raised by low power radio's former opponents.

We would like to thank the offices of Representatives Mike Doyle and Lee Terry, as well as Chairman Rick Boucher and Chairman Henry Waxman, for their tireless work in bringing both sides to a final version of the legislation that everyone can accept.

Communities across the country have been waiting for more than a decade for the opportunity to apply for their stations. The time for compromise and delay is over. We urge support for the bill in the House and full passage—without change—by the Senate.

Sincerely,

PETE TRIDISH,
Executive Director, Prometheus Radio Project.

CAROL PIERSON,
President & CEO National Federation of Community Broadcasters.

LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE ON CIVIL RIGHTS,
Washington, DC, December 14, 2009.

Re Support the Local Community Radio Act of 2009 (H.R. 1147)

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights (LCCR), the nation's oldest, largest, and most diverse civil and human rights coalition with nearly 200 member organizations, we urge you to support H.R. 1147, the bipartisan Local Community Radio Act of 2009, when it comes to the floor to a vote. The version being considered by the House of Representatives should be adopted into law.

H.R. 1147, introduced by Representatives Mike Doyle (D–PA) and Lee Terry (R–NE), will help increase the number of Low Power FM (LPFM) stations in our country by authorizing the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) to license thousands of LPFM radio stations in cities, towns, and suburbs across the country. In an era of mass media consolidation, LCCR believes that it is important to preserve this avenue through which diverse viewpoints can be represented over the public airwaves.

LPFM refers to community-based, nonprofit radio stations that operate at 100 watts or less and have a broadcast reach of only a few miles. Since 2000, the FCC has awarded more than 800 LPFM licenses to civil rights organizations, schools, and church groups. By authorizing even more LPFM licenses, H.R. 1147 will help ensure that all segments of society have the opportunity to participate fully in the broadcast communications environment in two important ways: by enhancing diverse viewpoints and by enhancing diverse ownership.

LCCR has long regarded expanding minority and female ownership in media as an important goal because of the powerful role the media plays in the democratic process, as well as in shaping perceptions about who we are as individuals and as a nation. By providing community leaders the opportunity to have a voice on the public airwaves where no such opportunity previously existed, LPFM radio will help promote greater diversity on the public airwaves.

While Latino Americans, African Americans, Asian Americans, and Native Americans make up one-third of the U.S. population, they own only 7.2 percent of all full-power radio and TV stations. Women make up 51 percent of the U.S. population, yet own less than 6 percent of full-power commercial radio and TV stations. We believe there is a direct connection between those who own these stations and the content they produce.

If you have any questions, please contact Corrine Yu, LCCR Senior Counsel, or Nancy Zirkin regarding this or any issue.

Sincerely,

WADE HENDERSON,
President & CEO.

NANCY ZIRKIN,
Executive Vice President.

Mr. TERRY. I appreciate your efforts, Mr. DOYLE.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. DOYLE mentioned a variety of religious organizations that support this, and I found the same thing in my community.

I want to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) who, in fact, wants to speak on that aspect of our low-power community radio.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1147, the Local Community Radio Act of 2009.

I appreciate the leadership of Congressman LEE Terry of Nebraska on this important issue.

Passage of this bipartisan legislation is vital to expanding the availability of noncommercial, low-power—LPFM—radio stations to towns and cities across our country. This legislation repeals certain restrictions which limit broadcast capabilities for low-power FM stations. Expanding LPFM licenses will make owning a radio station possible for churches, synagogues, schools, emergency responders, and other community groups that best understand the needs of their local communities.

These stations give civic, clergy, and community leaders a forum to discuss local issues and to provide essential emergency services during times of crisis. Hundreds of churches and ministries already rely on LPFM stations to get their messages out; but, unfortunately, service is currently limited only to rural areas and is frequently limited to property lines.

I urge Members to pass H.R. 1147, which will move to expand low-power FM radio for churches, synagogues, schools, community groups, and emergency responders in the United States.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to support HR. 1147, the "Local Community Radio Act," a bipartisan measure to revitalize the local, public interest radio programming that is so important to communities nationwide.

The broadcast spectrum, after all, belongs first and foremost to the American people. I continue to believe that public access to these resources and quality, local programming should be readily available to all. In the 106th Congress, we established the bipartisan Public Broadcasting Caucus to highlight the unique and invaluable contributions of public radio and television stations and programs. Public Broadcasters provide valuable commercial-free educational, informational, and cultural programming for communities all across the country, as well as emergency alerts.

