the medical community. They will continue to reap great profits that go toward marketing and executive bonuses and various other items. The first 26 cents now on the dollar are assumed to go for something other than health care. So status quo is not sustainable.

I know, Representative PINGREE, that you have been impacted by these issues within your district and have created a very strong voice for health care reform.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. You know, it's interesting to come from a State where we have done a lot of insurance reforms and a variety of reforms. What I find is because we've been talking about it for such a long period of time in our State and because the State has moved forward on a variety of things, I find that the constituents in my district are very literate and very articulate about this. Wherever I go, they've got to give me a piece of their mind about the insurance company, and most of them have had some kind of an encounter.

We often talk about the number of people that are happy with their plan, but I've also heard people say, you know, you're happy with your insurance plan sometimes until you have to go and use it. And I am amazed at how many times I meet with people who say, I thought it was going to be there for me. I didn't realize there was going to be a cap on it.

An awful lot of people in my district are self-employed or they do a variety of different jobs. We have a tremendous number of fishermen. People work at woodcutting, a variety of different things, and they have $5,000 and $10,000 deductibles. Well, that sounds pretty good when you first sign up, but the fact is you still pay a very high premium and you've got to pay that first $10,000. You do an injury to your knee or you do a variety of other things or one of your kids gets sick, before you know it, you've got to pay that first $10,000 and you're still paying enormous premiums, and what have you got in the end? It sounds like kind of a way to get around the situation, but most people say to me in the end, you know, This idea of just catastrophic coverage, it really didn't work for me, or, The insurance company wasn't really there when I needed it.

I just want to go back to that point. A number of people who I talk to say—it's a tough economy. Maine is 38th in per capita income, so my district doesn't necessarily look just like yours. A lot of people are really struggling to put it together. A lot of people are seniors or nearing retirement age. But because it's a hardworking constituency, they'll say, you know, We do pretty well at making ends meet. I go fishing. I paint houses. I cut some Christmas trees. My wife sells crafts. We've got this little business or we want a tourist motel. We can almost put it all together and have a pretty good income. The thing we can't afford is that $12,000 or $13,000 a year for insurance. And my daughter's diabetic or my husband's got a condition; we can't go without it. And I just want to go back to that point that the number of people who work hard and say, I could earn a pretty good living, but what I can't afford is health care insurance.

When I look at my State, the struggling economy, the job loss—our unemployment numbers just went up, and we're all looking for the big extension today of unemployment insurance. But the fact is the single biggest thing we can do to revive the economy in my State is to have universal coverage for health care. And I don't care whom I talk to. If they're on the left or the right or they own a business or they work for a big company, that's the one thing we all agree on: If there were affordable health care, we could get by.

One other fact I just want to put out there, and we're talking about a variety of things today, is sometimes people will say to us, well, you know, I don't want to have this kind of government health care. I don't want to have to pay for everybody else.

Well, if you're paying the cost of health care insurance today, at least $1,000 of your $12,000 to $13,000 premium is in the cost shift of all the people who aren't covered or who don't have adequate coverage. I mean, thank goodness people get coverage when they get sick and they get to the hospital. But the fact is our hospitals are struggling under the weight. Our practitioners are having to cover a lot of people who just don't have it when they need it or the insurance wasn't there when they thought they did. So you're already paying at least $1,000 a year in a tax, in a cost shift that's going somewhere else.

Why not make this a sensible system where everybody has early care and intervention and we emphasize wellness? It would make a huge difference in the economy.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Absolutely.

In my district, I've started something called ''house calls.'' In fact, CNN followed me around one day actually at it, saying, you know, it's not that often a Member of Congress makes house calls, but this one did.

What I did was sit around a kitchen table at a home with some neighbors in this particular neighborhood in my district and listened to stories. And while, obviously, there exists lots of considerable and legitimate fear and angst about what might constitute health care reform, what might be in a bill or not that we heard this summer, we also know there was also an awful lot of orchestrated noise to try to prevent the legitimate debate on health care sometimes and maybe to drown out these stories of average Americans and what they go through at the hands of the health care insurers.

So I'm picking up on what Ms. PINGREE said, but I am talking about those who have insurance, and yet time after time what I find when I go back to my district is stories, often horror stories, but certainly stories about capricious, arbitrary decision making.

We heard a lot of rhetoric this summer about I don't want a lot of government bureaucrats standing between me and my doctor and deciding on my medical care, and I think all three of us would agree with that. We don't want that either. There is a bureaucrat, however, if you're insured in America, standing between you, often, and your medical care, and that's not a government bureaucrat. It's an insurance bureaucrat sitting in a cubicle somewhere, looking for ways to shave costs irrespective of the medical requirements you may have, and sometimes and all too often irrespective of what the recommendation of your doctor may be in terms of best treatment or testing or both. Time and again, we hear sad story after sad story of lack of coverage, capping the amount of coverage, refusal to allow testing or procedures, often for very arbitrary reasons.

One of the things I hope, and I know that a number of the versions of health care reform legislation contain, is that we will actually address that. We will rein that in. We will protect health care consumers in America from that kind of capricious behavior by insurers whose only motivation isn't your health or your best interest; it is profit.

Mr. TONKO. Absolutely.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. There's nothing wrong with profit, but profit ought not to be the driving motivation in the most important part of our daily lives: our good health and well-being. And it seems to me we ought to be putting America's health before the insurers' profit motive.

Mr. TONKO. Representative CONNOLLY, you talk about some of the hardship that befalls people because of these decisions by bureaucrats in the industry. Well, there are also those situations where they drop coverage because of illness, which is a dreadful outcome. And I think that the insurance reforms, the health care insurance reforms that are required in this package would address situations like catastrophic illness, requiring that there be no prejudice shown against those suffering with catastrophic illness; that there be this portability that if you change jobs, lose a job, you continue to maintain health care coverage; that there be caps on certain situations where you're not draining—for the bankruptcy purposes we cited here or just the economic hardships that befall families, you're not draining them of resources unnecessarily, and putting a cap of perhaps $5,000 on an individual, $10,000 on a family, allowing for that cap to be placed so there is that benefit that comes the way of our American families.

Putting no copayment onto wellness programs and prevention programs, that's a smart thing for us to do. We know that when we bring people into the network and emphasize and underscore the value of prevention, they will be all the better for it.

So there are all these dynamics that should be responded to by the legislation that we do here, by the policy we develop.

Representatives talk about anecdotes that are shared within their districts to them either through house calls, which I think are unique, and just in group meetings that are had. I can tell you recently someone told me of their premium going up 37 percent in a matter of 2 years and that now, because of catastrophic illness, the wife of this married couple whom I reference here is unemployable at the age of 60. Her husband is now the single wage earner, trying to cover $18,000 worth of medical expenses.

Now, is that the kind of outcome that we want to protect? Is that the status quo that we're supposed to fight for? Or do we go forward and champion causes that will remove this sort of situation from the lives of the American families that we have the fortune to represent?

I think that there is a better way, and this health care focus in this House has been strong about wringing excess costs and inefficiencies out of the equation and putting in those measures that control overimpacting our American families in cases of catastrophic illness and advancing the cause of wellness. That's what we can achieve here and not be ruled by myth or fear tactics but by facts and information that is fed us that is responsible development of public policy, I believe.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. You know, Mr. TONKO, a lot of folks who have health care coverage have to look at what is the trajectory moving out in the next few years.

Let me give you an example of a couple I met in one of my house calls. This is a gentleman with a Ph.D. His livelihood is to tutor high school students in our school system who need extra help trying to make their way in the academic career, but he's considered a contract employee and, therefore, has to get his own health insurance. He has no benefits.

Seven years ago health insurance coverage for him and his family of four cost $4,000 a year. Absolutely manageable, easily fit into his budget. Seven

years later, no change in his health profile, it now costs $18,000 a year for that same family of four, and that includes no dental, no vision, and no drug coverage. He now has to look at the next few years of whether he has to drop that health insurance policy because he can no longer afford it because now it involves real tradeoffs economically.

□ 2000

This is not somebody who is abjectly poor; this is the middle class actually looking at terrible choices they never thought they would have to make regarding health care.

Mr. TONKO. And we have heard real-life stories that should affect all of us in our process here in the House. Both of you are strong voices for intelligent reform; and Representative PINGREE, I know you have a lot to add.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. We have a lot of colleagues who are strong voices for reform; and most of us, every time we go to the supermarket, go to somebody's birthday party, the first thing our friends and neighbors and constituents say to us, We need to get the health care bill passed. What is standing in the way?

There is so much hard work going on here in dealing with many of the complicated details. This is a major overhaul of the health care system. I commend my colleagues in Congress who are putting in a tremendous number of hours to get this right, and it is not easy to figure out and how to make it affordable for Americans. The stories that you talked about earlier are exactly what we hear everywhere we go. What we are trying to do now is put the finishing touches on a bill that will get us to that place.

I want to go back to the point you made about wellness. I have visited with a lot of the businesses in my district, many of which are self-insured. Those businesses are big enough to take on the challenges of health care themselves, and I am so impressed with the number of companies that are self-insured and say that wellness needs to be a critical component. What they have found as a business decision, the more you can emphasize wellness, good nutrition, smoking cessation, regular check-ups, some have fitness trainers on site, things we wouldn't consider as an early component, but they have realized that the more you can do to keep people healthy, to make sure that their workers and their families get tests, stay out of the hospitals, that is where we can cut significant costs.

That is one of the challenges that people are spending a tremendous number of hours trying to sort out. What does that mean to lower cost? How do you make sure that we don't do unnecessary testing, and that we pay our practitioners for keeping people well, not for hospital admissions and just the times we get sick. It is a major change that we are talking about here, and there has been a lot of thoughtful dialogue and debate, not the crazy talk that is out on some of the cable news shows, but serious dialogue about how to do this right, how to get real competition in with the insurance companies, how to help our small businesses to increase the number of people who are covered.

I have to say that in spite of the difficulties in making major change and crafting a big piece of legislation, I get excited when I think about it. I think about what would it be like to end this year and go back home to our constituents and say, We did it. We took a major step forward. We will no longer be the only Western nation that doesn't have civilized health care insurance, that hasn't worked to bring down costs. That it is affordable. It would be wonderful to say that to people.

I have to leave the floor, but I want to say in closing about my own district, we have talked a lot about the economic issues. When we talk about individual constituents, there is a part of me that believes this is a moral issue. It is a patriotic issue. It is a way of making sure that we understand that in America, we are all in this together. If my small business fails because I struggle under the cost of health insurance, or one of your constituents goes into personal bankruptcy because of cancer or another illness that wasn't covered, that is not the kind of America that I want to live in. That is not the kind of place we want to be. We want to do this because it is right for our economy, but also because we believe it is right for America.

Mr. TONKO. It expresses the character of our society and of our Nation. Obviously, there are determined individuals who understand and acknowledge that we can't fix this system with slogans or sound bites or banners that are flown at various events. It needs to get into the weeds of detail and make certain that people are protected.

Ms. PINGREE, you make reference to small business, some 13 million people, nearly one-third of America's uninsured, are employed by small and medium-size businesses, fewer than 100 employees. That is a huge number. People say to me, if we do this insurance benefit, shouldn't people be working? I say they are working; they are not getting insurance coverage.

About 15 years ago, 61 percent of our small businesses and medium-sized businesses offered employer-based health care coverage. Today that number has dropped to some 38 percent.

So the signs are there. The patterns are being developed. We cannot continue with the status quo. It is unaffordable and not sustainable.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Thank you for allowing me to join you.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. CONNOLLY.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Adding to what you just said, Mr. TONKO, if we do nothing over the next 10 years, the cost to small business for health care in America will climb to $2.4 trillion. And that means that 38 percent that currently provide health care coverage will drop to something like 30 percent or below.

Mr. TONKO. And I am reminded with that statistic that the $13,385 on average for a policy will grow to something greater than $29,000. Unacceptable outcomes, and it will drive business into unprofitable situations. And it will wreak damage and pain and suffering onto our Nation and onto its families. So there has to be reform here. Absolutely there has to be reform.

When you look at it from our senior citizens' perspective, knowing there have been injustices allowed, the creation of a doughnut hole where constantly, we have talked about this, you hear from your senior citizens as constituents, where they reach in a few months the threshold where they are in that doughnut hole and they are paying out of pocket for necessary pharmaceuticals, it is unacceptable.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. It is unacceptable. Of course, an awful lot of fear was engendered by misinformation spread over the summer about what would and would not happen to Medicare. No current Medicare benefits will be in any way negatively affected by any of the legislation that we are looking at. As a matter of fact, those benefits will be enhanced by the closing of the doughnut hole that you just referred to, Mr. TONKO. That is the hole that doesn't cover the price of prescription drugs at a certain expense range for senior citizens, meaning that their out-of-pocket cost for prescription drugs goes through the roof. They often have to make very difficult choices between food and drugs at the end of the month. We want to close that doughnut hole.

Mr. TONKO. Wouldn't you have expected the voice of advocacy out in the streets to scream and yell about that outcome when it happened just 5 or 6 years ago? But no one brought to the attention or carried any anger and expressed concern to the level that you hear today. And here is the situation we are attempting to correct, a wrong that was allowed to occur, and to close that doughnut hole to allow for more freedom and to have a sensible outcome.

At one of my health care forums in my district during this August recess, I heard from people who were not taking medications simply because of that doughnut hole. I heard from a couple again who testified at one of our forums that indicated for cardiopulmonary purposes the husband needed to take medication. It was a preexisting condition so it denied them insurance coverage, and they couldn't afford out of pocket to pay for the medications. So she cheerfully shared with us that he simply doesn't take it. It has put undue stress onto the family. It has caused economic hardship, and they are without insurance.

For those who would argue that that system should be maintained, I have

my insurance, you go find yours, we are all paying. As Representative PINGREE indicated, we are paying for that uncompensated care, and I believe that is to the tune of some $56 billion or $57 billion in this country. That is a huge savings that automatically flips over to a benefit if we do wise health care policy reform.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. You know, in addition, if you actually enumerated the benefit enhancement for our seniors, Medicare stays not only intact; it gets better. We close the doughnut hole, making it easier for seniors to be able to afford and to access the prescription medications that they need.

We eliminate copayments for routine, preventive medical care, including screenings, saving seniors hundreds of dollars a year.

We improve and increase reimbursement payments to doctors who serve Medicare patients, which is a complaint we often hear from our senior citizens, that because of reimbursement rates being inadequate, doctors put a cap on how many Medicare patients they will see. And in some cases they get out of business all together. Obviously, that is not a good thing for our senior population.

This bill addresses all three of those reforms, making Medicare benefits more generous to our senior citizens, protecting the benefit base they have got, and augmenting it. Unfortunately, some of the misinformation spread in the summer would suggest otherwise, creating needless fear and stress in our senior population which relies so heavily on an efficient and effective Medicare system.

Mr. TONKO. Right. And I think the sensitivities that we need to show to these various audiences are hampered when people are including in the discussion items that are simply not in the bill, or fabricating them in a way where they suggest that there are outcomes that would be very destructive.

So this has been a very unique effort because you are trying to share information with your constituents, which I think is valuable. They can constructively build this package with us. And at the same time, you have to dispel the myths and rumors and the misinformation so we can stay on that page of fact not fiction and do what is best for Americans, for all ratepayers and for all sectors of our economy.

We earlier talked about small businesses. When you think of the benefits that come if they can have better bargaining leverage as small businesses, there is a benefit there. Our larger companies and industries haven't seen the growth in premiums that our small businesses have. They are some 18 percent greater than the larger business community.

So what we need to do here is provide that benefit by pooling these resources, allowing for better leverage in bargaining for health care premiums to stay lower. Just with the report today that was issued, we had a growth in the last 10 years, New York State alone, they did a State by State measure, and 105 percent growth in premiums and a 44 percent growth in wages over a 10-year span.

Now, Representative CONNOLLY, I think we can all agree that is not a pattern that we can allow to continue because eventually the well runs dry, people become sicker, and the profit column is swelling for an industry that is standing between choices that should be made between a doctor and a patient.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Absolutely. I think the numbers you just cited for New York State actually are higher than the national average, and there are regional disparities here in terms of the growth of cost. But what we do know, based on the Kaiser Family Foundation study is that the average increase in insurance premiums over the last decade was 138 percent, far outstripping the rate of inflation and far outstripping, as you point out, the growth in wages and income. As a matter of fact, that was negative.

So there is no lodestone to measure what is happening in health care; but we do know that it is fast outstripping the ability of people's income to support, and it is far and away above the rate of any inflation index, and it is going to be pushing itself beyond the index of affordability in the not-so-distant future if we don't do something in the way of health care reform.

I need to leave the floor, but I want to thank my colleague for his leadership and for providing us a forum for a civil discussion about such an important topic.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative CONNOLLY, for being a strong voice in this Chamber so as to move us all along that path of progressive reform, for an industry that is representative of every one of $6 in the American economy. If it goes unchecked, in the short span of 30 years, it will be one in $3. That does not make strong sense. It is a situation that will be a train wreck just waiting to happen.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. It is not sustainable. I thank my colleague.

Mr. TONKO. We thank you for joining us this evening.

As we look at the progress that we can make here, it is important for us to move forward with fact not fiction, for us to instill reforms in the insurance area that allows for catastrophic illness to be addressed so that it does not prejudice against American families that require health care insurance.

We need to move forward so as to provide portability for our American families, especially at a time when we profess that there will be career changes, job changes many times over in the work lifetime of countless individuals in this country, where if you lose a job, you shouldn't be denied your health care. Some 14,000 Americans per day are losing their health care. That is unacceptable in this Nation of plenty.

We can have a better plan. We need to make certain that wellness and prevention are underscored as very valuable, important tools in the kit that speak to the soundness of holding down costs. We do that by not allowing for copayments in that regard. We need to cap those situations that could be catastrophic by making certain that no more than $5,000 or $10,000 per family, some reasonable measure be there, to restrict the payments that are demanded because so many families face bankruptcy.

□ 2015

I know that if our health care measure were approved as represented before the House here, some 1,200 families in my congressional district alone would escape the woes of bankruptcy because of medical expenses.

These are issues that face America each and every day. The business community has been paying stiffly for this sort of lack of reform. Some 40 percent of our business community is reported spending more than 10 percent of their payroll on health care costs. That is a pattern that is only growing worse with time.

And our seniors have been treated unfairly, with concepts like a Medicare part D doughnut hole, situations that find them in a very few weeks into any calendar year paying dearly for pharmaceutical needs that are a life-and-death choice for them. They shouldn't limit or fractionalize what they're taking. They shouldn't avoid the pharmaceutical needs that have been required of them by the medical community.

Those are situations that need to be responded through in this debate that hopefully will be factual, that will be fair, that will be based on soundness rather than fear tactics; those that might divide this Nation unnecessarily, that may impact the chance to really reform a situation that for decades has been talked about.

I applaud the President when he said he wants to be the last President to attempt this effort and fail. He wants to achieve success for the Nation. For decades we have had many an administration push for reform but it has failed because I think there are those who resist change simply to resist it rather than open up to the discussion and the dialogue and the debate in honest measure that needs to be had so as to move forward in progressive format.

Madam Speaker, we of the freshman class thank you this evening for the time allotted. I now yield back the remainder of my time and appreciate the opportunity to discuss what I believe is a critically important issue, that of health care and insurance reform here in America.

