United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 156 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JANUARY 19, 2010 No. 5

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LARSEN of Washington).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 19, 2010.

I hereby appoint the Honorable RICK LARSEN 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.

PEOPLE WITH ALBINISM

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

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have met many strong and courageous women in my lifetime, both here and abroad. But I rise today to recognize Mariamu Stanford, a young woman from Tanzania, who epitomizes the essence of bravery. I rise to shine a light on the untold horrors she and others with albinism faced, and continue to face, in East Africa.

I rise to highlight an ongoing, but little known, crime against humanity in East Africa, particularly in rural Tanzania, where human beings with albinism are butchered and their body parts sold for profit. These horrific acts are perpetuated by witch doctors who believe the body parts of people with albinism have magical powers, and can be mixed in potions to bring the buyer good luck. Rural villages strong incentive to harvest the limbs of their neighbors with albinism, because a single limb can sell for as much as $2,000, a king's ransom in rural Tanzania.

Mariamu, who has albinism, is one of the few survivors of these horrific attacks. Her story is one of fear, horror, and unbelievable courage. She told me her story, through an interpreter, when we met recently. One night in October of 2008, when she was asleep with her toddler son, a group of machete-wielding young men from her village broke into her home and attacked her. They cut off both of her arms while she struggled, screamed, and shielded her young son from the blows.

It was six long hours after the attack before she, 5 months pregnant, was able to receive medical treatment. In the end, she also lost her unborn child. But she survived, and she is now relaying her story here in America in the hopes that these brutal crimes against people with albinism will come to an end.

Mariamu came to the United States for a visit thanks to the generosity of many, including many of my constituents from Northern Virginia with albinism, and some who are parents of children with albinism. While she was here for nearly 2 weeks in December, Mariamu was fitted with prosthetic arms donated by the Orthotic Prosthetic Center in Fairfax, Virginia, and she underwent intensive physical therapy.

She is a rare survivor of a horrible and inhumane crime that is a growing concern in East Africa. More than 54 people with albinism have been butchered in the region, most of them women and children. In November of 2008 a 6-year-old girl was shot dead in Burundi's eastern province of Ruyigi, close to the border with Tanzania. Her attackers removed her head and limbs, leaving only her dismembered torso.

In January of 2009, three men armed with machetes killed an 8-year-old boy in Burundi and smuggled his limbs into Tanzania. Every one of these stories border on the unbelievable, and quite frankly, turn my stomach, as I hope they do yours.

Not only do people with albinism face violence in various parts of the world, but they also are at higher risk for medical complications from their condition. In East Africa's harsh sun, for example, skin cancer is very prevalent. But oftentimes, people with albinism have no choice but to expose themselves to the sun with little protection, as they must be outside to work, go to school, or attend to everyday business.

Unfortunately, the medical issues the people with albinism face are the least of their worries in rural East Africa. The threat of brutal violence looms over them at all times. Tanzanian Prime Minister Mizengo Peter Pinda has condemned these violent crimes, as he should, against people with albinism, but judicial and enforcement barriers remain.

My meeting with Mariamu and local families concerned about her plight has moved me to take action. I am contacting President Obama and the State Department to urge them to place diplomatic pressure on Tanzania to end these crimes against humanity and to provide education to dispel this myth that body parts of those with albinism have any supernatural properties.

I also believe we must look at providing humanitarian and medical assistance to people with albinism in East Africa, with a focus particularly in Tanzania, where most of these brutal crimes have occurred. To this end, I plan to introduce a House Resolution recognizing the plight of people with

Printed on recycled paper.

albinism in East Africa, Mr. Speaker, condemning their murder and mutilation, and advocating remedies to bring an end to this heinous and misguided behavior.

FISCAL DISCIPLINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, our national debt is setting new records each week, and Washington cannot ignore it any longer. Unless we take action, the debt could bring our recovery to a standstill, and raise interest rates for our families. Allowing excessive spending to continue is not an option.

In 2010, we must draw the line and put fiscal discipline at the top of our agenda. This Congress should develop and execute a plan to start paying down the debt and ensure sustainable spending levels for the long term. We can and should continue smart investments that create jobs, develop our critical infrastructure, and help new industries grow.

But at the same time, we have to start cutting waste and demanding efficiency. Government programs should be actively searching for ways to do more with less. And if they won't, Congress has to step up and do it for them.

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 38 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. MORAN of Virginia) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

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

Lord God Almighty, the legacy of the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., lives on in our day.

As we witness the horrible tragedy of Haiti on television and we become more attuned to the heartbeat, sympathy, anxieties, and hopes of America, the House of Representatives might call to mind the image Dr. King used. His prophetic call was for people everywhere to transcend race, class, nation, and religious differences to embrace a vision of a ''World House.''

Here and now, let us do our part to embrace his image and work to fulfill his dream for a universal dwelling on Earth as it is in heaven. Lord, we want a place for every person in our society where all have equal justice.

We pray for a home where conflicts may be resolved in a spirit of love and forgiveness, without violence, and wounds can be healed.

Lord, let Dr. King's vision and promise for the future resonate in every human heart until it becomes a way of living, living up to Your design for us.

This we pray now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. BORDALLO 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.

HEALTH CARE REDUX

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

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, as the health care negotiations have droned on for months behind closed doors led by REID and PELOSI without the participation of the American people, Republicans and even many Democrats, what do we have to show for it?