Complementing these efforts are our country's local, low-power FM radio stations. These stations, whose signals only operate in a three-to-five mile radius, serve as vibrant community resources. These small operators include all manner of local politicians, clergy, civil rights, and community leaders. In times of crisis, like public radio stations, they may also provide essential emergency services. I am pleased Congress is acting to strengthen the ability of these stations to operate responsibly.

This bill is the result of years of negotiations between commercial broadcasters, public broadcasters, and Congress. I appreciate the efforts of all, including National Public Radio (NPR) and the National Association of Broadcasters, NAB, to work together to craft this product. The result is a bill that balances the needs of incumbent stations to protect their signals with an opening up of the airwaves to smaller, more diverse operators.

I look forward to moving this compromise forward, and to strengthened programming in our communities.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, so I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BOUCHER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1147, 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. BOUCHER. 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.

COMMERCIAL ADVERTISEMENT LOUDNESS MITIGATION ACT

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1084) to require the Federal Communications Commission to prescribe a standard to preclude commercials from being broadcast at louder volumes than the program material they accompany, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1084

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 "Commercial Advertisement Loudness Mitigation Act" or the "CALM Act".

SEC. 2. RULEMAKING ON LOUD COMMERCIALS REQUIRED.

(a) REGULATION REQUIRED.—Within 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Communications Commission shall prescribe pursuant to the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 151 et seq.) a regulation that is limited to incorporating by reference and making mandatory (subject to any waivers the Commission may grant pursuant to

subsection (b)(2)) the ''Recommended Practice: Techniques for Establishing and Maintaining Audio Loudness for Digital Television'' (A/85), and any successor thereto, approved by the Advanced Television Systems Committee, only insofar as such recommended practice concerns the transmission of commercial advertisements by a television broadcast station, cable operator, or other multichannel video programming distributor.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—

(1) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The Federal Communications Commission shall prescribe that the regulation adopted pursuant to subsection (a) shall become effective 1 year after the date of its adoption.

(2) WAIVER.—For any television broadcast station, cable operator, or other multichannel video programming distributor that demonstrates that obtaining the equipment to comply with the regulation adopted pursuant to subsection (a) would result in financial hardship, the Federal Communications Commission may grant a waiver of the effective date set forth in paragraph (1) for 1 year and may renew such waiver for 1 additional year.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

(1) the term ''television broadcast station'' has the meaning given such term in section 325 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 325); and

(2) the terms ''cable operator'' and ''multichannel video programming distributor'' have the meanings given such terms in section 602 of Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 522).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BOUCHER) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, the bill before the House is the Commercial Advertisement Loudness Mitigation Act, or in short, the CALM Act. It sets standards on the permissible volume levels for commercials aired on television, and it is patroned by our colleague on the Energy and Commerce Committee, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO). It addresses in an appropriate manner a major consumer complaint.

We have all experienced the frustration of TV commercials blaring well above the volume levels of the programs that accompany them on broadcast television. After scrambling for the remote control and after turning down the volume on the commercials, we then have to pick up the remote again in order to restore the volume when the program that the commercial attends resumes. It is very frustrating. It's an annoying experience, and something really should be done about it.

□ 1315

Other countries, including Australia, Brazil, Israel, the United Kingdom and France all have regulations addressing the volume on television commercials, and with the bill that is now before the House, we have the opportunity to confer on American TV viewers a similar benefit.

We can take this step in a way that the industry finds acceptable. The television industry-based Advanced TV Systems Committee has developed the technical standards that are appropriate to control variations in commercial loudness. The industry has approved that standard and the bill before us directs the Federal Communications Commission to incorporate that standard in a rulemaking.

A waiver from the rule is available for any television station that can show financial hardship in making the changes to its equipment needed in order to comply with the terms of the rule.

Some may say that there is no need to take this step, but I think that the American public is going to react very differently and in a very supportive way. In fact, I think that the CALM Act has the potential to rival in popularity the Do Not Call List that was adopted by this Congress several years ago. That act, as most will recall, protected against unwanted commercial telephone calls. This will protect against intrusive higher volume levels that attend television commercials.

I want to commend the gentlewoman from California. She has shown great leadership in bringing this measure before the House. She has worked with the industry and the members of our subcommittee as we have revised the bill in order to achieve the broad consensus that it enjoys today.

It is my privilege to encourage approval by the House of the CALM Act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

This bill, H.R. 1804, the Commercial Advertisement Loudness Mitigation Act, or the CALM Act, is a bill whose time has come and perhaps because the transition to digital has created the perfect opportunity for industry to take care of this. But they did not take care of this for some 40 years. The bill would require the Federal Communications Commission to issue regulations, based on industry standards, for loud commercial advertisements within 1 year of enactment. The regulation would take effect 1 year after adopted by the FCC.