ACORN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you, Madam Speaker. I do appreciate the time.

There's so much going on and we've heard so much about community organizations, actually in the last year as we heard then-candidate and Senator Obama talking about community organizations being the way to go. I think it's wonderful—community organizations. I'm a member of a number of community organizations. None of them pay me, though. We do the things we do in the community organizations I've ever been a part of because we care about the community. We have jobs, we work, and then on our own time, without being compensated, we try to help others. We do it through church. We do it through all kinds of civic organizations.

So this whole thing of community organizations has been a bit of an anathema to me, an enigma, a riddle within a riddle; a community organization of volunteers who get paid to do some kind of organization. It's a strange thing.

As we've heard more and more about this group ACORN and the vast amount of money that it has been receiving from taxpayers, it becomes even more of an interesting enigma. Getting taxpayer dollars from the government, over 50 million, from people who are working and also being part of community organizations and churches and charitable institutions and helping their communities, they're working and they're paying taxes and they're also organizing and doing charitable work, and then come to find out their tax dollars are paying a group which has many, many other aspects to it to go around and basically try to undo the type of things they've been doing. It's really a strange phenomenon, ACORN. And from one acorn, we know that many nuts can grow.

As we think about and anticipate the work being done by ACORN, we find out, well, they go out and help people to know what their rights are and sign up for different benefits. I have seen my good friend from Iowa (Mr. KING) show the photograph he took down in New Orleans that had a big 2008 Obama sign in there. Well, wait. Charitable organizations, they're not supposed to be involved in politics. In fact, any other group seems to have the Federal Government come down rather strongly against them if they start engaging in politics. But apparently that applies to others and not ACORN.

I've also been amazed, Madam Speaker, the responses of some within ACORN saying, You set us up. You came in.

Yeah, they came in with a camera and began to ask could they get help to set up a prostitution ring of underage children with illegal immigrants coming in. At some point you would think people of morality, people of ethics who were organizing communities for the good and the uprightness, the righteousness, the goodness, the morality, the really growth within the community would have immediately said, Do you not understand what prostitution does to children? Do you not understand that it robs them of their childhood? Do you not understand how abusive that is to female children and how that destroys their adulthood as women? Do you not understand that you're a parasite if you're living off of young children in a prostitution ring? Or women for that matter. You're a pimp; you ought to be disgusted with yourself, because we certainly are.

We saw none of that in any of the videos. The reaction seemed to be the same: Well, how can we help you to get over and to make money as a parasite? It's like this was a parasitic organization trying to help someone else also be a parasite.

The outrage should not have been to anyone who exposed that kind of mentality within all these different organizations that are a part of ACORN but the outrage should have been, How could this be? How could a group like this be getting hard-earned tax dollars?

I'm pretty sure that most people around the country who have jobs and are struggling would like to have their own money back. I imagine they would like to have that $53 million back if they had known that it was going to be for folks who helped other groups and other individuals conduct illegal activity.

But there was no remorse. You see the video and you wonder, Where is the outrage? You're community organizers and you've got no outrage? Do you have no soul? Well, of course they do, but they don't show it. Is there no still small voice that speaks and says, This is wrong? They're talking about prostitution among children. They're talking about things that are completely against what we believe in in America; everyone fulfilling their great potential and becoming all that they possibly could be. Very tragic. Very tragic.

But then again, we've seen lots of slings and arrows hurled at one Member who was sitting right back here in the House who yelled, You lie. That was inappropriate. That violates the rule. But when you take it in context, the individual that came into this House, as an invited guest into the people's House, had just said that critics of the President's plan were not engaged in, quote, honest debate; that we were using, quote, scare tactics. He said that many of those who were hosting him here were making, quote, bogus claims; that we were making wild claims; that we were engaged in, quote, demagoguery; engaged in distortion, acrimony.

The President said we were cynical and irresponsible in the manner in which we were criticizing his plan. He said that facts and reason were thrown overboard. He said we were robbing the country of opportunity; we were killing the President's good bill. And he actually used the L word right here on the floor just a couple of sentences before the L word was used by our friend JOE WILSON. The President said, It's a lie plain and simple.

When you set that tone, you come into somebody else's house as an invited guest and you set that tone, what does that tell the people around you? You think it's okay to talk like that, to accuse your critics of being like that. You set the groundwork of making it okay to say those kind of things about people who happen to disagree with you.

We've seen the footage of the President telling members of ACORN, You're going to have a place in my administration; you're going to have a stake; you're going to get to participate. There has been plenty of involvement with ACORN. It was not like it was a new entity to the President as it was to many of us.

And so you have to wonder a bit about judgment. If that's the judgment of whom you want to be the stakeholder, of whom you want to give you advice and help you in the administration, then you have to wonder, Well, is that the same kind of judgment being used to pick people who are czars, who have no accountability to anyone but you? Because that seems to be kind of where ACORN was.

□ 2030

So we've got over 30 czars, and they fall into the same category as this lack of accountability. I don't care what group you are, Madam Speaker. I don't care where it is or what's involved when there is no accountability. We know from the Old Testament that the only man in the entire Bible to have been said to have had a heart after God's own was King David and that, when he had no accountability, the man who had the heart after God's own could commit horrible offenses.

Well, you have an organization like ACORN, and there is just complete unaccountability. There's not only unaccountability. We're going to give you all kinds of power. We're going to make you the stakeholder in this administration. We're going to let you organize America to fit your own image. Well, that's a little scary, but when there's no accountability, that's where all of this goes.

So I am pleased to see friends who are also wishing to address this topic. I'll recognize them in a moment.

I see a sign: ''ACORN Goes Nuts.'' As I just pointed out, from one acorn, we know many nuts can grow.

With that, I would like to yield to my friend from Texas (Mr. CARTER), Judge CARTER.

Mr. CARTER. I thank my fellow judge and friend from Texas, first off, for being here to start this, because I was across town, and was fighting the traffic to get back. I apologize for not being here on time, but sometimes things don't cooperate around here like they should.

We're starting off by talking about—and I think you've probably told people

we're again addressing what we've been addressing every week now for probably 12 or 14 weeks. It's very simple that the rule of law must prevail in this country. That means that we have to have rules both of this House, of this Nation and of our States. We have to abide by those rules. The failure to abide by those rules has to have consequences. So we've been talking a lot about internal things that go on with the Ethics Committee and so forth here in the Congress. Now, tonight, we're talking about some things that are in the news that, once again, are under the subject of the rule of law. It puts a bright light on an issue that we really need to be concerned about, and that is the issue with ACORN.

I think, probably, an awful lot of people have seen this video, what we have right here. I know, if they watch Fox News, they've seen the video, but I think now it's being shown on other stations. It's of these actors who pretended to be a pimp and a prostitute, who went to ACORN and asked for their advice on housing and taxes. They were basically given a hand on how to do things—on how to do fraudulent activities, on how not to get caught, on how to beat the system, on how to be able to run a child prostitution ring, and on how not to claim those people as dependents because you don't want people to know about them—all kinds of things like that, things from an agency which is supposed to be there to help people, an agency which is supposed to be law-abiding, which has received $50 million worth of American taxpayer money to help fund that organization, and which is standing in line right now, based upon bills that have already been passed through this House, to pick up another $8 billion—with a ''b''—as a potential that could go into ACORN's hands as community organizers.

This shocking event happened not just at one place but in Baltimore, Washington, D.C., New York, San Bernardino, and San Diego. They all have videos showing this.

Mr. GOHMERT. If my friend would yield for just a moment.

Mr. CARTER. Of course I will yield.

Mr. GOHMERT. With regard to the $8 billion that is discussed for which ACORN may be eligible, actually, if you look at H.R. 3200, which is the health care bill that is out here in the House, there is a provision that requires that the Secretary provides information about the Federal plan and also signs people up for the Federal health care plan. That provision is in there, and I haven't been able to find any kind of limit on how much may be available. It's typical ACORN-type language because it says basically that the Secretary may hire other entities to assist in providing information and in signing people up.

Of course, in the House version, we know there was no enforcement mechanism. If it's ACORN that's paid, it could be $100 billion. We don't know how much would be allocated under that provision to hire people to go out, to spread information and to sign people up. We know there was no provision for them to check on whether the people they were signing up were actually lawfully here. Yet, for what amounts could be spent under H.R. 3200 for ACORN to get them to go out, to provide information and to sign people up without checking their legal statuses, it could make $8 billion pale with that amount.

I yield back.

Mr. CARTER. Reclaiming my time, the only thing is that the $8 billion right now was in the stimulus bill and in some of the other bills, and it's available to be played with right now; whereas, H.R. 3200 has yet to pass this House. We anticipate it might. If there's a party line vote, it might pass this House. You're right. There is additional funding in that bill.

As we talk about this scandal, which is a scandal that has broken on national news, let me point out that the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of this House found that ACORN had committed the following offenses: voter fraud, tax evasion, obstruction of justice, aiding and abetting, embezzlement, investment fraud, use of taxpayer funding for partisan political activity, and Department of Labor violations.

Now, these are all things that have been raised by the Oversight Committee, the named ''Oversight Committee'' of this Congress. So, as we've talked about these various issues that involve the rule of law, what we want to do and what, I think, is necessary for this Nation to do is to—you know, a lot goes on in the dark, but when you put sunshine—sunlight—on an issue, you get to see a clear picture, and that's what we're about here. We're about putting sunshine on the issue so you can see a clear picture. This clear picture is awful. This country and anyone who stands up for this group of people should really be having second thoughts.

So here are some other issues that are listed, and we'll go into these, but I see my friend VIRGINIA FOXX is here.

Would the lady like to claim a little bit of our time?

Ms. FOXX. Well, I would.

I want to thank my two colleagues from Texas for beginning this hour, and I am glad to talk a little bit about this.

I think what you're bringing up in terms of the Committee on Oversight is extremely important in terms of what it has found out. I have found that people have been a little bit fooled in the last week about actions having been taken in the Congress, and I thought I might highlight that issue a little bit.

I know I heard several times on the news last week that the House has voted not to continue to fund ACORN, that the Senate has voted not to continue to fund ACORN and that Congress has voted not to continue to fund ACORN. So I think it's important that we explain exactly what happened last week because people don't have the full picture.

What really happened last week was our friend over in the Senate, Senator COBURN from Oklahoma, put an amendment on the Transportation and HUD appropriations bill. That's what I understand. If I don't get this exactly straight, I hope you two will help me get it straight if my memory is not as good as I'd like it to be. He put an amendment on that bill, an appropriations bill, that said that ACORN would get no more funding through the HUD appropriations bill.

What happened in the House is that we were dealing with a bill which I found extremely offensive—the bill that would do away with banks being able to make loans to students who were going to college and setting up the Department of Education as a banker for students who want to borrow money. What we did was to put an amendment on that bill to say funding would no longer go to ACORN. That bill passed with a large vote, so there are people out there thinking, Okay. Great. We're defunding ACORN. What has actually happened is the defunding of ACORN in one particular category in the Senate and the defunding of ACORN, period, out of the House. Now what has to happen is we have to have language that's exactly the same in both Houses.

So what I explained to some people on the radio show that I was on was, yes, it's an easy thing for Members of the House to vote to defund ACORN. They know that bill is going to go over to the Senate. They know that it's probably not going to be in the Senate version of that bill. If the Senate were to pass a bill related to loans for college students, it would most likely be very different from the bill that passed in the House. The two bills would go to conference. In the conference, very conveniently, the section on ACORN would simply disappear. As I explain to people, that happens all the time. The folks in charge over here let something pass, knowing full well it's never going to become law.

So those who thought that ACORN was going to be cut out of its continued funding from the Congress think that based on the news accounts from last week, but I think it's important that people know that that isn't the case. If they're interested in stopping funding to ACORN, what they need to do is to write their Members of Congress and say, ''I want you to vote to defund ACORN, and I want you to find a vehicle to do that,'' because we can pass lots of bills over here. Then people can go home and brag about it and say, ''I voted to defund ACORN,'' and then it never happens, and they're given credit for it, knowing full well it's never going to pass in a bill that would go to the President for his signature. So I think it's important.

I also want to say that I think ACORN is a symptom of the problems

with the way Congress is now operating. The Federal Government was established to provide for the defense of this Nation, and that's what we are here for. What has happened, particularly since the mid-1960s, is, I guess, many Members of Congress, to justify their being here, thought that the Federal taxpayers were providing a giant piggy bank to the Members of Congress. They thought we could take their money and could spend it any way we wanted to. We've gotten way off target.

One of the reasons that ACORN can do what it has been doing for the last 15 years is that there is such inadequate oversight, because we're simply funding too many different kinds of projects. We need to pull this Congress from where it is now—funding lots of things we have no business funding—back to the essential job of the Congress, which is to focus on national defense. I know it won't be done in this session of Congress because there are too many people of a different philosophy than of the three of us, but I'm hoping that after the 2010 election that we will find more people of like mind with us who will understand the reason we have a Congress and who will say to their Members, You need to focus on national defense. If there are programs like ACORN, community organizations which need to be funded, let's let the local and State governments do that.

With that, I yield back to my colleague from Texas.

□ 2045

Mr. CARTER. Well, I thank the gentlelady for giving a good explanation.

Leader BOEHNER, Leader JOHN BOEHNER, the minority leader of the House has asked NANCY PELOSI for a stand-alone bill that will clearly define no funds go to ACORN from any source. That's going to be difficult.

Ms. FOXX. It's my understanding there is a stand-alone bill. It is up to the Speaker now to call that bill up from committee and then up for a vote; is that correct?

Mr. CARTER. That's correct. There is a stand-alone bill, and he is calling on the Speaker to call it up. If the Speaker doesn't call it up, he is going to ask for a discharge petition so that we can force it to be called up for a vote. If we maintain the vote we got before, then we will have evidence that now this Congress overwhelmingly says ACORN is through.

Although I think you have given a very adequate description of the politics that may be involved in this issue, let's go back to right and wrong, and, unfortunately, you can vote to make things sound like they look right when, in reality, the results come out wrong. I think that's a perfect point.

Ms. FOXX. Would the gentleman explain a discharge petition? I think that would be helpful.

Mr. CARTER. Yes. If you get enough votes to pass the bill that says I want this bill voted on, any Member can file a discharge petition asking that that bill be voted on. If he gets enough people to sign his discharge petition that it would pass, by the signatures on the discharge petition, then it will be called up against the ruling of the majority party.

Ms. FOXX. Would it be safe to say that the true measure of whether somebody wants to defund ACORN is whether he or she signs that discharge petition?

Mr. CARTER. That is true.

Ms. FOXX. Not whether he or she voted for the Republican motion last week.

Mr. CARTER. That's absolutely correct. That is a good point.

Mr. GOHMERT. It would be typical here in Washington also to have public outcry and say we just fixed the problem. We are not going to let ACORN be funded with your hard-earned tax dollars anymore where they go spend it as we have been finding out how it's been spent, when, apparently, there may be a couple hundred related agencies or groups to ACORN.

It's not enough. Now know, if you are treating ants that are just killing everything in your yard, it's not enough to just go take care of the ants in one area; they move right over to another area. And that's what you have got with ACORN. There are so many fingers reaching out into so many other pots, it's going to take a full oversight and lots of investigation to get to the bottom of just how many organizations are tied to this and where all the money has gone.

Now, it's one thing to say, oh, no, we will do an internal audit, which now they have come around to finally saying they will do, but that's not good enough when you are using taxpayer dollars. It's never a good time to do that, but especially now when taxpayers need their tax money more than at any time in decades.

It's not enough to just say we are going to defund ACORN. They can just go right into another entity that they are already related to, still continue to get billions or tens or hundreds of millions of dollars.

It's going to take a full investigation into all the different fingers that reach out there, and what are they doing? I mean, we have seen video on a number of ACORN offices. We have seen the charges brought of a criminal nature against, as a friend from Texas said, voter fraud, tax evasion, obstruction of justice, aiding and abetting, embezzling, investment fraud, use of taxpayer funding for partisan political activity, Department of Labor violation.

We know about those with ACORN, but what about all the groups they are related to? What have they done, and how much money have they got? Those are all things that need to be investigated. We need to get to the bottom of it. Before my friends came in, I was pointing out I have been a community organizer. I have been a part of community organizations that helped to organize community and take people food and help them, take them to voter registration, do all kinds of things to reach out and help, to visit in the hospitals, to just do ministering stuff. But we never had the government pay us to do that. It was all voluntary stuff because we deeply cared about the community.

There is something to be said when the motivation is a paycheck from somebody that's out there working and helping the community and yet their tax dollars are being taken away from them. It would be called theft, except we passed a law to legalize that theft of taking their money away from them, even though they don't want to give it up, and then giving it to groups like ACORN that are going in an entirely different direction and actually working at great odds with the very things that people are volunteering to do with their own time.

Mr. CARTER. Just look at this chart right here. Colorado, vote fraud, multiple counts with convictions. Florida, vote fraud, case pending. Michigan, vote fraud, multiple counts with convictions. Minnesota, vote fraud, multiple counts with convictions. Missouri, vote, mail fraud, identity theft, multiple counts with convictions. Nevada, vote fraud, multiple counts pending. Ohio, vote fraud, multiple counts with convictions. Pennsylvania, vote fraud, multiple counts with convictions. Washington, vote fraud, multiple counts with convictions.

So not only are there allegations of fraud, identity theft and other things, there are people who have been convicted by a court of those offenses. Realize that American taxpayer dollars go to fund every one of those organizations. There are, by the stimulus package and other things we have created, there are multiple grant applications out there in this spider web that Congressman GOHMERT has so adequately described where there are all these offshoots, all these 501(c)(3)s out there that are nonprofits, with nonprofit status, and yet they can push up the money to the mother ship, if you will.

It's a real issue. It's an issue that, quite frankly, a team of very capable people at the Justice Department should be looking into, busting up as much of it as they can. But our job, from what we are trying to do here tonight, is let people see what's there. It's bad. It's awful.

Ms. FOXX. I wanted to point out one more way that the public could hold their Member accountable. We have heard a lot about the issue of accountability, particularly from the President, yet we have seen almost nothing in terms of real accountability measures being put out there.

But as our colleague from Texas pointed out, Leader BOEHNER has said if the Speaker does not bring up the stand-alone bill that he has introduced, he is going to file a discharge petition.

Well, getting to the point of filing a discharge petition takes a long time

and, again, many people will go home and say to their constituents, well, I voted to defund ACORN, but they know full well that that provision in that bill will be dropped out in the Senate or in the conference.

But, Leader BOEHNER has introduced H.R. 3571. It's entitled the Defund ACORN Act. If people want to know how their Member really feels about this, then they should ask that Member to sign on as a cosponsor to H.R. 3571. Then, if H.R. 3571 doesn't get taken up to vote on it on the floor, then they should sign the discharge petition.

Many people have the understanding that all you have to do is have 218 people sign on to a bill and then it automatically comes up for a vote. I have had to explain that to a lot of people that it's completely in the control of the Speaker whether a bill comes to a committee or comes to the floor for a vote. I have been on lots of bills that have had over 300 people as cosponsors and the bills never come up for a vote.

So I would say to any of the public who are watching us tonight, if you want to know, again, how your Member really feels about ACORN, then do that.