According to testimony at a June Energy and Commerce hearing, consumer complaints about loud commercials have been streaming into the FCC as far back as 1960 and are among the most common complaints. Complaints continue to come into the FCC today. In fact, in the 25 quarterly reports on consumer complaints that have been released since 2002, 21 have listed complaints about the, quote, abrupt changes in volume during transition from regular programming to commercials as among the top consumer grievances regarding radio and television broadcasting. So as we can tell, this is a top issue for consumers.

Now this issue is a little bit more complex than it appears. Many different entities are responsible for producing and distributing the content that consumers hear and see in their living rooms. Each element may be recorded and provided at a different respective volume level. Moreover, shows and movies have a dynamic sound range to cover everything from a quiet scene to a huge explosion. Commercials, meanwhile, tend to have a narrow sound range. Volume levels are typically set for the programming, which can simply throw off the volume levels for the commercial. But as I pointed out earlier, now we have a solution in place because the transition to digital has made that possible.

Two years ago, the Advanced Television Systems Committee established a Subgroup on Digital Television Loudness. Now it is this subgroup, consisting of leading experts in audio technology who participated together from all the major broadcast networks, cable, production and post-production companies, manufacturing and education; all these very bright, talented, highly technical people got together in this subgroup. They established a way to solve the problem. And since it was established, these audio technology experts have crafted a hard-fought consensus on a recommended practice that should be employed across the TV industry to deal with the complaint that consumers have made for almost 50 years. I trust the collective wisdom of these technical experts—it is done by the private sector—and Subgroup's hard work to craft a solution to the TV loudness issue should be commended.

Let me say a few more comments about this. There are going to be some small cable companies, broadcasters, who are going to have a difficult time complying with this. Remember, now, after 1 year, the FCC is going to take this directive that the Advanced Television Systems Committee established and is going to make it industry-wide. Now some of these small companies are going to complain that they can't afford to implement it. In the bill, there is a 1-year extension for those small companies, and if it turns out they still can't make it, there is another extension. So now we have the majority of the industry able to do this, but we have set aside within the bill a safety hardship in which they just demonstrate they can't do it for financial reasons and they will be left to have another year to meet the standards.

So in a sense, Mr. Speaker, I think we have a solution to a problem that

has been one of the biggest complaints with the FCC all these years; and so with that in mind, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1804, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am pleased to yield such time as she may consume to the sponsor of the bill, the gentlelady from California (Ms. ESHOO).

Ms. ESHOO. I would like to begin by thanking the chairman of our subcommittee, Mr. BOUCHER, for his consistent support and cooperation to help bring the bill through the committee. I doubt that we would be here today were it not for that. And I want to recognize and thank the ranking member of our subcommittee for the work that he has put into this as well and the suggestions that he made in order to bolster the bill and to make it imminently workable. I also want to thank, of course, the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), for his support.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill which is designed to eliminate the earsplitting levels of television advertisements and return control of television sound modulation to the American consumer. I first introduced the Commercial Advertisement Loudness Mitigation Act, called the CALM Act, more than 3 years ago. This is something that many of our constituents now refer to in their shorthand as the Loud Commercial Law. I have heard loud and clear from people across the country. We have consumers across the country that are with us and would like to see this accomplished.

The premise of the bill then, as now, was really simple; and in an era of 1,000- or 1,800-page bills, this is a 2-page bill, and it is to make the volume of commercials and programming uniform so that consumers control the sound. The problem has existed for more than 50 years, when television advertisers first realized that consumers often left the room when commercials were playing. They used the loud commercials as a gimmick to grab the attention of consumers, even as they moved to other parts of their home. But for anyone who can't get to the mute button fast enough, we know that we are all subjected to blasting ads. For those with sensory difficulties, the loud commercials are more than just an annoyance. Sound spikes can harm hearing and sometimes they are painfully loud.

This issue, as my colleagues have referenced, is also one of the top complaints, consistently one of the top complaints, from consumers across the country to the Federal Communications Commission. This bill is going to bring a measure of relief to the American consumer. It is also, I think, an important step in identifying the need to make broadcasters and video providers responsible for answering to consumers at the most basic level. I created this bill taking into account the economic health of licensees and the importance of smaller stations and providers. The Advanced Television Systems Committee, or the ATSC, a body that sets technical standards for digital television, has developed a solution to the problem of the varied volume between commercials and programming, with one stream that keeps the volume uniform.