But, of course, we understand that much of the—I don't want to call them mainstream media anymore, because I don't think they are the mainstream media. I think the three dominant networks plus one of the cable networks, many of the people who watch that, those channels, don't know anything about ACORN because those media outlets have not been talking about ACORN.

So we have a real problem in this country with selective reporting of things that are transgressions by our colleagues across the aisle. I know that we have lots of data on that. We want everybody to be treated fairly, and we know that many times when there are shortcomings on the part of our colleagues that it never gets reported in the national media except for one or two newspapers or one or two TV stations or radio stations.

Thankfully, more and more people are paying attention to those, so we are getting the news out. And I just wanted to point that out that if somebody is watching and they want to know if their Member is serious about doing something about ACORN and they voted for the bill the other day, then they should ask them to sign on to H.R. 3571 introduced by JOHN BOEHNER, and already cosponsored by, I think, most of us, and also if a discharge petition comes up, to sign the discharge petition.

Mr. CARTER. Let me point out one thing. You made a very good point, Congressman GOHMERT, when you said this internal audit thing isn't going to get it done. That's right. Let's just look at what Government Reform has discovered with the discovery they have done.

First, ACORN has evaded taxes, obstructed justice, engaged in self-dealing and aided and abetted the coverup of embezzlement by Dan Rathke, the brother of ACORN founder Wade Rathke.

Second, ACORN has committed investment fraud to deprive the public of its right to honest services and engaged in racketeering enterprises affecting interstate commerce.

Third, ACORN has committed conspiracy to defraud the United States by using taxpayer funds for partisan political activities.

Fourth, ACORN has submitted false filings to the Internal Revenue Service, the IRS, and the Department of Labor in addition to violating the Fair Labor Standards Act, FLSA.

Fifth, ACORN falsified and concealed facts concerning an illegal transaction between related parties in violation of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act, ERISA.

Now, all those things, in addition to what we have discussed, and an internal audit has already been done once with no information released. Basically they look at their own books and say, We are just fine.

We should have a full external audit of the books at ACORN and, quite frankly, I believe the Justice Department or this House should be involved in subpoenaing all the records of all the entities that are involved in this, and we should lay this picture out on the table, which brings us to another issue that I want to talk about.

ACORN, we can talk all day and all night, but there is a new thing out there that our colleague from Texas, RON PAUL, Congressman RON PAUL has brought out, and that is holding the Federal Reserve accountable; H.R. 1207, Congressman RON PAUL's bill that's pending before the Congress and trying to get the Federal Reserve audited.

Congress has given 700 billion in the Bush TARP, 787 billion in the Obama stimulus funds to the Fed. Congress and the taxpayers have no way to independently verify how those funds have been used. The American public wants to know what is happening with that money. The American public doesn't want any more double standards.

Quite frankly, this is a bipartisan bill, because, quite frankly, RON PAUL points out that 1207 is sponsored by Congressman PAUL but has 290 cosponsors already. Obviously there are Democrats and Republicans on this bill. There is going to be a full hearing on this on Friday.

And I think people back home want to know, in fact, I got asked that the whole time I was home in August, and which I, if you recall, had said that on the floor of this House more than once, Where's our money? Where is it? What's happening to it?

The stimulus isn't being spent at a rate we were told it would stimulate the economy. Special projects are being funded. Where's our money?

□ 2100

And, then, what we forget is the Treasury and the Fed can independently pour more money into the economy. And I don't even know the number, but it could approach trillions of dollars.

Mr. GOHMERT. If the gentleman will yield.

Mr. CARTER. I yield back.

Mr. GOHMERT. The question, Where is our money, is extremely important. And another question is, What have you committed us to? We ought to able to know that. You know, the Constitution says that the Congress will be the one who holds the purse strings. They felt like with two Houses that was a good check and balance to holding the purse strings. This many people would be that envious and that careful. That was what they thought.

But I love what our friend Newt Gingrich has said: if transparency is good enough for the CIA, it ought to be good enough for Federal Reserve. Even more so, of course. But the Federal Reserve is committing money, and we don't even know the full extent that they're committing it to. And this isn't like in the earliest days with Alexander Hamilton—and I just recently finished a biography on Hamilton. When they were trying to get the banks going in America in the earliest days, guys like Hamilton were broke, yet you see nowadays we've got Goldman Sachs had their biggest profit in history in the second quarter.

We don't know all the ties there. We know that, apparently, our Treasury Secretary has said it's okay to have someone overseeing the spending of the TARP money as applied to Goldman Sachs, who happens to own Goldman Sachs stock, and he will waive the conflict there. But it's like ACORN: there's so many little fingers going in all these different directions.

We need full transparency. And, goodness sakes, if this government, if this Congress cannot force the Federal Reserve to come clean and be fully accountable, then we're in a lot bigger trouble than most anybody suspects right now.

But I believe my colleagues are cosponsors. I will let them speak for themselves, and yield such time as they may need.

Ms. FOXX. Let me point out, again—and our colleague from Texas has a chart, and I will turn it over to him in a second—but the bill calling for an audit of the Federal Reserve, as you have indicated, Mr. GOHMERT, has 290 cosponsors. That's more than enough to pass that bill. Yet Speaker PELOSI has gone very slowly on holding hearings.

I hope very much that there will be that full committee hearing on Friday. I know that Chairman FRANK has offered to hear the bill; and I hope that will happen, because that's what we need.

It's obvious that a lot of people in this country are very concerned about the role of the Federal Reserve. We're at a stage in this country where we owe more money than we have ever owed in the history of this country.

Our deficit is going to hit almost $2 trillion by the end of this month. Our long-term debt is just so large, it's almost inconceivable to think of. Our unfunded liabilities from Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, and what this Congress continues to do, in the control of the Democrats, is spend, spend, spend. Almost every bill that comes up before us is something that will authorize or appropriate money. And they passed the largest budget that has ever been passed in the history of the country.

It's really scary because people can't understand where this is leading. I know that Chairman Bernanke said he would not monetize debt, yet that's exactly what he's doing. The way that things are going in a circle around here, we're borrowing money from ourselves day after day after day, and it is high time that we had a very, very good audit of the Federal Reserve. And I am in very strong support of H.R. 1207, and I'd like to yield to my colleague, Judge CARTER.

Mr. CARTER. Well, what our chart here shows, since 1913 the U.S. dollar has lost 95 percent of its purchasing power. The Federal Reserve has many privileges of government agencies, but many benefits of private organizations.

H.R. 1207 would open the Fed operations to enhanced scrutiny. The Federal Reserve Transparency Act would achieve much-needed transparency of the Federal Reserve. Under H.R. 1207, we would audit the Federal Reserve system and the Federal Reserve banks by the end of 2010. The Comptroller General would submit a report to Congress within 90 days. The report would include recommendations for legislative or administrative action.

On July 30, RON PAUL asked, Why are Wall Street and the Fed so hysterically opposed to H.R. 1207? Just what information are they so anxious to keep secret? Only an audit of the Federal Reserve will answer this question.

When you really get down to it, when it's our money and they have the ability to dump money into our economy by printing it, then with—with the help of the Treasury—then what's so unreasonable for asking for an audit? I think that's a perfect point.

I'll yield back to Judge GOHMERT.

Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate the point, because you would think it's such a matter of common sense but, as people know, sense is not so common around this place.

It was in fact in a hearing months ago that the Federal Reserve, in an effort to get the economy going, may have pledged as much as $9 trillion to get us going. That's what motivated me to inquire how much money will be paid in for the whole year of 2008 in individual income tax. And I found out the projection was around $1.21 trillion.

When we heard it was trillions that the Federal Reserve and the Treasury was committing us to to get things going in the economy, and we're going to receive $1.21 trillion in income tax, individual income tax for the year, I thought, Wow.

Instead of having two guys over Treasury and the Federal Reserve just obligating, signing this country's life away through all this money here and there, what if they just said, You know what? If you earned this money, instead of paying tax, you're going to get it all back? You talk about making the economy explode.

You don't need a guy over a Federal agency trying to figure out what to do with trillions of dollars we don't have. If you gave the American public their own money back, you would see the economy explode.

Moody's did an independent study that indicated that would increase the GDP more than anything else in one year. Yet we're still playing games months later trying to find out what the Federal Reserve and the Treasury Secretary have committed us to in the way of debt, just to try to, on their whims, get us going.

Now, we know it's made some people rich, like Goldman Sachs, since this big devastation of the economy occurred. But rank-and-file Americans have not found that to be such.

I yield back to my friend from Texas.

Mr. CARTER. Thank you. I thank the gentleman for yielding. And as we talk about all this, we don't want to forget what the President told us when we started out in his new administration: I campaigned on changing Washington and bottom-up politics. I don't want to send a message to the American people that there are two sets of standards, one for the powerful people and one for ordinary folks who are working every day and paying their taxes.

And that's what this group—basically, we have taken the President's charge, and that's what we're doing every first night of the week, talking about helping the President do what he said he wanted to do and what he said he wanted to do in his administration: show that there's no special treatment for one who is a Member of Congress and one who is Secretary of the Treasury versus one who lives in east Texas or one who lives in North Carolina. They all should be treated the same, which brings us to the fox watching the henhouse.

Mr. GOHMERT. If I might, before you go to that poster, reclaiming my time just momentarily, because we've talked about it, I know what you're about to bring up.

On Friday, I met with a gentleman in my district named Mr.—and he said I could use his name—Mr. de la Torre. He said de la Torre is Spanish for ''of the tower.'' And he's proud of his name; he's proud of his heritage.

He has a sheet metal fabrication business and employs four full-time employees and four part-time employees. And when the economy hit so hard and devastated everybody, he did not want to let his employees go because they were good, hard workers. But he could get no loan. He had no money in his account, and nobody would loan him money.

And so being as honest and forthright as he was, he notified the Treasury that, I don't have any money. Nobody will loan me money. I don't want to drop these employees. I want to keep them employed, but I'm going to be late making my quarterly payment.

What the Treasury, the IRS, let him know is, That's too bad. We're coming after you. We want penalty and we want interest. And this man, who was able to keep his employees, his four full-time, his four part-time employees, still employed, but he was just late on his payment. The credit froze up. He couldn't get a loan. He couldn't get a line of credit. He didn't have the money. But he was honest and forthright. And what happened in return? They're after him. They have come after him, and they're threatening to seize anything he's got. That will put him out of business and put his employees out of business.

With that set-up, I would yield to my friend to talk about special treatment for special people that apparently did not include Mr. de la Torre.

Mr. CARTER. Obviously, it didn't include Mr. de la Torre. And Mr. de la Torre was not treated the way the Secretary of the Treasury was treated.

I've been talking about others, but I want to go back to the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Geithner. The fox is watching the henhouse. He's the guy who's supposed to be watching over our money. Let's see what he didn't do.

He didn't pay Social Security and Medicare taxes for several years. The IRS audited Mr. Geithner in 2003 and 2004, finding he owed taxes and interest totaling $17,230. The IRS waived any penalties on Mr. Geithner. Could it have been because he was in the nomination process for Secretary of the Treasury? I think maybe so. I think so. It certainly wasn't your friend, Mr. de la Torre.

In 2008, they found he owed $25,960. He used his child's time at an overnight camp in 2001, 2004, and 2005 for tax deductions. Sleep-away camps don't qualify.

Recently, he filed $4,334 in additional taxes and $1,232 in interest for infractions including a retirement plan early withdrawal penalty, an improper small business deduction, and the expense of utility costs that went for personal use.

Now, this is the guy that's in charge of our IRS. He is the Treasurer of the United States.

Now we talked about the Rangel rule, where Mr. RANGEL didn't pay his taxes and got no penalties and no interest assessed, which I find extremely curious. Now we ought to look at the Geithner rule. Mr. Geithner had interest assessed, but no penalties.

Now, what makes Mr. Geithner more special than Mr. de la Torre, which Mr. Geithner had to be found out by the IRS? Mr. De la Torre went to the IRS

and said, Work with me. I have a going business. I have issues. I will get my money and I will pay you. And they said, Sorry, Charlie.

□ 2115

Now what's wrong with this picture? What should an average person back in their living room, back home, if they're watching this, think, that we've got special treatment for a man who comes from Goldman Sachs—is that where he came from?

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, he didn't. But he had been the former Chair of the Federal Reserve, which is an elected position by the bankers of that area.

Mr. CARTER. He originally was in Goldman Sachs, wasn't he? I think everybody who has been Treasurer for the last, I don't know, 20 years have been Goldman Sachs people. There's something interesting there, something we ought to look into.

Anyway, I want to know why Mr. de la Torre can't write ''Geithner Rule'' across his tax return and ask them to treat him this way, to let him be assessed with no penalties and interest which would drive him into the poorhouse. This is the kind of question I think the American people want to ask. I think they want to know, because the man they elected President said that he wasn't going to have a world where men and women of power got treated differently than ordinary citizens. That's why we are here. We're here fighting a good fight for what President Obama had promised this Nation would be the agenda of this administration. I think it's time to step up to the plate and start swinging because these fastballs are getting thrown at us. They are coming in high, hard and inside, and we've got to deal with them. With that, I will yield back to Mr. GOHMERT.

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, in conclusion, I think there's nothing that says it better than President Obama did back on February 3, 2009: ''I don't want to send a message to the American people that there are two sets of standards—one for powerful people, and one for ordinary folks who are working every day and paying their taxes.''

Well, unfortunately that is exactly the message that's being sent as the Federal Government and the cronies that have surrounded this administration—they're getting away with all kinds of stuff, getting away with not paying taxes, not paying penalties. They're not producing jobs. They're killing jobs. Mr. de la Torre has a regal heritage. He was proud of that. He is a man of integrity. He wants to do what's right. Those are the kinds of people that make America great, and that is who deserves special treatment, not those who are parasites on the system.

THE 30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP'S HEALTH CARE AND ENERGY HOUR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to be here. I will be joined shortly by a colleague of mine from Ohio (Mr. BOCCIERI) and maybe several others to talk about a variety of issues that I think are pressing the country right now and that we want to inform our constituents about and speak to the House of Representatives about. You know, I think it's important for us—and I think every time I've been on the floor in the past year or two, I follow some of our Republican colleagues, and I feel the need to just kind of clarify the record as to how we ended up getting to the spot we're at now.

I realize that in a democracy like this, we always have the opportunity to criticize each other, and I think that the beautiful thing about this democracy is that, you know, we do have the opportunity to come to the floor of the House of Representatives and speak directly to the American people, live on TV, live to all of our other colleagues, and speak in a way that is pretty straightforward. That's a beautiful thing about this country. But if we look at where we are today, and if we look at where we were just 7 or 8 months ago, our economy was on the brink of collapse. Unemployment rates were climbing at unprecedented rates, where we were losing 600,000, 700,000 jobs a month. The stock market had crashed. The housing market had crashed. Our budget deficit just ballooned. And all of this was because of the policies, Mr. Speaker, that we had in this country from 2000 to 2008.

And if it weren't for an election in 2006, we would have went further over the cliff. Those are the facts of the matter, and the facts of the matter are that during that time, the House, the Senate, the White House were all controlled by Republicans. And we got the Milton Friedman, supply-side, Ronald Reagan, cut taxes for the wealthiest 1 percent of the people in the country and hope that health care would get fixed, energy would get fixed, and the economy would get fixed, and then people would get jobs at some point.

Well, it's important for all of us to recognize that we don't have to go to some theoretical schoolbook to figure out if the supply side Republican neoconservative domestic and foreign policy program works. It has been implemented, and it has been an absolute failure on all accounts, by all measures. Our friends on the Republican side now who say, Oh, my God, this health care bill that the Democrats are trying to push is going to cost $800 billion, $900 billion over 10 years. But it's important for us to recognize that it was the Bush tax cuts, that went to primarily the top 1 percent of the people in the country, that cost $2.5 trillion over 10 years. So don't come to us about a health care bill that costs $800 billion or $900 billion, that would end up saving the country a bunch of money in the long run, end up fixing the health care problem, because you were the ones and they were the ones, Mr. Speaker, who were walking in lockstep, following George Bush right over the cliff, $2.5 trillion in tax cuts, primarily to the top 1 percent over 10 years, bankrupted the country.

Now all of a sudden everybody's concerned about the budget deficit. All of a sudden, everyone's concerned about borrowing money from China. What we're saying is, the investments that we are going to make are going to stop health care projections from growing at 9 percent a year and try to bring some justice to the system so that average people can afford health care, so that average people don't get sick and then try to go get health care and an insurance company says, We can't cover you. You have cancer. But my cancer's fixed, the patient says. But it hasn't been gone for 10 years, so we can't cover you.

Or when we attempt to change the energy policy in this country—which my friend Mr. BOCCIERI has become an expert on because of his position in the military and his recognition of this as a national security issue—when we send $750 billion a year from the United States of America to Middle Eastern countries and foreign countries to buy oil—countries who don't traditionally support our views, our values or our Democratic principles—we send this every year to them, money that goes out of our economy into these OPEC countries. Then a couple of years ago, Mr. BOCCIERI, we spent $115 billion or $120 billion out of our defense bill to escort Exxon-Mobil ships and big oil ships, coming into and out of the Persian Gulf.

So all these tea baggers who want to stand up like they're the most patriotic people in the United States of America are saying, We shouldn't change our energy policy, We should just continue sending $115 billion a year out of our defense budget to escort these big oil ships in and out of the Persian Gulf. Is that pro-American? I don't believe it is. Is it pro-American to allow health care to grow at 9 percent when our GDP grows at 3 percent so that insurance companies can make money hand over fist and deny American citizens coverage?

I'm going to ask you a question: Where are the family values there, Mr. Speaker? That we want the government out. The only entity left to protect people who are getting screwed to the wall by the insurance companies is the government. We need to make rules to make sure that these people, these insurance companies stop hurting people. They're hurting people.

Now I'm sorry, but we had to listen all August about all this nonsense that's going on. In Ohio's 17th Congressional District, we will have 1,600 families go bankrupt next year if we do absolutely nothing about health care. Now I'm sorry. That's not right. And if

we have to act and maybe take on the insurance companies, then so be it. Let's clean this up, what's happened in this Congress and with this new President over the last 7 or 8 months, let's clean this whole thing up.

We've taken on the big oil companies. We're taking on the big insurance companies. We're taking on the big pharmaceutical companies. Today we extended unemployment benefits for another 13 weeks so that average people who can't find a job will have a little peace of mind for 13 more weeks. That's what we've been doing. Our policies have been clear, Mr. BOCCIERI. We're not hiding behind them. We're trying to reduce our dependency on foreign oil, bring that investment back to the United States, take money out of the hands of the insurance companies, bring it back to the average people so that they have better health care, and transform our country, get us ready to go.

We recognize that there are going to be some powerful interests that aren't going to be for this. But tough. Tough. You can't make money on the backs of human beings, of American citizens, and think it's okay because it's not. And we are going to do something about it. You can scream and yell. I want to just ask one question. These people talk about, where's our liberty, where's our freedom? Well, first of all, we're giving you more choice in your health care. But where's our liberty? Where's the liberty and where's the freedom of the United States citizen that's sick and can't get health care? How free of a citizen are you? You're not free at all because you're sick. You're in your home. You're in a hospital. You're in a nursing home. There's no freedom there. So you can talk freedom all you want.

I stood at the Canfield Fair, the biggest fair in Ohio, for 4 hours. For 4 hours I talked to every single person that came by that wanted to chat, and I had two people in 4 hours tell me they were against health care reform. Some wanted some clarification, some wanted to know exactly what was going on. But the people were for it. If we pass this, the people are going to recognize that we wanted the reform, the people voted for the reform, and the people got the reform.

I yield to my friend from Canton, home of the Football Hall of Fame, the National First Ladies' Library.

Mr. BOCCIERI. There's no question. Congressman RYAN has been a mainstay for supporting those types of projects throughout Ohio in his position on the Appropriations Committee. Congressman RYAN and I both came up together in the legislature. We cut our teeth together in the State capital, and now we're in Washington, trying to fight for our part of Ohio, to move our State and to move our country forward.

The gentleman from Niles is correct that the two largest issues that confound our economy, confound our Nation and really threaten our long-term competitiveness as a Nation are energy and health care. Energy and the fact that we bring more oil to the United States than any other country: 66.4 percent of our oil is imported from overseas, 40 percent comes from the Middle East alone. I talk to my friends who are still serving in the military in the Persian Gulf right now, and we often chat. I remind them of what we did as a country, the Greatest Generation, back in 1944 when we bombed the remaining Ploesti oil fields and we effectively cut off the German supply of oil. And they quickly transitioned to a synthetic fuel which is a derivative of coal.

Ohio has a lot of coal. And we know that right now, the single-largest user of energy in the United States is the Department of Defense. This is a matter of national security, and this Congress stood up and took bold initiative to take on the big powerful special interest groups that always challenge us and act as barriers to passing good, sound public policy. It is about time we put America first, and it's about time we put the American people first, and we put the special interests on the back burner, because we can no longer continue to operate the way we've been doing.

We've seen what happens when we have an administration that really doesn't reflect on the amount of money that we're spending and the amount of money we're borrowing from overseas interests, doesn't reflect on the amount of oil and the amount of energy that we bring in from different countries. This is about putting America first. The gentleman is right; health care is affecting our long-term competitiveness as a Nation. I can't go to any small business in the 16th Congressional District of Ohio or any large business, for that matter, and every governmental agency from the most local to the most Federal, has said the fastest-growing line item of their expenditure sheet is health care costs.

□ 2130

We know we spent $2.5 trillion every year on health care. There was an article, Congressman RYAN, that came out at the beginning of this year in the spring, and it said that one-third of that $2.5 trillion never reaches the doctors or patients. It's lost somewhere in the administration of the system, in the delivery of health care. So we're losing almost a trillion dollars in inefficient practices. And when you start peeling back that onion, really, quite frankly, where the fingers meet the onion, when you start peeling back that onion, you find out that insurance companies have over 15 percent administrative costs, administrative costs of 15 percent.

I went back and spoke to some of my doctors, and it may shock some of the folks who are listening tonight, but I've got to tell you they said the most efficient payer out there is Medicare. Medicare, with 3 percent, 3 percent overhead costs.

There was a study that came out last year, Congressman RYAN and Mr. Speaker, that said that $84 billion is spent every year to block, deny, and screen people from seeing their doctor by the insurance companies, when it will only cost $77 billion to cover all those uninsured and underinsured people in our country. It would actually be cheaper. Keep the $77 billion, insure everybody, make sure that they have access. Let's help reduce our costs in the long run. That is sound public policy.

Now I agree with what Congressman RYAN has said when he stood at his county fair in his district, that folks are concerned about the fact that this is going to be some encroachment on their own health care policy. Look, government has the role of setting the goalposts, of setting the out-of-bounds markers, of letting the free market act in between, but act as a good referee. When someone goes out of bounds, you throw the flag. And we ought to throw the flag right now, because we have citizens in this country who are being denied access to health care because they were sick before they got a new job, and to me, that makes absolutely no sense.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Reclaiming my time, I think it's important because we tell our seniors and they hear that there are going to be all of these cuts in Medicare. There's going to be savings in Medicare. There's actually going to be an increase in the benefits.

I want to say two things, one about part D, which is the drug program. Right now if you qualify for Medicare and then you get part D up to like about $2,700, you're covered, and then coverage for your prescription drugs completely falls off and then it picks back up at $5,000 or so. I got a letter from a doctor in Warren or Howland that said, I have a patient. She used up all her $2,700. She now fell into the doughnut hole, so they had to change the drug that she had. I think it was diabetes. It was a diabetes drug. They had to change the prescription. They changed it after she got into the doughnut hole because they had to go to a cheaper drug. There was a reaction because of the change. They changed it again, changed it again. She ends up in the hospital.

So what we're trying to say is by filling in this doughnut hole and paying just in this one instance, this woman, covering her for another thousand dollars or two would have saved the Medicare program thousands of dollars because she went from not qualifying anymore for part D, falling into the doughnut hole, to into the hospital.

Now, let's use, as my grandmother used to say, our ''medulla abingatta,'' the Italian version. But let's use our brains. This makes no sense what we're doing here. It makes no sense and it's hurtful to the patient and it wastes money.

But one of the main ways how we're going to save money and start to bend

the cost curve on Medicare is in areas especially like ours in northeast Ohio, Pennsylvania, Indiana, Michigan, the older industrial States, we have people 50, 55 years old and they lose their job. So they lose their health care or they just lost their health care and they keep their job. We had a lady on one of our telephone town halls who kept her job and lost her health care, 60 years old.

So when you're 60 or 55, you start saying, I don't know if I can really get insurance or afford it, so I'm going to wait this sucker out. I'm going to wait until I get into Medicare because they'll pay for it and then I'll be good. I can maybe get a supplemental, but most of it will be covered. So we have a population of Americans who are getting into the Medicare program sicker than they need to be and sometimes chronically, which is really driving up the cost of Medicare.

So what we're saying is we're paying for these people anyway because they're going into the Medicare program. But if we want to save money, wouldn't it be smarter to make sure that these people have some basic health care before they get into Medicare, because it will save us money because they'll get preventative care. They may not have cancer as bad. They may catch breast cancer early or cervical cancer early or prostate cancer early as opposed to letting it develop and then getting dumped into the Medicare program and costing everybody a bunch of money. This is basic ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

Mr. BOCCIERI. The gentleman is correct. I've seen more and more constituents coming into our office suggesting that they had health care insurance, that they had good private insurance, but when they got into that age group of 62 to 65, seemingly they were pushed off and pushed into the Medicare system, the government-run program, if you will, the Medicare system.

To me, I think your insurance policy is something that you and your employer pay into for all these years, and then all of a sudden when you get to the age of where our seniors are when you're going to have to rely more and more on a very good health insurance program that you're going to be using it more because you may become ill or have to use it to see your doctor more often, this is the time when they push you into the Medicare program. Now, you should have some ownership of that policy. It should amount to something, as an annuity, or you should have some ownership like a whole life policy.

But more than that, we ought to focus on what the guideposts are in this public policy debate on where we go with health care, Congressman RYAN. And I have always talked about, when I cross my district, the six Ps of health care. The first P is to make sure that all people have access to health care insurance. All people have access to health care insurance.

I don't know if you know this, but in 2004 our Secretary of Health and Human Services, Tommy Thompson, flew to Iraq with one of many billion dollar checks in hand to make sure that every man, woman, and child in Iraq had universal health care coverage. So while Americans are sending their tax money to Washington so that we can send it to Iraq to make sure that when Iraqis get sick they can see their doctor, and I have constituents showing up in my district who say they can't see their doctor because of being denied because of a preexisting condition, something's got to change. We need to have this debate, Congressman RYAN, and that's why all people need to have access to affordable health care coverage.

The second P is to make sure we have portability in our system. That factory worker in Canton, Ohio, that gets a pink slip, their health care effectively ends when they get that pink slip because they cannot afford the COBRA premiums, oftentimes as much as their own salary, to pay for coverage while they're unemployed or looking for another job. So they oftentimes go without health care. But if they were a diabetic and got rehired at another factory or another company, well, guess what. They're not going to have access to health care because they have a preexisting condition now. And when they have to show up at the hospital emergency room because they had no health care insurance in that time when they were unemployed or looking for new work, they cost all of us in the system five times more, and that's why we need portability and we need to end this practice of preexisting conditions.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Can I make a point on your second P there?

When you talk to people, when you talk to educators that are talking to our kids that are going to high school, going to college, guidance counselors, what they tell these kids today is that you are going to have seven, eight, nine, ten different jobs throughout the course of your life. You need to have skills that are mobile because it's not going to be like the 1960s where you're going to go to a General Motors factory or you're going to go to Youngstown Sheet and Tube and you're going to work there for 40 years, get a retirement and you're done. It's over. You work for one employer your whole life. Our educators are telling our kids how many different jobs they're going to have to have.

So does it make any sense to have a health care system that locks people into their employment because they have a spouse or they have a condition that some insurance company, some jerk that a doctor calls up to try to get coverage and the person at the insurance company says, Nope, sorry, we don't cover that? Well, it's in my policy. Sorry, we don't cover that. You are preventing people from going out and starting businesses because they're afraid they can't get any health care coverage. You're locking people into work that they may not like or enjoy when they have another opportunity elsewhere but they know they can't move because of this.

The health care system needs to reflect the dynamism of the economy, and it doesn't now. So it's stifling creativity at a time where we need people to be out creating jobs and creating work.

Mr. BOCCIERI. That's correct. So making sure that all people have access to health insurance, making sure that we end this discriminatory practice of preexisting conditions, and making sure that we have portability in our system so that workers can take their health care from job to job to job without any interruptions or without any distortions in their coverage.

The forth P is to make sure that physicians, physicians, not bean counters or bureaucrats, are making the calls for health care.

I had a woman show up in my office. She was crying. She was a middle class worker, showed that she had this condition and the doctor said that she needed to get an MRI. She knew she was going to have to pay some out-of-pocket expenses, so she went to her health care provider, her private insurance company, and they said, No, we don't want you to get an MRI. We want you to do therapy. So she went and did therapy, went back to her doctor with the results, and the doctor said, No, we need an MRI. She went back to her insurance company, and they said, No, you're going to do an X-ray, not an MRI.

Now, to me, Congressman RYAN, that sounds like rationing of health care. Rationing of health care. Some bean counter at an insurance company somewhere is telling this person in my district what type of health care she can get. One out of every five individuals that asks to get some sort of health care coverage or some treatment is being denied by an insurance company, and that needs to be corrected. We don't need bean counters or bureaucrats deciding who is going to get health care. Physicians need to make that call.

The fifth P is about prevention. And Congressman RYAN was a stellar, stellar athlete back in his day, could throw the football a mile.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Keep talking.

Mr. BOCCIERI. He was a good athlete. And we know that prevention is worth so much. For every $1 that we spend on prevention, we can get, on average, and this is a conservative estimate, $3 in return. Prevention, living right, eating right, exercise, diet, and nutrition to help correct these chronic diseases like diabetes, heart disease, and asthma that costs 75 cents out of every health care dollar that we spend, prevention should be a big part of this discussion.

Am I right?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Exactly. And right now we spend four cents of every

health care dollar on prevention when we know that's the big saver.

But there's a point that we all need to remember. We are fighting for the public option and whatever. Some people are for it, some aren't. I don't know if it will be in. Who knows. But we have to remember that if we have everybody covered and everybody is going to be covered by primarily private insurance, then the whole dynamic of the system changes. So we say to the insurance companies, as you said, and I like that analogy that we set the ground rules basically. And States regulate insurance now, so we're going to say, Here's the goal line. Here's the end zone. Here are the goalposts. Here are the rules. And the rules that we want to change are that you can't be denied because you have a preexisting condition. If you have diabetes, heart disease, the insurance company has still got to cover you. There will be a cap on how much you can spend a year so you're not going to go bankrupt over a health care crisis.

□ 2145

But the dynamic that changes when every single person can have health care insurance and the insurance companies have to cover you where they can't shake you any more, because now the insurance companies are spending money saying let me see what you've got, and I shouldn't have called somebody a jerk because they are just trying to make a living, and so I apologize for that. But you call up and the game now is the insurance company tells you, sorry, you have a preexisting condition. They spend money hiring bureaucrats within their organization to deny people coverage.

But this all changes if now I am the insurance company and I have to cover you. So now all of a sudden it is in my interest to make you well. So I'm going to spend money and time and energy and effort working with your employer, creating incentives for you to go work out, stop smoking, do things that are going to reduce your stress level, because I know stress is a killer. I am going to do things from an insurance company perspective to make you healthier. That is something that we have failed to talk about.

Once everybody is covered and we all get married to our insurance company and they can't get rid of us, their incentive changes from denying you coverage and getting rid of you to making you healthy. That is part of this whole preventive thing that you are talking about.

Mr. BOCCIERI. That is a good distinction, Mr. RYAN.

Mr. Speaker, when you enact a policy that helps people live healthier, live longer with screenings—and I had someone in my district argue with me, that is going to cost money over the long run, enacting provisions that are going to require people to be screened. I argued with them that I believe if we let that go to a point where they have prostate cancer or some chronic disease that could have been prevented with early intervention, that is costing more money at the back end. That is not what this should be about. This should be about catching diseases early. It will help spawn research, in my opinion.

The last ''P'' is probably the most significant, Mr. Speaker. I believe this is where perhaps some of my colleagues and I disagree. I will tell you that the last ''P'' is, How do we pay for this? How do we pay for this? We know, as Congressman RYAN said, there is a cost of doing nothing and then there is a cost of doing something. The cost of doing something should be enacting a public policy that takes money out of the system. We spend more than any industrialized country on health care, $2.5 trillion. It is almost 20 percent of our gross national product, more than any industrialized country. And yet we have nearly a trillion dollars of inefficient, wasted, bloated bureaucracy from bean counters, and even the government can be to blame as well.

We have to find every efficiency we can within that system, draw that money out, and find a way to pay for these reforms. That's where I think the rubber meets the road in this debate, finding money within the system, taking every last dime out of an inefficient system and making it work for the American people, making it work for those people who go without health care insurance and worry every day, who are one accident, one medical emergency, one diagnosis away from complete, utter bankruptcy. And that has to change.

We have a responsibility to set the goal posts, to set the out-of-bound marker, let the free market operate in between, and throw the flag when we see a flagrant violation. And it is flagrant when we deny people health care because of a preexisting condition. It is flagrant when we don't allow people to take their health care from job to job. It is flagrant when we allow bean counters and bureaucrats to provide a prescription of health care rather than letting the physician do it. It is a flagrant foul when we don't enact some sort of prevention, some sort of ability that all people are going to have access to some preventive care; when we spend 4 cents out of every dollar on prevention, and then end up spending 75 cents out of every dollar on chronic diseases that can be managed like diabetes, asthma and heart disease. Those things can save us money with the right public policy.

This should be the framework of our debate as we go forward.

You know, Congressman RYAN, this is not a Democrat or a Republican issue or challenge. This is not a conservative or liberal challenge; this is an American challenge. And energy and health care deserve American solutions. So we are waiting for our friends on the other side of the aisle to come to the table and offer us solutions on how we fix this American problem.

We can do this. America is much stronger than the challenges that confront us. We find our strength in challenges. We do these things not because they are easy but because they are hard, as John Kennedy said. That is where America has always found her strength.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Part of this prevention component is training our physicians in a way, first and foremost, having policies, and part of the rules of the game need to be making sure that physicians don't have to practice defensive medicine. That is one thing. Another is to make sure that our physicians are trained. The average physicians spends 7 minutes with a patient. I think there are a lot of ways in which physicians can stop spending a lot of money on things that maybe they see as an opportunity that they need to cover their own rear ends, but also to spend some time and figure out that people have life-style issues that need to be changed. And that doctor and that patient should both be rewarded for improving their health.

That is in this bill to make sure that you are not just getting rewarded for the tests that you run and paid for the tests that you run, but you are getting paid for making sure that the patient is healthier, comes less often, and doesn't come back to the hospital. All of these are incentives built into the system.

But let's look at energy and health care in America in 2009.

I think it is important for us to recognize that it may be easy to go over, Mr. Speaker, and bury our heads in the sand; and if you look at what our friends did when they were in control here, they basically continued to subsidize Big Oil to the tune of a couple of years ago $117 billion to protect Persian Gulf ships coming in and out of the Persian Gulf. So our carriers and our battleships are protecting these oil ships coming in and out of the Persian Gulf. Our money. So let's look at this.

If we want to be competitive in the 21st century, we need to get that investment, that $750 billion that is going to these oil-producing countries, and get it back invested into coal, nuclear, drilling in America, oil shale, algae, the whole nine yards. Instead of the investment being somewhere else, we want the investment here. Instead of hiring oil workers in Saudi Arabia, we want them hiring coal workers in Ohio. And the technology in Ohio, the scrubbers and everything else getting manufactured in Ohio.

So you take the energy investment back into the United States. You take all of the venture capitalists that sit in my office and say that they want to put money into this and that, private money, you take the energy money, $180 billion that we are putting into coal in the energy bill that passed here, along with a health care bill that will reduce costs for small businesses and allow them to reinvest back into their business, you have the recipe and the

strategy for long-term economic growth.

I know that may be hard to believe; but some of our friends, who will remain nameless, supported policies that said if we cut taxes for the top 1 percent, that that will lead to long-term economic growth. That if we deregulate Wall Street, that will lead to long-term economic growth. And all those things did was lead to an economic collapse that if we didn't have the social programs from the Great Depression in place, that would have led to the Great Depression, the second Great Depression in the United States.

So, fortunately, we have moved off that track into a track of responsibility, sound fiscal policy, sound investments in the future, and a strategy to let businesses grow as we reduce their health care cost burden.

Mr. BOCCIERI. The gentleman is correct: the two largest issues that confound our United States economy are health care and energy. This Chamber took bold action in trying to craft, in attempting to craft, a national energy policy that makes sense for our country. Energy efficiencies.

You know, I had a hospital in my district, Mercy Hospital, that put some variable-speed fans in and carbon dioxide detectors. When you walk into a room, the lights will turn on when someone starts breathing. These types of efficiencies are saving them a million dollars a year, a million dollars every year. That is the type of efficiencies that we need with a national energy policy because we know that the cheapest energy is the energy that we never use.

We passed an energy policy that moves away from our dependence on foreign oil and focuses on creating alternative forms of energy and in the long term creates jobs here in our country and increases our national security.

One day we roll into a fuel station and have a choice between traditional gasoline, biofuels, ethanol, plug in our electric hybrid, or maybe drive by the gas station altogether because we have a fuel cell that allows us to get 100 miles to the gallon that was researched right in our part of Ohio. That is the type of choice and diversity that we need to make our country stronger.

Or how about investing in alternative forms of energy, like what is happening in the 16th district, not only fuel cells and electric plug-in hybrids; and at the Ohio State Ag Research and Development Center in Wayne County, we are researching these anaerobic digesters and making compressed natural gas out of our own waste and selling it back to the grid. This is the type of innovation that will make America stronger in the long term and increase our national security.

Congressman RYAN and I have talked about this often, the fact that 80 percent of the world's oil reserves are in the hands of governments and their respective national companies. Sixteen of the world's largest 20 companies are state owned. State owned. And when we import 66.4 percent of our oil from overseas, and 40 percent from the Middle East. We know that makes our country vulnerable, very vulnerable. Knowing that if we just put 27 percent of the vehicles on the road today, if they were these gas electric hybrids like the Toyota Prius or the Ford Escape, we could end our dependency on oil from the Middle East.