The bill directs the FCC to adopt these engineering standards as mandatory rules within 1 year. These standards were not in the works until we introduced this legislation in the last Congress, so I am pleased to have encouraged the industry to find the answer to this problem so we don't have to wait another 50 years for a solution.

I look forward to voluntary and immediate adoption of the standards by broadcasters, cable, satellite and all multichannel program providers. But the bill exists because we know that voluntary compliance or adherence to consumer needs has been a failure and we need to assure enforcement to protect the rights of consumers. The bill also requires cable and satellite operators to install the engineering fix necessary to ensure that the sound is modulated.

The bill is not inflexible. It heeds the call by industry for a compliance grace period. Those affected, and I think it's very reasonable, will have 1 year after the FCC adopts the rule for purchase and installation of the ATSC standard-based equipment, and the FCC may grant up to two successive 1-year waivers for financial hardship. Small stations and cable operators certainly should be able to comply within 3 years, plus the amount of time it takes the FCC to adopt and release the rules.

I have read the minority comments that have been filed relative to the bill, and I want to answer directly the concerns of some of my colleagues about the necessity of the bill, so I want to reiterate the following:

First, I think the bill is necessary because we need a mandatory enforcement tool, and I stated that earlier. Volunteerism hasn't worked for 50 years.

Second, the bill makes the ATSC standards applicable to all FCC licensees, and that includes satellite and cable providers as well as broadcasters. The voluntary standards as written only apply to broadcasters.

Thirdly, the bill matters to our constituents, and I think that that's what really matters the most, and it stands as proof that Congress can listen to their concerns.

Fourthly, it has been said that Congress has better things to do. I have never suggested that this solves the great challenges that face our country today. As I said, it's a 2-page bill, but it is something that has been left unattended to for half a century and I think the time has come that we end the practice of consumers being blasted out of their seats when they're listening to their favorite programming.

The technical fix is long overdue and under the CALM Act, as amended, consumers will be in the driver's seat. I look forward to the passage of this bill, and most importantly so do millions of other consumers and our constituents across the country.

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

Let me just perhaps move a little further. The gentlelady from California mentioned that a lot of people had said, well, why does Congress have to get involved? That has been brought before me before. And I would say—and this is a compliment to the lady from California—what she did with her bill.

Her bill originally directed the FCC to write its own rules, but she reached out to industry and engaged them, which is a commendation for her, and asked them, Well, how can we solve this? So for those people who say, Why can't industry solve it?, she was an impetus to do this, and her bill is furthermore an impetus to do this, because now industry developed a subgroup, the subgroup came up with the technology to be able to solve the problem, and now she's saying basically, let industry solve the problem and let the FCC adopt what they've come up with.

□ 1330

Another thing that I think came through the process which is also, I think, a compliment to her was that she was willing to realize that some in the industry, some of the smaller companies, might have a financial problem with this, so she was willing to change the bill to allow this, I'll call it a safety valve, for those small companies that can't make it, that petition the SEC to get a delay so that they have 1 year and possibly another year.

So I think what this bill shows to those people who say why can't we just let the industry solve it, I think the simple fact that she went out and engaged them, they developed a subgroup working with the industry, as she did, works it in a way that industry is solving their own problem, but they also realize, after all these years, going back to the 1960s, and these complaints, something's got to be done. And I think many of us, in the last weekend watching football games, can remember that time we had to get up with the remote and turn it off. And you can say, well, that's fine; just turn it off. But it's constantly an irritant when you have to do it. And we've got all the new bowl games coming up.

So I think the aspect about that we all should realize is that Ms. ESHOO also was willing to change the bill and reach out and work with industry to get this done, and to also provide the safety valve. So I think that's an important aspect to bring to the attention of my colleagues, how this bill works I think in a way to help industry.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, so I yield back the balance of our time.

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I simply want to take this time to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) for the bipartisan way in which we have processed this measure through our committee, and for his strong support of the measure that we bring to the floor this afternoon. The work on this bill is reflective of the best traditions of our committee, where we work out problems, we resolve concerns within the confines of the committee process, and we do so in a collaborative way, with people on both sides of the aisle participating in that effort. And in no matter has that spirit of cooperation been better reflected than in the way we have processed and handled this bill today. So I want to thank Mr. STEARNS and his colleagues on the Republican side for that outstanding bipartisan cooperation.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the CALM Act.

While I, too, would like to have someone turn down the TV when it gets loud, I've already given that job to my thumb. As a result, I only need one Member of Congress at work on this vital problem, not 435. I appreciate Ms. ESHOO'S efforts to protect America's ears from loud commercials and our thumbs from arthritis brought on by overuse, but writing a law to do so seems a stretch.