That is the type of energy policy we need; but yet we have big special interests here in Washington and around the country that are trying to prevent this from being enacted, a national energy policy that is about national security and creating jobs in our country, moving away from our dependence on foreign oil.

We know that the amounts of alternative energy our Nation is able to produce are only limited by the amount of energy we are willing to invest here in Washington and across the 50 States of our great country.

Now this bill, the American Clean Energy and Security Act, gets a lot of attention, but not for that name, Congressman RYAN, but for the name of cap-and-trade. Cap-and-trade.

We heard from two court cases at the end of last year the fact that the EPA was going to regulate emissions, and we decided in the House we were going to allow a free-market approach to handle this rather than have the United States EPA regulate emissions in this country. That is going to make our American businesses stronger, by allowing the Midwest innovation to drive this instead of our dependence on foreign oil. The innovation of America is going to drive our future progress in this realm.

But let's revisit what some of our colleagues have said about the cap-and-trade system, as they like to call this new energy solution that we are going to find for our country. It is about cap-and-trade, as JOHN MCCAIN has said. There will be incentives for people to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. It is a free-market approach. Let me repeat that, Congressman RYAN: it is a free-market approach. The Europeans are doing it. We did it in the case of addressing acid rain. If we do that, we will stimulate green technologies. There will be profit-making in the business arena. It won't cost the American taxpayer.

□ 2200

Joe Lieberman and I introduced a cap-and-trade proposal several years ago which would reduce greenhouse gases with a gradual reduction. We did the same thing with acid rain. This works. This really works. The Republican Presidential candidate last year introduced a cap-and-trade bill three times in the United States Congress because he believes it's a free market approach and that it won't cost the American taxpayers.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I had an interesting conversation with someone from Babcock the other day. They're in Barberton, Ohio. They're in your district, Congressman. They do a lot of defense work and a lot of work with the military.

I asked the guy, What portion of your employers work on these kinds of ''green'' technologies?

He said that half of their workers are employed, the engineers and other workers, on the issues of cleaning up the air—the scrubbers—the technology that goes into power plants and into other facilities to help clean some of the poison out of the air that was causing all kinds of health problems.

There are industries that pop up to clean the air. These are economic development opportunities. Now, that $750 billion that goes abroad will come back to the United States. The money will be invested into windmills, into solar panels, into batteries, into new autos, into all kinds of different things.

The other day, we were in Kent, at Alpha Micron. They're making a liquid crystal-based technology that is film on windows. It darkens when the sun comes out to keep the house cool in the summertime. They just opened up a manufacturing facility in Kent, Ohio. They have 45 people working there now. Once this product catches on, there will be hundreds of people working there, making this special liquid crystal technology film that will be going into the homes to conserve energy.

The economy will adapt. People will find ways to make money and to make profits off of these things. Yet, when you go to the gas tank, you might as well send the check to the OPEC countries. Now, let's be honest with each other. What we're saying is, when you stop at a gas station or whatever kind of station there's going to be in the next decade or two, we want that money staying in Ohio—in the Midwest, in America. So you send the $750 billion off. Then you pay your tax bill at the end of the year, and you send money to the Federal Government. Then you find out that the Defense Department is sending $120 billion of your tax dollars to escort oil ships that are going in and out of the Persian Gulf.

Does this make any sense to anybody? This makes no sense what we're doing here. We've got to stop it. Then we send subsidies to the oil companies so that they can keep going. This doesn't make any sense. I'm sorry. I don't know any other way to say it. We need to stop doing this. It's going to have some disruption, and everyone is going to have to figure this out, but we have smoothed this over for over 20 years, and no one is jamming this down anybody's throat.

These manufacturing facilities have all kinds of credits. We're holding harmless a lot of manufacturers, a lot of consumers. We'll see infinitesimal increases 10 years from now. It may be $100 a year, but the benefit is that $750 billion is going to come back to the United States and is going to get invested here. The Defense Department

won't be spending money escorting oil ships in and out of the Persian Gulf.

I mean let's stop this. This is insane. It doesn't make any sense. It's wasting all kinds of money. It's polluting the air. It's empowering countries that are on sand. Then they hate America, and we get tangled in all of these geopolitical problems that we don't need to be involved in. Let's invest the money back into the United States. I mean, do you want to talk about a pro-American position? There couldn't be a bigger one. You know that. You've been to Iraq four times, five times.

This young man has flown in and out of here. By ''young,'' I mean 5 years older than I, but he has flown in and out. He has flown soldiers back over here who have died while serving their country, and he's saying we can't keep doing this. JOHN MCCAIN, who served the country so nobly, said the same thing, that we can't keep doing this. Stop. That's what this is about.

It's about leadership. It's not about just going down the same road and about doing what's comfortable. That doesn't get you anywhere. This is about leading. There is going to be a transition; but at the end of the day, you're going to provide a safer country for your kids, a less entangled geopolitical situation for our country, and you're going to create jobs in the United States. This is a win-win-win.

Mr. BOCCIERI. Congressman, if you would yield, just yesterday, we had wonderful news in the 16th Congressional District. Rolls-Royce is anchoring its world headquarters for fuel-cell research in our part of Ohio. The robust research that they're doing on fuel cells is going to be anchored in our part of Ohio because we're beginning to take action where there was none previously. Let me just say this:

Quite frankly, I believe that we will be judged in next year's elections by two measures—whether we acted or whether we did not, by action or inaction. Teddy Roosevelt said that the worst thing you can do in a moment of decision is nothing, and we know that the status quo is unsustainable with an energy policy in this country which continues to empower petro dictators who hold America hostage by our importing 66.4 percent of oil from around the world. We're going to expand drilling in the United States here. We know that this will not be the answer to all of our energy woes here because we only have 3 percent of the world's oil reserves in the Northern Hemisphere, but we consume 24 percent of the world's oil, so we've got to find diversity. We've got to find a way to become diverse Americans in our energy consumption, which will be by investing in these alternative energies. Whether it's switchgrass or algae or whether it's ethanol or biofuels or whether it's fuel cells, we've got to make this transition now because it is about our national security.

So, next year, when we go before the voters, when we go before our citizens and our constituents, they are going to ask us: Did you act to make America stronger?

All of us know we have relatives and friends, and friends of mine, who are still serving over in the Middle East right now. We are there, fighting for countries that provide us a whole lot of oil. In fact, 40 percent of our oil comes from the Middle East. Like Rudolph Giuliani said last year, if 27 percent of the vehicles on the roads were gas-electric hybrids like the Toyota Prius or the Ford Escape, we could end our dependency on oil in the Middle East. That is a goal we should all strive towards.

Rudolph Giuliani said that we need to expand the use of hybrid vehicles and of clean coal—$324 million of research in clean coal in Ohio every year, Congressman RYAN, and in carbon sequestration. We have more coal reserves in the United States than we have oil reserves in Saudi Arabia. This should be a major national project. Let me echo that again in this Chamber. This should be a major national project. This is a matter of our national security. We've got to act, Congressman RYAN.

Now, I graduated with a baseball degree, and I minored in economics in college, but let me tell you this: In 2003, our former President said this about a Department of Defense study: The risk of abrupt climate change should be elevated beyond a scientific debate to a U.S. national security concern. The Department of Defense was saying this under our previous President.

He also said that the economic disruptions associated with global climate change are projected by the CIA and by other intelligence experts to place increased pressure on weak nations that may be unable to provide the basic needs and to maintain order for their citizens.

We've got our CIA saying this. We have our Department of Defense saying this. We've got every candidate running for President last year saying this is a matter of national security. What did we have? We had a vote along partisan lines.

National security is about America. It's not a Democrat or Republican challenge. It's not a conservative or a liberal challenge. It's about making America stronger. When we invest in ourselves, we will become stronger. This is about our future and about our children's future. It's about creating jobs here in Ohio, Congressman RYAN, like we did with Rolls-Royce and like we will do with so many others that are beginning this burgeoning industry.

□ 2210

Having a diversity of energy, we should all agree, is going to make our country stronger. And these two long-term challenges of health care and of energy should be national projects, national projects that make our country stronger and protect our national security in the long run.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. The thing is, too, with this manufacturing, this green manufacturing, we have Thomas Steel in Warren, Ohio, is now making the specialty steel. About 300 steelworkers signed a contract with a solar panel company from Toledo, a very exciting proposition, because when the solar panel industry takes off, a local steel company in Warren, Ohio, with United Steelworkers of America that have good health care benefits and a decent pension are going to benefit from this.

And the more solar panels happen, the more steel they are going to buy from Warren, Ohio, the more steelworkers that are going to go to work. Ohio Star Forge on Mahoning Avenue, they make a bearing that goes into the windmill, 4,000 component parts. No, 8,000, 8,000 component parts that go in the windmill. That's what we do.

Does anyone else have a better idea how to revive manufacturing in the United States of America than to have us supplying 8,000 component parts and 400 tons of steel that go into a windmill? Does anyone have anything better? Cut taxes for the rich people and hope it trickles down? That's not a manufacturing policy in the United States of America.

But what we are doing here with the Volt at General Motors, with the new battery storage, the hybrids, we drove in a car the another day, Congressman INSLEE and ISRAEL and I, that went from California to Washington, D.C., on algae, on algae. Do you know how you grow the algae? You pump a bunch of CO_2 in it and it grows the algae.

So here you have an opportunity to learn, make cars that run on algae, grow the algae in places like Ohio that, unfortunately, or maybe fortunately, at some point, give off all this CO_2, grow the algae, put it in cars, and we have a clean economy, and it's a new economy.

And, let me tell you something, there is not a lot going on manufacturing-wise in the United States anymore. But if you take the $750 billion that we keep sending abroad to oil-producing countries and that money comes back to the United States, that's a heck of a lot of investment here to go into companies that are going to make these 8,000 component parts that are going to go into the windmills, that are going to make the 400 tons of steel that are going to go into the windmills and the cars and the solar panels and the biodiesel facilities. I haven't heard a better idea.

It's nice to be against everything, but does anyone have another idea on how to get 750 billion that's going right out of the country back here?

Come on, let's be smart. Let's keep our money in America. That's what this is all about. This is the most pro-American, pro-independence, pro-freedom, pro-liberty bill you could ever get your hands on because it directs investment into the United States of

America and puts Americans back to work.

You know, if you are refitting homes with insulation, with special roofing to capture rainwater, those are sheet metal workers. Those are carpenters. Those are building tradespeople that you and I live and work with every single day. Put them back to work. This is great.

I don't see it, other than being against it.

Mr. BOCCIERI. Well, they weren't against it last year. In fact, I point to my friend Mike Huckabee who suggested that a Nation that can't feed itself, a Nation that can't fuel itself, or a Nation that can't produce the weapons to fight for itself is a Nation forever enslaved. He also said that it's critical that for our own interests economically, and from a point on national security, that we commit to become energy independent and we commit to doing it within a decade.

We sent a man to the Moon in a decade. I think in 20 years we could become energy independent. I believe we can. We have to take responsibility in our own House before we can expect others to do the same in theirs. It goes back to his basic concept of leadership, that leaders don't ask others to do what they are unwilling to do themselves. That's why leaders who ran for the office of the Presidency last year believe that a strong national energy policy is about making America stronger, relying on the innovation in the Midwest rather than relying on Middle East oil. That makes America stronger.

In 1950, over half of the jobs in this country were in manufacturing. We are at 10 percent now because we exported our ability to produce and build things here. We are becoming the movers of wealth instead of the producers of wealth.

Let's invest in something that we have to use every day, and that's energy. Let's invest in our own future, produce things here. Let's build windmills here. Let's let Timken in Canton, Ohio, make the roller bearings for these huge wind turbines. Let's let SARE Plastics in Alliance build the moldings and cast moldings for these wind turbines. Let's let fuel cells be developed at Rolls Royce so that we can put them in our cars and have them recharge batteries and use the solar panels that are developed in our part of Ohio recharge the batteries that are being developed in Medina County in my congressional district.

Let's use that compressed natural gas now that we are using and researching at the Ohio State Agricultural Research Center in Wooster, Ohio. Let's use that compressed natural gas to turn our generators to heat and to produce electricity for our homes.

That's the type of innovation and diversity of energy that will make America stronger in the long run and focus, focus on our economic interests as a country.

As John Kennedy said, we do these things not because they are easy but because they are hard. Because they are hard. But we know that if we don't make this transition right now, decades later we will make America very, very vulnerable.

When I go back and answer to my constituents, when I go back and answer to the people, I want to tell them I stood with them, and I stood with making America strong.

INCREASE SOURCES OF ENERGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KRATOVIL). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, what a glorious evening it is to come to the floor to remind my colleagues about a little fact and about a little truth. I have heard so many things over the last 15 or 30 minutes, Mr. Speaker, I am not quite certain where to begin.

But I guess I would begin by imploring my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to talk to the Speaker. Goodness gracious, talk to the Speaker. When they talk about expand drilling, oh, they could talk to the President as well, expand drilling. You betcha, Mr. Speaker, you betcha that that's what we want to do is expand drilling.

When they talk about clean coal technology and advancing clean coal technology, you betcha, Mr. Speaker. The problem is, the Speaker of the House and the President of the United States don't support it. That's the problem.

I would encourage them to talk to their own leadership because the principles and the policies that they have just espoused over the last 15 to 30 minutes are as strong as we have on our side of the aisle, the Republican side of the aisle, espoused over the last number of years. I would encourage them to talk to their leadership. I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that one of the things that was said is absolutely correct, and these aren't Democrat problems and these aren't Republican problems. They are American problems.

To that end, I want to talk about what America has been concerned about. Mr. Speaker, if you think about what happened in August in this Nation, all across this Nation, it was a remarkable outpouring, a remarkable outpouring of concern, yes, and of fear, yes, and of anger about the direction in which the American people see their Nation headed.

What they said, I believe, in town hall after town hall and meeting after meeting after meeting was, Washington, you are not listening. You are just not listening. We thought that we were electing change in November of 2008, and, in fact, we have elected change as a Nation.

□ 2220

The problem is the change that's being instituted by my friends on the other side of the aisle and the Speaker and the President are not the change that the American people wanted. That's the problem.

So they come out to these meetings and they come out to talk to their Representatives, if even they will meet with them. So many of my friends on the other side of the aisle refused to hold town hall meetings. But they come out to these meetings and they say, Please, please listen to us. Listen to what we're telling you. Your policies are killing us. They're killing us from an economic standpoint, too many taxes. You're spending our children and our grandchildren's money. You just can't do that. We can't do that at home. You can't do that at the Federal level.

And so what they want are solutions. And my friend on the other side of the aisle earlier talked about solutions. And I'm going to talk a lot—a lot—about solutions this evening, because even this evening my two grand colleagues from Ohio reiterated this fabrication, this falsehood. Oh, yes, Mr. Speaker, something that isn't absolutely the truth when they say that Republicans have no solutions; they don't bring any solutions to the table.

Well, we're going to talk about tonight a couple of solutions just in the area of energy and health policy. And if you, Mr. Speaker, would like to go look at our solutions, they're on our Web site. I'm privileged to chair the Republican Study Committee, the largest caucus in the House of Representatives, that puts solutions on the table for every single American challenge that we face, solutions that embrace fundamental American principles that are optimistic and forward thinking and upbeat and realize that the reason we're the greatest Nation in the history of the world is because we have followed fundamental American principles.

So you can Google Republican Study Committee or go to RSC.price.house.gov—RSC.price.house.gov—and look at our solutions. Look at our solutions for an economy that we've seen a nonstimulus bill that is driving more individuals into unemployment, that is losing 4 million jobs just in this year alone.

Look at our solutions, which is the contrast to a budget that was passed by this House of Representatives that spends money that we don't have, borrowed from the Chinese Government; money that makes us $1 trillion in debt year after year after year after year. And the American people are fed up with it, Mr. Speaker.

Look at our solutions that say that the way to be able to utilize American resources responsibly so that we solve the energy challenges that we have, there's a way to do that that makes it so that the government isn't put in charge and also so that we aren't taxing the American people to death.

Mr. Speaker, look at the solutions at RSC.price.house.gov for the health care

challenges that we face that we will be talking about a little more this evening.

I want to start with the health care issues because one of the things that drove me into public service after 20 years of practicing medicine—Mr. Speaker, I took care of folks who had broken bones and battered bodies as an orthopedic surgeon for over 20 years. I took care of them the best way I knew how and the best training that I was able to avail myself of, and I took care of them in a way that oftentimes led me to believe that the State government and the Federal Government were impacting the ability of myself and my staff in an adverse way—in an adverse way, not a positive way—in an adverse way to be able to care for those patients.

So my friends on the other side of the aisle, the presentation that we just saw, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman had six Ps. I only caught five of them. But they were: People, portability, preexisting conditions, physicians, and prevention.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that none of those—none of those challenges that the gentleman from Ohio described—none of them are improved by the intervention of the Federal Government. Not one. Not one.

So when I talk about principles in the area of health care, which is what I think we need to be talking about here in the United States House of Representatives and the Congress of the United States and by the President, we ought to be talking about principles of health care so that we create a system that is responsive to patients. That's the goal. Correct, Mr. Speaker? Responsive to patients.

When we talk about principles, most of us have the top three. Most Americans have the top three principles. They're affordability. You ought to be able to afford the system that we create. Accessibility. You ought to be able to get into the system if you're a patient. And quality. You want the highest quality of care in the world, which is in fact what we have right now.

I add three more principles to those: affordability, accessibility and quality. I add three. One is responsiveness. You have got to be able to have a system that's responding to people, which is so often not the case in other nations where they have systems that are taken over by the government.

The second is innovation. We are a Nation that has allowed for the greatest amount of innovation in the world—in the world—in the area of health care. That has resulted in the highest quality of care for all of our citizens, for every single American. So we want a system that creates and incentivizes innovation.

Third and finally, choices. The American people want choices when it comes to health care. They want to be able to choose their doctor; they want to be able to choose where they're treated. They want to able to choose when they're treated and how they're treated. And that ought to be their right. That ought to be their right.

So principles of health care—affordability, accessibility, quality, responsiveness, innovation, choices. Those six principles, Mr. Speaker. And you may have some others, the people listening may have some others.

I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that those six principles, and the ones that were outlined by my friend from Ohio just a little bit earlier this evening, that none of those principles are improved by the intervention of the Federal Government. Think about it. Accessibility to the system. The Federal Government runs basically four specific medical programs: Medicare, Medicaid, the VA Health Service, and the Indian Health Service.

Accessibility. All of those systems have some kind of rationing of care. You don't have to take my word for it. Talk to anybody who works in those systems. When I worked in the VA Medical Center in Atlanta, we would get to a point every single quarter when they would say, I'm sorry, you can't perform any more total joint surgeries this quarter. And it wasn't because we'd run out of total joints; it wasn't because we'd run out of prostheses. It wasn't because we'd run out of patients for whom the indication was to provide them with a total joint.

No, Mr. Speaker, it was because we had run out of money. And that's because when you get a government-run system, what happens is that the decisions are controlled by money; they're not controlled by patients and by quality. Accessibility is limited in every one of those.

For example, the Mayo Clinic, one of the finest health care providers in the Nation, in Jacksonville, Florida, is limiting the number of Medicare patients that it sees. Limiting the number of Medicare patients that it sees. Why? Not because they forgot how to take care of seniors. No, it's because the system is broken and flawed.

That's what happens with a government system, is that it limits accessibility. When veterans in our veterans health care system call up for an appointment, are they given the appointment in the way that happens in a personal or a private setting? No, because accessibility is limited in a government health care system, not just in the United States, but in every other system in the world that is run by the government. It's limited. Accessibility is limited.

So affordability is compromised; accessibility is compromised. Quality is compromised because of those first two. Responsiveness and innovation, certainly not consistent with anything that the Federal Government does with responsiveness and innovation. No, we know that responsiveness is in the private personal sector. We know that innovation is in the private personal sector, not in the governmental sector. Certainly, the government tries to catch up. And sometimes it does with relative efficiency. But it doesn't do so initially because there's nothing, nothing in the Federal Government that demands that you have responsiveness and innovation.

And then the final principle of choices. The Federal Government and choices are inconsistent with each other because the Federal Government defines what individuals ought to do, defines what individuals must do, and determines basically what is available to people. And if it's available in something that doesn't mean anything to folks by and large, it doesn't really make a whole lot of difference.

But in the area of health care, in the area of medicine, in the area of personal decisions that make it so that you are able to care for you and your family in the most personal and effective way, the government has no place in those decisions.

□ 2230

The government has no place in those decisions, Mr. Speaker, none. And they ought not. So our friends on the other side of the aisle say, Oh, no, the government is the only entity that can provide the balance to this equation. Mr. Speaker, you know that the balance in this equation in the area of health care means that individuals will not receive the kind of care that they desire, not receive the kind of care that they and their families choose for themselves. They'll receive the kind of care that the government chooses for them, but they won't receive the kind of care that they and their families desire.

In the fall of 2009, nothing could be more important here in Washington and here in the United States Congress as we try to talk productively about this issue that is of such incredible importance to the American people. One of the greatest concerns that I have is that at least half, and maybe more—at least half of the Members of Congress have been shut out of this debate. I mentioned that I'm privileged to Chair the Republican Study Committee, the largest caucus in the House of Representatives. We have attempted to solicit and take the President at his word when he said, If you have an idea, if you'd like to discuss the issues that we have before us in the area of health care, come on down to the White House. My door's open. Right, Mr. Speaker? That's what he said. My door's open. Come on down, and we'll go over the bill line by line.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this may come as a surprise to some folks, but we, the Republican Study Committee, have been asking for a meeting with the President of the United States since the week he was sworn into office. And the response every single week has been, Well, thank you very much. This is an incredibly important issue. There are nine Members of our conference who are physicians, like I am, who have significant passion about the

issue of health care and the reason that we ought not put the government in charge. Our friends on the other side of the aisle say cavalierly, Well, you just ought to let the government compete for this.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, if the government competes for it, it drives over 100 million individuals, over 100 million Americans from personal, private health insurance that they choose, that they select for themselves and their families. It drives them, it shoves them, it forces them into the government program. Mr. Speaker, that's not what you want, or at least that's not what you say you want. That's not what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle say they want, by and large. But that's the system that we're going to have if, in fact, the Speaker of the House and the President have their way.

So we've got some incredibly important issues to discuss here in the United States House of Representatives. I'm joined this evening by a great friend and colleague, the gentlelady from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) who has been front and center on the health care issue and on the energy issue. I know that she has been frustrated by much of the information we have heard this evening, especially in the area of energy policy, because we have been fighting tooth-and-nail to make certain that we could put forward an all-of-the-above energy strategy. My friends on the other side of the aisle earlier this evening talked about the lack of solutions that we have. So I'm pleased to yield to my friend from North Carolina, VIRGINIA FOXX, for her comments on energy or whatever else she would like to chat about this evening.

Ms. FOXX. Well, I thank you, Dr. PRICE, for beginning this hour and bringing an extraordinarily comprehensive and cogent discussion to the health care issue. I did hear more of our colleagues who were here in the previous hour talking about energy than health care. But I did hear them say if we were to adopt the health care proposals—and I assume that they mean H.R. 3200—that that would bring long-term economic growth to this country. And I thought that I must be living in either Never-Never Land or Wonderland or someplace other than in the United States of America and serving in the United States Congress, because having the government take over health care in this country is a formula, in my opinion, for harming economic growth in this country, not creating economic growth. I think that the American people have caught on to that.

I want to say that the thing that kept running through my mind as I was listening to them—and let me say here that many folks wonder why we often are here speaking to an empty Chamber. But we're usually in our offices, listening to what's going on in the Chamber, along with about 800,000 other people in the country. So we do listen to each other, and sometimes it is very frustrating to hear what's being said, because I believe, in many cases, the American people are being misled by the comments that are being said. We don't expect to see long-term economic growth from health care. One of the best things, I think, that has happened this entire summer is that the American people have been paying closer attention to what's being proposed in the Congress.

H.R. 3200 has been looked at by the public, and they understand that what we have been saying about the bill is more accurate than what our colleagues have been saying about the bill. I have read the bill. I know you have read the bill, and I want to encourage more and more Americans to read it because I don't think that the time has passed for our considering that bill. I think that, or something similar to it, is going to be dealt with on the floor of the House.

But what I wish is that more Americans had paid closer attention to the bill that our colleagues call cap-and-trade, and which we call cap-and-tax, because I think if the American people had paid as much attention to that as they have to the health care bill, they would have been up in arms earlier this year. Most of them don't realize that, again, what our colleagues were saying is just the opposite of what they do in legislation.

Last summer we were here talking about the problems with energy. Gas prices were skyrocketing. And as you pointed out, we stood for an all-of-the-above energy policy in this country. We want to be able to use the resources that are available to us in this country. I believe the Good Lord gave us the resources in this country to take care of our energy needs. But our colleagues on the other side of the aisle—and let's say it—the Democrats are in control of this Congress. It's very important that people understand that our colleagues who were speaking a while ago were speaking of the folks in charge who are of their party. They make it seem like they're not in control, that they can't make the things happen that they're talking about. But they are in control. Every day they make us more and more dependent on that foreign oil that they say they don't want us to be dependent on.

We have seen here how they have shut down accessibility to shale and oil and the Outer Continental Shelf. Over and over and over again, they stymie every opportunity that we have to increase the sources of energy in this country.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. FOXX. Absolutely.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I appreciate those comments because I was stunned as I was sitting here, listening to the gentleman from Ohio say—and I wrote it down just because I was so astounded—say that we ought to increase our use of ''coal, nuclear and oil shale.'' He said that, and in fact, that is exactly the opposite thing that his party has done; isn't that the truth?

Ms. FOXX. It is absolutely the truth. In fact, in the cap-and-trade bill, that they call it—we call it cap-and-tax—what it will do is it will make us more dependent. It stops the use of coal in this country. We have much more coal resources available to us than Saudi Arabia has oil resources, and we know that. But they seem to hate coal and want to do everything that they possibly can to diminish the use of it.

There are no plans for creating nuclear energy, increased nuclear energy. Yet we know if we're going to maintain our standard of living in this country, we need to be building in the next 30 years 30 to 50 nuclear power plants. We also know that since World War II, France has gotten 85 percent of their electricity from nuclear power, and they have never had one tiny problem as a result of that. But the radical environmentalists in this country seem determined to create blackouts in this country. They don't want coal. They don't want us to drill for oil. They don't want nuclear. They're even protesting now putting in solar panels out in the Mojave Desert. They don't want wind farms.

Solar and wind are not the solutions to our energy needs, and we know that. President Obama said he would double the use of alternative energies, meaning wind and solar, and yet President Bush did that in the last 18 months of his administration. We went from 1.5 percent to 3 percent. Well, President Bush did that in 18 months. President Obama has said that he would double it during his first term. Well, going from 3 percent to 6 percent, given how the technology is growing, isn't a very big leap.

□ 2240

But we also know that we can only absorb in our current electric grid only 10 percent of solar and wind. Beyond 10 percent we put our wonderful system of energy in great jeopardy because we simply don't have the grid to handle it, and we can handle up to 10 percent, as I understand it from listening to the experts. But even that, for us to absorb 10 percent of wind and solar, which are undependable, and that's the main reason we can't absorb more than 10 percent, would take $3 trillion to redo our grid. They never say anything about that cost. And to be able to put in cap-and-tax would be enormously expensive to the average American consumer. We know that it's probably going to increase energy costs between $1,700 and $3,000 for the average American family. They never mention that when they're talking about what they want to do in terms of alternative energy.

I think it's very important, again, that we call the attention of the American people to that bill. I'm sorry I forgot to write down the number of the bill, but if people, again, would pay

some attention to that bill and read it, as they have H.R. 3200, I think they'd find that we are telling the truth about it and that rather than expanding domestic energy sources, it's going to contract domestic energy sources because of all the rules and regulations and the costs of them. I think it's a cruel hoax being put out to the American people along with what they have been saying about health care also.

I want to switch back to that subject because you are an expert in both of these areas, but you're really such an expert in the health care area. I want to take it down, though, to, I think, a conversation that everybody can understand.

When I was growing up in western North Carolina in the 1950s, my family was extraordinarily poor. I mean dirt poor, as we used to say. And yet we could afford health care. I had chronic asthma and allergies and often had to get health care treatment, and my family could pay for that. The costs were very low. And I began to think a few years ago, now, what has happened since I was a child living out in the country, a very rural area, the poorest county in North Carolina, and yet we had a small hospital, we had doctors there who would treat us, and we could pay cash and meet our obligations? What has happened since that time in the mid 1960s Medicare was created, Medicaid was created? Government policies encouraged companies to provide health insurance for their employees because they could tax deduct it but individuals could not. So the rules changed dramatically.

I know also that we have wonderful technology. We have many, many more specialists in our country, and our health care has gotten better and better in this country. And I get really furious when I hear these statistics from our colleagues that want to say that we are 35th in the level of health care that we provide. Well, why is it that everybody comes to our country to get health care and why is it that our average lifespan is now 80 years old and people are living such vibrant lives right up almost until death, most people are? It's because we have created government-run health care in Medicare and Medicaid and in the other areas that you talked about and third-party payer. We have taken away the sense of responsibility from Americans for how much things cost. And everybody thinks, well, if insurance is going to pay for it, it's not costing me anything. I'll utilize it to the full.

But I make the analogy we all have to buy car insurance because as we drive our cars, there is the chance we will harm someone else, so we all have to have liability insurance. But our car insurance does not pay to change our oil or put new tires on the car, and yet we have come to accept that.

The same thing with homeowner's insurance. We buy homeowner's insurance because it's the practical thing to do. But if our roof gets a leak in it, we don't turn that in to the insurance company. We fix the roof because we know if we don't fix the roof, pretty soon the ceiling is going to be leaking, then the floor is going to be damaged.

So we assume that responsibility for our cars and our homes, and yet over the years, this insidious growth of government and third-party payer through insurance have taken away the sense of responsibility that we have for taking care of our own bodies and taking care of our own health. And the more we involve the government, the worse it's going to be. We don't need government-run health care in this country. We need to follow the principles that you outlined, and I think you did a beautiful job.

The other thing I want to say is we keep hearing that Republicans have no alternatives. Our alternatives fit exactly the principles that you outlined, and I just want to mention a couple of bills here.

H.R. 2520, the Patient's Choice Act by Mr. RYAN from Wisconsin. The Patient's Choice Act would transform health care in America by strengthening the relationship between the patient and the doctor by using the forces of choice and competition rather than rationing and restrictions. It seeks to ensure universal affordable health care for all Americans.

And then there's the bill that you introduced, which you, I don't think, have spoken of, but it's H.R. 3400, and we want to make sure people understand the difference: The Empowering Patients First Act to increase patients' control over their health care decisions by offering more choices and the highest quality available.

We have comprehensive bills out there that do what needs to be done, but the Speaker refuses to pay attention to those, as you said, and the President refuses to pay attention to them. They are determined to control every aspect of our lives, and taking over health care gives them the wonderful opportunity to do that.

I want to thank you again for leading this hour tonight and getting us on the right track on these issues.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Thank you ever so much, my dear friend from North Carolina, Ms. FOXX, who outlines very specific and clear and cogent discussion points in the area both of energy policy and in health care policy.

I think one of the important takeaways that I would offer in the area of energy policy is that we have been talking about and desirous of what we call an all-of-the-above energy solution that our friends on the other side talk about but, in fact, they have never voted for or introduced policy legislation that would accomplish that. And by ''all of the above,'' we mean sincerely that America has been blessed with incredible resources, remarkable resources, and that we ought to be able to utilize them in a very environmentally responsible and sound way.

What does that mean? That means that offshore from the United States, there are resources that we can utilize. Onshore there are oil resources that we ought to be able to utilize: oil shale technology that allows us to gain the fossil fuels from oil shale; shale out west, to be able to use that and supply the American people with appropriate resources in the area of oil; clean coal technology, which my friend from North Carolina discussed and our friends on the other side talk about but, in fact, they vote against every time it comes up; and then nuclear technology.

We ought to be able to use increasing nuclear resources to be able to provide energy for the American people. And we ought to be able to do so not just because it's the right thing to do for our Nation, not just because it's available to us and the good Lord has blessed us with this remarkable knowledge and expertise and resource base, but because in so doing, we make it so that we're not helping people across the world who don't like us. There are people that we are supporting to a huge degree, the Government of Venezuela, which is headed by an individual that has absolute animosity for the United States. There are governments in the Middle East that we are sending literally hundreds of billions of dollars to that are not fond of the United States or our government or our people.

□ 2250

We ought not be utilizing American resources, American tax money, American labor, and ingenuity to fund folks who don't care for us. That is just wrong. If it were the only option available, that would be one thing, but it is not. There are wonderful resources that we have, but we are blocked by the Democrats in charge and the majority party. And that is wrong.

The President has said over and over again that he doesn't believe that we ought to utilize our resources in this way. As the gentlelady from North Carolina says, he wants to double wind and solar energy. That is fine. That is great. But it will be ultimately 6 to 8 percent of the energy utilization of this Nation. That is not going to get us over the hurdle. It is not going to get us where we need to be.

So on the one hand, we need to conserve more. Absolutely. We need to utilize American resources for Americans. That is a responsible thing to do. That is a common sense thing to do. One would think if one was elected to the United States House of Representatives or the Senate that one would have that as a responsible feature of their policy, to utilize American resources for Americans. And we ought to be able to incentivize the creation of the new form of energy without the government picking winners and losers. That is a responsible energy policy. That is an all-of-the-above energy policy. That is an energy policy that we have been clamoring for for years, literally, and

have been blocked at every single turn by our friends on the other side of the aisle in their beholden nature to folks who would not allow us to use American resources.

I want to talk a little more about the issue of health care because it is driving the entire debate here in Washington today.

I have talked about principles in health care: accessibility, affordability, quality, responsiveness, innovation, and choices, and that none of those principles are improved by the intervention of the Federal Government.

I don't think there is a single American who sincerely believes that they are improved by more imposition of rules from Washington. So if you believe that, if we believe that, then the President would have us believe there are only two alternatives, that it is either the government in charge or it is the insurance companies in charge.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is a false choice. That is a false premise. In fact, it is not just the government in charge or the insurance companies in charge; in fact there is a better way. There is the right way. There is the correct way, and that is to put patients and their families in charge.

How do you do that, to put patients and their families in charge so that accessibility, affordability, quality, responsiveness, innovation, and choices are all improved? In fact, all of the principles in health care are improved if the patients are in charge. In fact, the system moves in the direction that it ought to move, and the direction that our health care system ought to move isn't the direction I, as a physician or Member of Congress believe it ought to move; it isn't the direction that you believe it ought to move; it isn't the direction in which our collective intelligence here in the House believes it ought to move. The direction that it ought to move in is the direction that patients want it to move. The only way to do that is to allow patients to control the system.

Mr. Speaker, the bill that will do that is H.R. 3400. You can go to the Web site for the Republican Study Committee, rsc.price.house.gov. Look it up. It is right there. There is a side-by-side with H.R. 3200, which is Speaker PELOSI and the Democrats in charge here in the House, their monstrosity, a 1,000-plus-page bill. Or there is a responsible way to do it, H.R. 3400.

Now what does H.R. 3400 do? Well, it does five big things very specifically, in addition to a lot of other things, but five big things.

One is that it gets Americans insured. It is imperative that we make certain that those individuals who are unable or appear to have the lack of resources to be able to finance health coverage for themselves or their family have the wherewithal to do that. How do you do that as a good conservative? Well, you make it so for every single American it makes financial sense to be insured. Americans are bright people. They are making financial decisions right now not to be insured. So we devise a system, create the rules of a system that will respond to patients that will make it so each and every American citizen sits down at the end of the day and when they are doing their budget, they realize that it makes more sense for them financially to be insured than not.

You do that through a series of tax deductions, tax credits, refundable tax credits, advanceable refundable tax credits, tax equity for the purchase of insurance so that individuals are able to purchase insurance with pretax dollars, just like businesses, instead of post-tax dollars. So you get folks insured.

Secondly, you have to solve the challenges of the health insurance system right now. There are wonderful things about our health care system, but there also some things that are flawed. Those flawed things we ought to solve, and they are relatively easy to solve.

For example, the two main issues, portability, you ought not lose your insurance if you change your job or you lose your job. It ought not be the case. Preexisting injury or illness. If you happen to have a diagnosis that results in a major calamitous event for you or your family from a medical standpoint, or you have an injury that results in a major expenditure, you ought not be priced out of the market. You ought not lose your insurance. That is wrong.

So how do you solve that? Well, you make it so that individuals own and control their insurance policy so they can take it with them if they lose their job or they change their job. In addition to that, you make it so Americans can pool together with millions of other people for the purchase of insurance. So you get the purchasing power of millions even if you are one individual or a small group or small business or small employer in that market to purchase health insurance. So you solve those challenges. You get people insured, and you solve the insurance challenge.

Third is to make absolute certain that it is patients and their families and doctors who are making medical decisions. Not government bureaucrats, not insurance bureaucrats, not anybody else.

Medical decisions are some of the most personal decisions we ever make in our lives for ourselves and for our family. We ought to have the right, we do have the right, but we ought to be able to exercise the right of making those decisions ourselves.

It is a sad commentary, Mr. Speaker, right now in America that in order to get that accomplished you have to write that into law. That is a sad commentary, but it is where we find ourselves right now. So H.R. 3400 says that, that nobody else in the Federal Government or the insurance industry will be able to make decisions as it relates to the provision of medical services and care for individuals or members of their family.

Fourth, we solve the issue of lawsuit abuse. Lawsuit abuse, the lottery mentality that we have created in our society that makes it so that individuals believe if they just hit the right note, if they just are able to find the right cause of action against a physician or hospital, they might make millions. That results in the practice of defensive medicine. And the practice of defensive medicine are those tests and examinations that your doctor performs or orders in order to make certain, make absolute certain to as much scientific certainty as one can that the diagnosis or procedure he or she proposes for a patient and then carries out is backed up by all of the knowledge and evidence that is available to them so that if they find themselves in a court of law at some point they can look at the judge and jury and say look, I did every one of these things to make certain what I proposed to do and what I did was appropriate for this patient. And the judge and the jury nod their head and say, yes, he or she did.

It doesn't make any difference whether the first two of those things were what was necessary to perform the diagnosis or cure the patient, the next 15 or 16 were redundant; but that is the practice of defensive medicine. Hundreds of billions of dollars each year, and it is not necessarily that it harms the patient, because it doesn't; but it makes it so that the system spends so much more money than it has to in order to provide the care that it currently provides because of the lawsuit abuse that we have.