The bill adopts into Federal law the industry-developed standards that are already being implemented, and consumers do not need the government to function as remote volume controls for them. Simply put, the private sector already has acted on this noisy nuisance.

If you're not convinced that having a reliable and fully functioning thumb is better for both you and the Nation than having a fully functioning bureaucracy to adjust your TV's sound, there's also this: Many entities are responsible for producing and distributing the content that we all see and hear. Broadcast affiliates, networks, and cable, satellite, and phone companies then transmit the content. Each element of the programming may be recorded and provided to the distributors at different volume levels. Moreover, shows and movies have a broad, dynamic sound range to cover everything from explosions in a car chase to lawyers whispering to juries. Commercials, meanwhile, tend to have a narrow sound range, and they can blare and annoy when they suddenly follow a movie scene that was putting you to sleep.

The technical challenges presented by these facts are significant, but with the transition to digital television, industry has responded. On November 5, the Advanced Television Systems Committee, ATSC, announced the approval of the "ATSC Recommended Practice: Techniques for Establishing and Maintaining Audio Loudness for Digital Television." These standards provide guidance to the industry, and focus on audio measurement, production and postproduction monitoring techniques, and methods to control loudness for content delivery.

I want to commend my friend, Ms. ESHOO, for working with all the relevant parties and for amending her bill to acknowledge the industry's work. In my opinion, however, there is no reason for Congress to get between me and my remote control. On those grounds, I have to give this measure a thumbs down.

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, we also have no further requests for time. I yield back the balance of our time and urge passage of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BOUCHER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1084, 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.

BREAST CANCER SCREENING GUIDELINES

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 971) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding guidelines for breast cancer screening for women ages 40 to 49.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 971

Whereas the United States Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF), an independent panel of experts in primary care prevention and evidence-based medicine, issued guidelines on November 16, 2009, regarding mammography screening for women, including women age 40 to 49;

Whereas these guidelines reflect a change from USPSTF mammography recommendations issued in 2002;

Whereas the new guidelines have caused concern among many health providers and confusion among many women age 40 to 49;

Whereas the Department of Health and Human Services has stated that while the USPSTF has presented some new evidence for consideration, the policies of the Department remain unchanged; and

Whereas the Department of Health and Human Services has stated that there is a great need for more evidence, more research, and more scientific innovation to help women prevent, detect, and fight breast cancer: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) the guidelines of the United States Preventive Services Task Force ("USPSTF") would not prohibit an insurer from providing coverage for mammography services in addition to those recommended by the USPSTF and should not be used by insurers to deny coverage for services that are not recommended on a routine basis; and

(2) the National Cancer Institute should continue to invest and provide leadership regarding research to develop more effective screening tools and strategies for improving detection of breast cancer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) and the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend remarks and include extraneous material in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 971. This resolution expresses the sense of the House of Representatives that the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force guidelines would not prohibit an insurer from providing coverage for mammography services beyond those recommended by the task force.

It further states that these guidelines should not be used by insurers to deny coverage for these services.

It also expresses the sense of the House that the National Cancer Institute should continue to invest and provide leadership regarding research to develop more effective screening tools and strategies for improving the detection of breast cancer.

On November 16, 2009, the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force issued a series of six recommendations regarding breast cancer screening, three of which pertain to mammography screening among women of various age groups. At a recent hearing in our Energy and Commerce Committee's Health Subcommittee, the task force representatives acknowledged that they should have done a better job communicating their findings to the public. Unfortunately, this failure in communication has led to much concern and confusion about what their findings and recommendations are and what the implications would be.

Mr. Speaker, this task force is not suggesting that women in their forties forego mammography. The task force is recommending that women in their forties determine when to begin screening and base this decision on a conversation with their doctors or health providers. And we can all agree that women in their forties should have access to mammography if these women and their physicians decide it's right for them. I think we can also agree that while mammography is still the best tool that we have to detect breast cancer in its earliest stages, it is, by every means, an imperfect tool. We need continued research into more effective screening tools and strategies to improve the detection of breast cancer.

Breast cancer is the second most common cancer among United States women, and it is the leading cause of cancer death for women between the ages of 29 and 59. This year, new cases of breast cancer among American women will reach an estimated 192,370, and over 40,000 women will die from breast cancer this year. The American Cancer Society estimates that one in 8 women will have invasive breast cancer at some point in her lifetime. These statistics illustrate that breast cancer