Mr. Speaker, so we can have everybody insured. We can solve the insurance challenges. We can make certain that medical decisions are made in their rightful place, that is, between patients and families and doctors; and we can solve the whole issue of lawsuit abuse.

And the fifth item in H.R. 3400 is that we can do all of those things that would solve 99 percent-plus of the challenges that we face in health care, all of those things we can solve without raising taxes one penny. Not one penny.

□ 2300

So, Mr. Speaker, when we look at 3400 and when we compare it to the bill that has been passed through three committees here in the House of Representatives by the Democrats in charge, a $1.3 trillion monstrosity, a 1,000-plus-page monstrosity that results in an $800 billion tax increase and a $500 billion slash to Medicare programs—when you look at that, that's why the American people are confounded, they're confused. They don't understand what's going on because they know that that's not the solution. They know that the majority party—the Democrats in charge, the Democrats in power—are taking us down a path that is not consistent with what they believe.

They cry out, clamor, and have said over August and earlier this month, Why aren't you listening to us? Why aren't you listening to us?

So that is why the opportunity that we have in this Chamber and in the Senate, right down the hall here in the Capitol, to solve the challenges that we face in positive ways that make fundamental American principles come to the table is so wonderful. We've got a great opportunity. In fact, we're ignoring that right now because of the leadership that we have—because of the lack of leadership from this Speaker and from this Congress to allow to be put in place the positive solutions that are available to us as a Nation.

My friend from North Carolina is kind enough to stick around and to remain here for these discussions. I'm happy to yield to her.

Ms. FOXX. Well, I thought that it might be useful to throw out a few other statistics tonight. I haven't had a chance to read this entire article, but the Weekly Standard, September 21, has an interesting article in it by Fred Barnes, entitled ''An Unnecessary Operation.'' It has some very interesting statistics in it, some of which we have talked about before. I think it's important to point out, he says here in this article, that 89 percent of Americans, in a June 2008 ABC News-USA Today-Kaiser Family Foundation survey, said they were satisfied with their health care.

Most Americans think that we're trying to do too much in our government. One area that they're very happy with is their health care, and I think that it's important that we point that out.

As you say, there are things that do need to be done. There is no question. Republicans understand we need to make modifications in people's accessibility to health care, in its portability—those principles that you laid out earlier. We want to do that, and we have ways to do that, as you say, without it costing a dime to the American people. That's what we should be focusing on. With 89 percent of Americans being satisfied with their health care, let us make minor adjustments to the health care system.

Let me point out some other statistics that, I think, are very, very important. These go against those people who decry what an awful health care system we have in this country, which really infuriates me because, again, we know that people are coming here—thousands of them. In here, I think they say 400,000 people a year come from other countries to get medical care. Let's talk a little bit about those.

The two very major innovations in health care are the MRI and the CT. The statistics on this are absolutely astounding in terms of the numbers of machines. The United States has 27 MRI machines per million Americans. Canada and Britain have 6 per million. We have 27. The United States has 34 CT scanners per million. Canada has 12 per million. Britain has 8 per million.

Now, we know just on the face of it, with that many fewer machines, it's going to take a lot longer to have access to those machines. Right now, American patients pay out-of-pocket expenses of 12.6 percent. It's much higher in other countries, including the countries that have government-run health care.

Then we can talk a little bit about mortality. I mean, again, you've laid out the arguments for why we should make the kinds of changes you've recommended and that Republicans have recommended, but let's talk a little bit about survival rates:

For all cancer, 66.3 percent of American men and 63.9 percent of American women survive. In Europe, it's only 47.3 percent of men and 55.8 percent of women who survive after 5 years. These are statistically significant numbers. Let's talk about breast cancer. There is a 90.1 percent survival rate for Americans and a 79 percent survival rate for Europeans. I mean, not only do we have the least expensive health care in this country and the most available health care in this country, but we also have much, much greater survival rates in this country.

Why do we want to mess up that system by implementing what Speaker PELOSI and President Obama have recommended? That is simply going to go against the Hippocratic oath.

I was thinking about that earlier. I know physicians say, above all else, they should do no harm. You know, I really think that that needs to be added to our oath when we come here and swear our allegiance to the Constitution. I think it's entirely appropriate for us to do that, but I really think we should add something like the Hippocratic oath, which says to do no harm, because what the Democrats want to do, who are in charge of this government right now—of the Congress as well as of the executive branch—is to actually bring harm to the American people. They will be violating all of those principles which you laid out earlier, and we're going to be reducing life spans and survival rates if we go to a government-run plan. It's unnecessary except that it is part of the philosophy of the liberal Left.

Their idea is that the government knows best. For those of us who are conservatives and who are mostly Republicans, our idea is that it's not the government that knows best. We should leave people as free as possible, and we should operate as we have for over 200 years in our society and in our country, which is with a capitalistic operation. We have a Judeo-Christian bedrock. Our rule of law and our capitalistic system have allowed us to have the most successful society that has ever existed in the world.

Yet these folks want the government to take over. They want the government to run automobile companies and to become banks for student loans. Everything should be run by the government, in their minds, while we say let's perfect the situations that we have. We can certainly improve what we do in almost every area, and we should focus on those things instead of turning upside down and reversing the things that we do well.

So I want to thank you very much for leading this hour and for focusing on these two issues, energy and health care, which are so important to Americans, and for helping to set straight some of the things that our colleagues said, particularly in the previous hour, but they're things which they say almost every day. Let's call them to task on those issues.

Thank you, Dr. PRICE, Congressman PRICE, for the leadership you've given to the RSC and particularly to this issue of health care.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Thank you so much, my friend from North Carolina, Congresswoman FOXX, for your wonderful expertise and comments.

You alluded to significant misinformation on this issue, and there is a lot of misinformation out there. It's no wonder that the American people find themselves somewhat confused.

One of the problems that I have found is that one of the greatest purveyors of misinformation happens to be the President of the United States, himself. Again, you don't have to just believe me. I have a letter from the American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons, responding to President Obama's remarks about amputations, remarks which some of you may recall. The President has insisted on saying that physicians make financial decisions, and that's why they do things in treating patients, which is abhorrent to members of the medical profession. The oath that they take, as you said, Ms. FOXX, is, first, to do no harm.

□ 2310

The President, as you recall, Mr. Speaker, said sometime about 6 to 8 weeks ago that we have a system that doesn't allow or doesn't incentivize the treatment of a diabetic limb disease and then rewards by providing 30 or 40 or $50,000 in compensation for surgeons to take off a limb, amputate a limb.

Mr. Speaker, I was struck by that, because when I first heard it I was astounded. In fact, what it showed me was that the President has no clue about what it means to take care of patients and the incentives that go into caring for patients, not a clue.

I was so heartened when I read a letter from Dr. Joseph D. Zuckerman, who is the president of the American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons, that I would submit for the RECORD, dated August 13, 2009, in which he said to the President:

''Dear Mr. President:

''On behalf of the American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons (AAOS), I am writing to express our profound disappointment with your recent comments regarding the value of surgery and blurring the realities of physician reimbursements. The AAOS represents

more than 17,000 U.S. board-certified orthopaedic surgeons who provide essential services to patients every day. As you yourself have said, 'Where we do disagree, let's disagree over things that are real, not these wild misrepresentations that bear no resemblance to anything that's actually been proposed.' In that spirit, we would like to bring some clarity to your comments and underscore the value that orthopaedic surgeons bring to Americans every day of every year.

''First, surgeons are not reimbursed by Medicare, nor by any provider for that matter, for foot amputations at rates anywhere close to $50,000, $40,000 or even $30,000. Medicare reimbursements to physicians for foot amputations range from approximately $700 to $1,200, which includes the follow-up care the surgeon provides the patient [for] up to 90 days after the operation. Moreover, orthopaedic surgeons are actively involved in the preventive care that you mentioned. We are a specialty that focuses on limb preservation whenever possible and when it is in the best interests of the patient. Our approach to amputation follows the same careful, thoughtful approach, always with the patient's best interest as the primary focus.

''It is also a mischaracterization to suggest that physicians are reimbursed 'immediately.' The AAOS itself, along with numerous other organizations, has testified in congressional hearings investigating the delays in reimbursement by Medicare and other payers that create additional administrative burdens making it more difficult to provide access to care for patients.

''As you continue to pursue your health care reform agenda, we implore you to disengage from hyperbole,'' and it goes on.

[From AAOS Now, Sept. 2009]

AUGUST 13, 2009.

AAOS RESPONDS TO OBAMA'S AMPUTATION REMARKS

President BARACK OBAMA,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On behalf of the American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons (AAOS), I am writing to express our profound disappointment with your recent comments regarding the value of surgery and blurring the realities of physician reimbursements. The AAOS represents more than 17,000 U.S. board-certified orthopaedic surgeons who provide essential services to patients every day. As you yourself have said, ''Where we do disagree, let's disagree over things that are real, not these wild misrepresentations that bear no resemblance to anything that's actually been proposed.'' In that spirit, we would like to bring some clarity to your comments and underscore the value that orthopaedic surgeons bring to Americans every day of every year.

First, surgeons are not reimbursed by Medicare, nor by any provider for that matter, for foot amputations at rates anywhere close to $50,000, $40,000, or even $30,000. Medicare reimbursements to physicians for foot amputations range from approximately $700 to $1,200, which includes the follow-up care the surgeon provides to the patient [for] up to 90 days after the operation. Moreover, orthopaedic surgeons are actively involved in the preventive care you mention. We are a specialty that focuses on limb preservation whenever possible and when it is in the best interests of the patient. Our approach to amputation follows the same careful, thoughtful approach, always with the patient's best interest as the primary focus.

It is also a mischaracterization to suggest that physicians are reimbursed ''immediately.'' The AAOS itself, along with numerous other organizations, has testified in Congressional hearings investigating the delays in reimbursement by Medicare and other payers that create additional administrative burdens making it more difficult to provide access to care for patients.

As you continue to pursue your health care reform agenda, we implore you to disengage from hyperbole and acknowledge that health care delivery can only be improved by recognizing that health care is a system in which orthopaedic surgeons play a crucial role. With $849 billion of our national economy impacted by musculoskeletal conditions, orthopaedic surgeons provide care that improves lives and puts peoplg back to work. Pediatric orthopaedic surgeons provide life-altering care to our nation's children and play an invaluable role in ensuring Medicaid patients have access to needed services. Military and civilian orthopaedic surgeons provide care to our service women and men, which preserves limbs and has improved survival rates over past conflicts. Orthopaedic trauma surgeons perform limb- and life-saving procedures and help to ensure that our communities have the medical services that we all deserve. Total hip and knee replacement surgeries are now two of the most successful operations in medicine through a predictable reduction in pain, restoration of function, and return of patients to both work and activities of daily living. And we are working every day to ensure that medicine provides Americans with disabilities the quality of life to which they are entitled.

The AAOS is committed to improving the American health care delivery system and increasing health care coverage. The most expedient way to accomplish your goal is to ensure that the debate is based in fact and reflects the value of the services that all physicians, including orthopaedic surgeons, provide. We request a meeting with you and your staff at your earliest convenience to discuss these important issues.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH D. ZUCKERMAN, MD,
President, American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons.

Mr. Speaker, it is remarkable that the leader of this Nation continues to suggest, as do our friends on the other side of the aisle and the majority party, that the quality of health care that's provided in this Nation is not of the highest quality in the world. In fact, it is.

If you look at disease-specific criteria, whether it's cancer or heart disease or diabetes or trauma or virtually any disease you can think of, Americans have the highest quality of care related to that specific diagnosis than anywhere in the world. It's why my friend from North Carolina said that when people are injured or have a disease from somewhere else in the world, they come, they flock to the United States by the hundreds of thousands to get care. And in this whole discussion about health care, to denigrate the care that's provided by compassionate and caring physicians and other providers around this Nation does a disservice to the debate and it makes it so that we are not talking about real things, about real things that affect real people.

So I implore the President, I call on the President, I call on the Speaker, I call on my friends on the other side of the aisle to know of which you speak when you are talking about health care, to make certain that when you are talking about issues that relate to accessibility for patients and affordability for patients and quality of care and responsiveness of a system and innovation in a system and choices that patients must have in order to gain the highest quality of care and the care that's most appropriate for them and their families.

Because, Mr. Speaker, as you may know, and as I hope the President now recognizes, that a given diagnosis in one patient doesn't necessarily mean that the same diagnosis in another patient is followed up with the same treatment, because no two people are the same. It's what this whole debate ignores. No two American citizens, no two individuals in this world, given the same diagnosis, regardless of that diagnosis, are absolutely the same, and the treatment that those individuals ought to receive ought to be determined by patients, those patients, and their families and caring and compassionate physicians.

This notion by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, by the President of the United States, by the Speaker of this House and by members of the majority party that somehow you could come up with some algorithm that if you just answer the questions correctly and march through the maze that the American people will be better served, Mr. Speaker, you know that's not true and I know that's not true.

When we come to this House, when we come to the United States Senate and we recognize that there are challenges that we face in the health care arena, we ought to come together as Americans and solve this challenge in a way that respects those principles of health care and respects the fundamental American principles that have allowed us to become the greatest nation in the history of mankind.

I look forward to that debate. I look forward to that discussion, and I look forward to being able to vote and have all Members of this body vote on a bill that will reform our health care system in a positive and productive way.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MEEK of Florida (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of business 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. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SOUDER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, September 25 and 29.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today, September 23 and 24.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, today, September 25 and 29.

Mr. FORBES, for 5 minutes, September 23.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, September 25.

Mr. INGLIS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, today, September 23, 24 and 25.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, for 5 minutes, September 24.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah, for 5 minutes, September 23 and 24.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, for 5 minutes, September 23 and 24.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 23, 2009, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3629. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; St. Thomas Harbor, Charlotte Amalie, U.S.V.I. [COTP San Juan 07-079] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3630. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; St. Thomas Harbor, Charlotte Amalie, U.S.V.I. [Docket No.: COTP San Juan 07-098] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3631. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Christiansted Harbor, Christiansted, U.S.V.I. [Docket No.: COTP San Juan 07-108] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3632. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Captain of the Port San Juan Tropical Cyclone Safety Zone [COTP San Juan 07-190] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3633. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zones: San Juan Harbor and Rio Grande, Puerto Rico [COTP San Juan 07-193] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3634. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; St. Croix Coral Reef Swim, Buck Island Channel, USVI [Docket No.: COTP San Juan 07-219] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3635. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Bahia de Guanica, Guanica, PR [Docket No.: COTP San Juan 07-250] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3636. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone: Sag Harbor Volunteer Ambulance Corp. Fireworks, Havens Beach, Sag Harbor, NY [CGD01-07-107] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3637. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Pier 67, Edgewater Hotel, Elliott Bay, Washington [CGD13-07-044] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3638. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Bellevue, KY, Ohio River Mile 469.2 to 470.2 [Docket No.: COTP Ohio Valley 07-024] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3639. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Tennessee River Mile Marker 255.5 to 256.5, Tuscumbia, AL [Docket No.: COTP Ohio Valley-07-027] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3640. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Pier 59/Seattle Aquarium and Pier 58, Elliott Bay, Washington [CGD13-07-045] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3641. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Clinch River Mile Marker 0.5 to Mile Marker 1.5, Kingston, TN [Docket No.: COTP Ohio Valley-07-028] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3642. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Ohio River Mile 307.5 to 309.1, Huntington, WV [Docket No.: COTP Ohio Valley-07-029] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3643. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Pier 70/Waterfront Seafood Grill Restaurant, Elliott Bay, Washington [CGD13-07-046] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3644. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Cumberland River Mile Marker 125.4 to 126.6, Clarksville, TN [Docket No.: COTP Ohio Valley-07-030] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3645. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone: Budd Inlet, West Bay, Olympia, Washington [CGD13-07-047] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3646. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Ohio River Mile Marker 262.8 to Mile Marker 268.5, Point Pleasant, WV [Docket No.: COTP Ohio Valley-07-031] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3647. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Temporary Safety Zone; New Sauvie Island Bridge Arch Transfer Safety Zone, Terminal 2, Willamette River, Portland, Oregon [CGD13-07-050] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3648. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Warsaw, KY, Ohio River Mile 527.5 to 528.5 [Docket No.: COTP Ohio Valley 07-032] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3649. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Temporary Safety Zone; New Sauvie Island Bridge Arch Transfer Safety Zone, Terminal 2, Willamette River, Portland, Oregon [CGD13-07-050] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3650. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Port Everglades, Fort Lauderdale, Florida [COTP Miami 07-202] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3651. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones; Weather-Forced Closure of the Tillamook Bay Bar and Entrance [CGD13-07-058] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3652. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Oracle Air Show Demonstration, San Francisco Bay, CA [COTP San Francisco Bay 07-045] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3653. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones: Weather-Forced Closure of Quillayute River, Washington Coastal Bar [CGD13-07-059] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3654. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Butterfly Restaurant Fireworks Display, San Francisco, CA [COTP San Francisco Bay 07-046] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3655. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones: Weather-Forced Closure of the Columbia River Bar and Tillamook Bay Bar and Entrances [CGD13-08-001] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3656. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Paradise Cup Shoot Out, Franks Tract, CA [COTP San Francisco Bay 07-048] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3657. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Motor Vessel COSCO BUSAN, in San Francisco Bay, California [COTP San Francisco Bay 07-052] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3658. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Ford Ironman 70.3 California Triathlon, Oceanside Harbor, CA [COTP San Diego 07-014] (RIN: 1625-00AA) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3659. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Jet Jam Performance Weekend Jet Ski Races, Lake Havasu, AZ [COTP San Diego 07-017] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3660. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; North San Diego Bay, San Diego, CA [COTP San Diego 07-051] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3661. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Ohio River, Miles 791.0 to 795.0, Evansville, IN [Docket No.: COPT Ohio Valley 07-021] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3662. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Mission Bay, CA [COTP San Diego 07-052] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3663. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Mission Bay, San Diego, CA [COTP San Diego 07-351] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3664. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Upper Mississippi River Mile Marker 82.3 to 83.3, Grand Tower, IL [Docket No.: COTP Ohio Valley-07-037] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3665. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Upper Mississippi Mile Marker 54.0 to 54.8, Cape Girardeau, MO [Docket No.: COTP Ohio Valley-07-038] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3666. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Cumberland River Mile Marker 190.6 to 191.1, Nashville, TN [Docket No.: COTP Ohio Valley-07-039] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3667. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Tennessee River, Mile Markers 324.0 to 324.5, Huntsville, AL [Docket No.: COTP Ohio Valley-07-040] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3668. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Cumberland River Mile Marker 126 to 127, Clarksville, TN [COTP Ohio Valley-07-041] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3669. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Kanwaha River Mile Marker 58.0 to 59.0, Charleston, WV [Docket No.: COTP Ohio Valley-07-043] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3670. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone: Weather-Forced Restriction of all vessel traffic on the Gray's Harbor, Washington Bar and entrance [CGD13-08-002] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3671. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Tennessee River Mile Marker 471 to 476, Chattanooga, TN [Docket No.: COTP Ohio Valley-07-044] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3672. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Kennebunkport, ME Presidental Visit [CGD01-07-089] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3673. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Ohio River Mile 931 to 935, Ledbetter, KY [COTP Ohio Valley-07-056] (RIN 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3674. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Kennebunkport, ME, Presidential Visit [CGD01-07-089] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3675. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone: St. Peter's Fiesta Fireworks — Gloucester, Massachusetts [CGD01-07-090] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3676. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone: Point O'Woods Fire Department Fireworks, Great South Bay, Point O'Woods, NY [CGD01-07-106] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3677. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River Mile Marker 951 to 953, Cairo, IL [Docket No.: COTP Ohio Valley-07-035] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3678. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Upper Mississippi River Mile Marker 0.5 to 2.0, Cairo, IL [Docket No.: COTP Ohio Valley-07-036] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3679. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone: Christmas Boat Parade Fireworks, Patchogue Bay, Patchogue, NY [CGD01-07-160] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3680. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone: Christmas Boat Parade Fireworks, Patchogue River, Patchogue, NY [CGD01-07-159] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3681. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Salem Haunted Happenings, Salem, MA [Docket No.: CGD01-07-154] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3682. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety

Zone: Thames River Channel, New London, Connecticut [CGD01-07-149] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3683. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone: Gillette Castle Celebration Fireworks, Connecticut River, East Haddam, CT [CGD01-07-147] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3684. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone: Thames River Channel, New London, Connecticut [CGD01-07-146] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3685. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; Marine Events on the Colorado River, between Davis Dam (Bullhead City, Arizona) and Headgate Dam (Parker, Arizona) [COTP San Diego 07-006] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3686. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Ohio River Mile Marker 602.0 to 603.5; Louisville, KY [Docket No.: COTP Ohio Valley 07-033] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3687. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Ohio River Mile 496.8 to 497.8, Aurora, IN [Docket No.: COTP Ohio Valley-07-034] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3688. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; 600 yards off North West shore of Lake Palourde, IVO Lake End Park Morgan City, LA [COTP Morgan City-07-005] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3689. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Morgan City-Port Allen Alternate Route, Mile Marker 14 to Mile Marker 16, bank to bank, Belle River, LA [COTP Morgan City-07-006] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3690. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; 200 yards east to 200 yards west of the Lewis Street Swing Brige at MM52.5 Bayou Teche, New Iberia, Louisiana, bank to bank [COTP Morgan City-07-007] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3691. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway MM58.5 to MM59.5 WHL, bank to bank [COTP Morgan City-07-011] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3692. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Ohio River, Miles 604.4-605.0, Louisville, KY [COTP Ohio Valley 07-010] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3693. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Ohio River Mile Marker 307.8 to 308.8, Huntington, WV [COTP Ohio Valley-07-011] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3694. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Ohio River Mile Marker 182.5 to 183.5, Parkersburg, West Virginia [Docket No.: COTP Ohio Valley-07-013] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3695. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Kanwaha River Mile 46.1 to 57.1, Saint Albans, WV [Docket No.: COTP Ohio Valley-07-014] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3696. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Cumberland River Mile Marker 126 to 127, Clarksville, TN [COTP Ohio Valley-07-015] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3697. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Ohio River Mile Marker 943 to 944, Metropolis, IL [Docket No.: COTP Ohio Valley-07-016] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3698. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Ohio River Mile 321.6 to 323.3, Ashland, KY [Docket No.: COTP Ohio Valley-07-017] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3699. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Ohio River Mile 316.6 to 317.6, Big Sandy River Mile 0.0 to 0.5, South Point, OH [Docket No.: COTP Ohio Valley-07-018] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3700. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Ohio River Mile 265.2 to 266.2, Kanawha River Mile 0.0 to 0.5, Point Pleasant, WV [Docket No.: COTP Ohio Valley-07-019] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3701. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Ohio River Mile 355.5 to 356.5, Portsmouth, OH [Docket No.: COTP Ohio Valley-07-020] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3702. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Ohio River Mile 171.3 to 172.6, Marietta, OH [Docket No.: COTP Ohio Valley-07-022] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3703. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Cincinnati, OH, Ohio River Mile 461 to 470 [Docket No.: COTP Ohio Valley 07-023] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3704. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Fox Wedding Fireworks, Boston, MA [CGD01-07-144] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3705. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Fox Wedding Fireworks, Boston, MA [CGD01-07-144] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3706. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone: The Event Store Fireworks, Southold Bay, Southold, NY [CGD01-07-143] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3707. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone: NY Islanders Kick-Off Celebration Fireworks, Bayville, NY [CGD01-07-142] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3708. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone: Redstone Wedding Fireworks, Revere, MA [CGD01-07-131] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3709. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Celebrate Revere Fireworks, Revere, MA [CGD01-07-128] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3710. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Search and Rescue Operations, Quinnipiac River [CGD01-07-125] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3711. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone: Blynman Canal Bridge over the Blynman Canal, Gloucester, Massachusets [CGD01-07-124] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3712. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone: Friends of John Rouse Fireworks, East Beach, Port Jefferson, NY [CGD01-07-122] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3713. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Kennebunkport, ME Presidential Visit [CGD01-07-119] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3714. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Yankee Homecoming Fireworks, Newburyport, MA [CGD01-07-117] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3715. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Portland Harbor, Maine, The Zone Living Urban/Epic Triathlon [CGD01-07-114] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CARDOZA: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 760. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 324) to establish the Santa Cruz Valley National Heritage Area, and for other purposes (Rept. 111–263). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. AUSTRIA (for himself, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. BILBRAY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. PITTS, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. MARCHANT, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. AKIN, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. POSEY, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, and Mr. CASSIDY):

H.R. 3610. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve access to health care by allowing a deduction for the health insurance costs of individuals, expanding health savings accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROUN of Georgia (for himself, Mr. BOREN, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. LINDER, and Mr. TAYLOR):

H.R. 3611. A bill to restrict the diplomatic travel of officials and representatives of state sponsors of terrorism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROUN of Georgia (for himself, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, and Mr. KINGSTON):

H.R. 3612. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to waive the 10 percent penalty with respect to early retirement distributions for certain unemployed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.R. 3613. A bill to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to modify financial disclosure filing requirements for certain employees of the Executive Office of the President; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 3614. A bill to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. SCHRADER (for himself, Mr. NUNES, Mr. KIND, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BRIGHT, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona, Mrs. HALVORSON, Mr. MANZULLO, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. SCHAUER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. HIMES, Ms. KOSMAS, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, Mr. PAUL, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. MINNICK, Mr. PERRIELLO, and Mr. NYE):

H.R. 3615. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a standard home office deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. FALLIN:

H.R. 3616. A bill to expedite the exploration and development of oil and gas from Federal lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. OBERSTAR (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts):

H.R. 3617. A bill to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a multiyear law reauthorizing such programs; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Natural Resources, and Science and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. OBERSTAR (for himself, Mr. MICA, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. LOBIONDO):

H.R. 3618. A bill to provide for implementation of the International Convention on the Control of Harmful Anti-Fouling Systems on Ships, 2001, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Science and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. OBERSTAR (for himself and Mr. CUMMINGS):

H.R. 3619. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 2010, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H.R. 3620. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employers a credit against income tax for employing members of the Ready Reserve and National Guard and veterans recently separated from the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALTMIRE:

H.R. 3621. A bill to require employees at a call center who either initiate or receive telephone calls to disclose the physical location of such employees; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BRIGHT:

H.R. 3622. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit for the construction of pond establishments for the purposes of non-commercial recreational fishing and conservation of water-based wildlife habitats; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Alabama:

H.R. 3623. A bill to amend the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 to provide funding for successful claimants following a determination on the merits of Pigford claims related to racial discrimination by the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 3624. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to ban the use of the arsenic compound known as roxarsone as a food additive; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York (for herself and Mr. PLATTS):

H.R. 3625. A bill to provide for the Secretary of Education to study and report on the marketing of foods and beverages in elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York (for herself and Mrs. MALONEY):

H.R. 3626. A bill to amend section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786) to promote and support breastfeeding; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PERRIELLO:

H.R. 3627. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employers a credit against income tax for the cost of teleworking equipment and expenses in rural and small town America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 3628. A bill to create a cause of action and allow standing in Federal courts against a country that denies or unreasonably delays the repatriation of a national ordered removed from the United States to such country who later commits a crime of violence in the United States, to withhold foreign assistance from each country that denies or unreasonably delays the repatriation of nationals of such country who have been ordered removed from the United States, to prohibit the issuance of visas to nationals of such country, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RODRIGUEZ (for himself and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 3629. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to develop and implement a mitigation plan to address the ecological impacts of border security measures and activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BROWN of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, and Mr. INGLIS):

H. Con. Res. 187. Concurrent resolution remembering the 20th anniversary of Hurricane Hugo, which struck Charleston, South Carolina on September 21 through September 22, 1989; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MCMAHON (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH):

H. Con. Res. 188. Concurrent resolution recognizing the 75th anniversary of the National Conference of State Liquor Administrators; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SCHWARTZ (for herself and Mr. HINCHEY):

H. Con. Res. 189. Concurrent resolution encouraging the Government of Iran to grant consular access by the Government of Switzerland to Joshua Fattal, Shane Bauer, and Sarah Shourd, and to allow the 3 young people to reunite with their families in the United States at the soonest possible opportunity; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CAMP (for himself and Mr. KILDEE):

H. Res. 759. A resolution expressing condolences to the family of Jim Pouillon on his passing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. WOLF, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. FLAKE, Ms. WATSON, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SIRES, Mr. DREIER, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. OLVER, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. HARE, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. NADLER of New York, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. PASTOR of Arizona):

H. Res. 761. A resolution remembering and commemorating the lives and work of Jesuit Fathers Ignacio Ellacuria, Ignacio Martin-Baro, Segundo Montes, Amando Lopez, Juan Ramon Moreno, Joaquin Lopez y Lopez, and housekeeper Julia Elba Ramos and her daughter Celina Mariset Ramos on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of their deaths at the University of Central America Jose Simeon Canas located in San Salvador, El Salvador on November 16, 1989; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HINCHEY (for himself, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MASSA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MURPHY of New York, and Mr. TONKO):

H. Res. 762. A resolution honoring the Hudson River School painters for their contributions to the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. INGLIS):

H. Res. 763. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United Nations resolutions on the ''defamation of religions'' are incompatible with the fundamental freedoms of individuals to freely exercise and peacefully express their religious beliefs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 122: Mr. AUSTRIA and Mr. MORAN of Kansas.

H.R. 147: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. HEINRICH.

H.R. 197: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 208: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. JONES, Mr. MACK, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. HALVORSON, and Mr. REHBERG.

H.R. 213: Mr. SNYDER.

H.R. 272: Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 275: Mr. KLINE of Minnesota and Mr. JORDAN of Ohio.

H.R. 303: Mr. DRIEHAUS, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 305: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 333: Mr. DRIEHAUS, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 391: Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, and Mr. BLUNT.

H.R. 422: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 471: Mr. CARNEY, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. HARE, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 571: Mr. MCMAHON and Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 621: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 649: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 678: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 690: Mr. HIMES and Mr. AUSTRIA.

H.R. 734: Mr. TEAGUE and Mr. BOREN.

H.R. 795: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. RUSH, and Ms. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 811: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 816: Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. BOCCIERI, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. HONDA, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. INGLIS, Mr. PETERSON, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 847: Mr. SIRES and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 855: Ms. SPEIER and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 868: Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BERKLEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 930: Mr. BAIRD.

H.R. 953: Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. NYE, and Ms. MARKEY of Colorado.

H.R. 1017: Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 1074: Mr. MCCLINTOCK and Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 1079: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. PITTS.

H.R. 1086: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 1147: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 1173: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1182: Mr. REHBERG, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mrs. HALVORSON, and Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 1203: Ms. SCHWARTZ.

H.R. 1207: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.

H.R. 1242: Mr. LYNCH and Mrs. BIGGERT.

H.R. 1245: Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 1255: Mr. MORAN of Kansas.

H.R. 1269: Mr. CHAFFETZ.

H.R. 1283: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H.R. 1300: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 1322: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 1326: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.

H.R. 1339: Mr. BURGESS and Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 1454: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. MASSA.

H.R. 1456: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1474: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1548: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 1570: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1587: Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 1588: Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 1590: Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. SESTAK, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 1608: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 1618: Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 1628: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 1646: Mr. KLEIN of Florida.

H.R. 1695: Mr. WITTMAN, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Ms. TITUS, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 1727: Mr. RADANOVICH.

H.R. 1806: Mr. MCMAHON.

H.R. 1826: Mr. CHANDLER.

H.R. 1831: Mr. DRIEHAUS, Mr. FARR, Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1835: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. HODES, and Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 1864: Mr. MACK and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 1885: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 1917: Mr. SESTAK.

H.R. 1924: Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 1964: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1969: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1977: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York and Mr. SCALISE.

H.R. 1985: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 1993: Mr. SARBANES and Mr. HALL of New York.

H.R. 2002: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2006: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 2017: Mr. FOSTER and Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 2054: Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 2061: Mr. MORAN of Kansas.

H.R. 2067: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 2084: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 2138: Mr. LEE of New York and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 2140: Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 2149: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 2170: Mr. REHBERG.

H.R. 2194: Mr. ETHERIDGE and Mr. HELLER.

H.R. 2214: Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 2254: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2269: Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 2296: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.

H.R. 2302: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 2319: Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 2328: Mr. EHLERS.

H.R. 2329: Mr. CHILDERS, Mr. SKELTON, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. PERRIELLO, and Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 2365: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 2393: Mr. SHULER.

H.R. 2408: Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 2413: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. HIMES, and Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 2429: Mr. SESTAK and Mr. CARNAHAN.

H.R. 2452: Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. MARCHANT, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.

H.R. 2476: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 2478: Mr. BAIRD, Mr. CARNAHAN, and Mr. PITTS.

H.R. 2499: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts and Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN.

H.R. 2523: Mr. SABLAN.

H.R. 2555: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 2567: Mr. WALZ and Ms. SUTTON.

H.R. 2573: Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 2575: Mr. CHAFFETZ.

H.R. 2626: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 2695: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 2697: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Ms. CHU.

H.R. 2708: Ms. CHU.

H.R. 2715: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 2733: Mr. ELLSWORTH and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 2736: Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. HODES, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. BOREN, and Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 2737: Mr. POSEY, Mr. MINNICK, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MAFFEI, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. TERRY, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 2807: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 2817: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 2935: Mr. PITTS and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 2936: Mr. CARNEY and Mr. HOLDEN.

H.R. 2941: Mr. BAIRD, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. MATSUI, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 2964: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 3012: Mr. RUSH and Mr. HEINRICH.

H.R. 3017: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. CHU, Mr.

MEEKS of New York, Mr. DICKS, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. RUSH, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. WATSON, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. ARCURI, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 3042: Mr. COHEN and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 3043: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 3070: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DRIEHAUS, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 3085: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 3105: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California and Mrs. BONO MACK.

H.R. 3141: Mr. TEAGUE.

H.R. 3206: Mr. OLVER, Ms. WATSON, and Mr. BAIRD.

H.R. 3226: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. LANCE, and Mrs. BIGGERT.

H.R. 3245: Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 3308: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 3336: Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 3339: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. INSLEE.

H.R. 3355: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 3365: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. MINNICK, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 3371: Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 3383: Mr. LEE of New York.

H.R. 3398: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 3400: Mr. TIAHRT.

H.R. 3454: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 3485: Mr. HINCHEY and Mr. HALL of New York.

H.R. 3486: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HARE, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 3488: Mr. VAN HOLLEN and Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 3508: Mr. DENT, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 3522: Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 3524: Mr. FARR, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. HEINRICH.

H.R. 3536: Mr. GRAYSON and Mr. WILSON of Ohio.

H.R. 3548: Mr. SIRES, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. SUTTON, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 3554: Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 3569: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CULBERSON, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. JONES, Mr. BONNER, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. LANCE, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mrs. BIGGERT.

H.R. 3571: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. SHADEGG, and Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 3572: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.

H.R. 3584: Mr. CLEAVER and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 3586: Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 3597: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 3607: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 3608: Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. HONDA, Mr. BONNER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. LUCAS.

H.J. Res. 47: Mr. LAMBORN and Mr. LEE of New York.

H. Con. Res. 43: Ms. NORTON.

H. Con. Res. 52: Mr. SESTAK.

H. Con. Res. 74: Mr. WHITFIELD.

H. Con. Res. 149: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H. Con. Res. 151: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. SIRES, Mr. CAO, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H. Con. Res. 158: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H. Con. Res. 160: Mr. BURGESS, Mr. KRATOVIL, and Mr. SULLIVAN. H. Con. Res. 163: Mr. ELLISON.

H. Con. Res. 170: Mr. WEXLER.

H. Con. Res. 177: Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. CAO, Mr. FILNER, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. COBLE, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. SKELTON.

H. Con. Res. 181: Mr. LEE of New York and Mr. SCHAUER.

H. Con. Res. 186: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H. Res. 16: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. GERLACH, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. JONES, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. EHLERS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. PAUL, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. BACHUS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. KIRK, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. TERRY, Mr. TURNER, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DENT, Mr. CAPUANO, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. KOSMAS, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. HIMES, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. KING of New York.

H. Res. 55: Mr. SMITH of Texas and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H. Res. 111: Mr. HARPER and Mr. CLAY.

H. Res. 175: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. CAO.

H. Res. 200: Mr. COHEN.

H. Res. 209: Mr. SESTAK.

H. Res. 255: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Mr. TANNER.

H. Res. 291: Mr. NYE and Mr. BACA.

H. Res. 351: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona.

H. Res. 414: Mrs. EMERSON.

H. Res. 441: Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana and Mr. HIMES.

H. Res. 491: Ms. SUTTON.

H. Res. 605: Mr. TOWNS.

H. Res. 613: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H. Res. 615: Mr. BUCHANAN and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H. Res. 630: Mr. WALZ, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Mr. HARE.

H. Res. 666: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California and Mr. CAO.

H. Res. 672: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H. Res. 692: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. BARROW, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. ROSS.

H. Res. 693: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. FARR, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. WATERS, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H. Res. 704: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. NYE, Mr. STARK, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H. Res. 707: Mr. WAMP.

H. Res. 711: Mr. HONDA and Mr. SCHIFF.

H. Res. 715: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MASSA, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. HALL of New York.

H. Res. 716: Ms. RICHARDSON.

H. Res. 717: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H. Res. 721: Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. INGLIS, and Mr. NUNES.

H. Res. 727: Mr. BAIRD, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. MURTHA.

H. Res. 729: Mrs. BACHMANN.

H. Res. 733: Mr. WOLF, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. FALLIN, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H. Res. 736: Mr. NYE, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. KIRK, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H. Res. 739: Mr. TANNER, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. CARNAHAN.

H. Res. 740: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. KIND, and Mr. SKELTON.

H. Res. 742: Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. TANNER, Mr. BOSWELL, and Mr. JONES.

H. Res. 743: Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. KOSMAS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. MAFFEI, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. WALZ, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. PAYNE.

H. Res. 748: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H. Res. 749: Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H. Res. 752: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, and Mr. SHIMKUS.

H. Res. 754: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MASSA, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. KRATOVIL, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. AKIN, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. CAO, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. BOSWELL, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. TAYLOR.

H. Res. 758: Ms. WATSON and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. RAHALL

H.R. 324, the Santa Cruz Valley National Heritage Area Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of Rule XXI.