We have the Louisiana Purchase, the Corn Husker Kickback, backroom deals with special interests, protection of the trial lawyers, and, finally, an embarrassing deal with the unions that allows them to be exempt from a 40 percent excise tax on ''Cadillac'' health care plans that the rest of the Nation will be subject to.

To my colleagues: Have you no shame?

What happened to the President's promises of open debate on C–SPAN and inviting Members of Congress to come to the White House to go over the health care bill ''line by line''?

I submit today that we scrap the flawed documents under consideration and immediately begin a bipartisan discussion on how to truly reform health care in this country in a way that does not involve higher taxes, higher costs to policyholders, and even more governmental interference in our daily lives.

GOVERNOR CHRISTINE TODD WHITMAN HIGHLIGHTS THE PROBLEM WITH BACKROOM HEALTH CARE NEGOTIATIONS

(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. Congress and this administration continue pushing a job-killing health care takeover. Brokered in back rooms, the bill includes $518 billion in new job-killing taxes that will hurt small businesses, and squeezing Medicare threatens senior citizens.

Backroom deals in Washington is politics at its worst, and it is high time that the American people were given a seat at the negotiations table.

The President promised the American people eight different times health care would be public. C–SPAN has offered to broadcast the negotiations. In Politico, former New Jersey Governor Christine Todd Whitman highlights Speaker PELOSI's brushoff of the request, saying that the President stood for a number of things while on the campaign trail.

I encourage the Speaker to encourage the President to keep his promise of open discussions by letting C–SPAN show the American people what is going on behind closed doors. We need change in Washington.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

AMERICANS SEE MEDIA AS BIASED, LIBERAL, TOO POWERFUL

(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, Americans see the media as biased, liberal, and too powerful, according to a new Rasmussen survey.

Just two in ten Americans say reporters try to offer unbiased coverage of political campaigns. More than seven in ten say reporters try to help the candidate they want to win.

Furthermore, a majority of voters believe, ''The average reporter is more liberal than they are.'' And two-thirds think the media have too much power and influence over government decisions.

This is the fourth public opinion poll in the last few months that has found that Americans don't trust the media. If the national media want to restore Americans' confidence, they should report the facts and not tell people what to think.

PUT GOVERNMENT IN ITS PLACE

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, according to the 10th Amendment, any power not specifically granted to the Federal Government is reserved to the people and to the States.

Those that demand government take over health care have yet to provide a constitutional example for such government oppression. Further, it doesn't

say anywhere in the Constitution the Federal Government can force anybody to buy anything, including health insurance. It is not there.

Some have said, what about car insurance? The States, not the Feds, regulate car insurance so drivers can pay for third-party injuries. And driving is a privilege, not a right.

A better example would be if the Feds forced the people to buy a car from GM. ''Government Motors'' would pick the car they want the citizens to buy, then tax them to pay for it. That is unconstitutional. So is forcing people to buy health insurance.

Thomas Jefferson said, ''The Federal Government is our servant, not our master.'' It is about time we put government in its place.

And that's just the way it is.

ARMY SPECIALIST KYLE WRIGHT

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

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Army Specialist Kyle Wright, a 22-year-old from Romeoville, Illinois, who was killed in combat on January 13 while serving our country during his first tour of duty in Afghanistan.

Specialist Wright followed in his father's and grandfather's military footsteps by enlisting in the Army, and did so out of a strong desire to advance the freedoms and liberties of women in Afghanistan, a cause very close to my heart.

He joined the Army after graduating in 2006 from Romeoville High School, where, even as a young man, he demonstrated his love for this country by serving in the Marine Corps Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps.

He was passionate, honorable, and loved by all who knew him, his family, his girlfriend, and his fellow soldiers. His dedication to women's rights in Afghanistan was inspired by his sisters, his mother, stepmother, and grandmother. And his dedication to upholding the American ideals and freedoms he believed in knew no bounds.

I would like to extend my deepest condolence to the Wright family and to all who knew this brave soldier. Our Nation lost a true hero with Specialist Wright's passing. He will be missed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken after 6:30 p.m. today.

CASTLE NUGENT NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE ESTABLISHMENT ACT OF 2010

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3726) to establish the Castle Nugent National Historic Site at St. Croix, United States Virgin Islands, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3726

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 ''Castle Nugent National Historic Site Establishment Act of 2010''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) HISTORIC SITE.—The term ''historic site'' means the Castle Nugent National Historic Site established in section 3.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. CASTLE NUGENT NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established as a unit of the National Park System the Castle Nugent National Historic Site on the Island of St. Croix, U.S. Virgin Islands, in order to preserve, protect, and interpret, for the benefit of present and future generations, a Caribbean cultural landscape that spans more than 300 years of agricultural use, significant archeological resources, mangrove forests, endangered sea turtle nesting beaches, an extensive barrier coral reef system, and other outstanding natural features.

(b) BOUNDARIES.—The historic site consists of the approximately 2,900 acres of land extending from Lowrys Hill and Laprey Valley to the Caribbean Sea and from Manchenil Bay to Great Pond, along with associated submerged lands to the three-mile territorial limit, as generally depicted on the map titled ''Castle Nugent National Historic Site Proposed Boundary Map'', numbered T22/100,447, and dated October 2009.

(c) MAP AVAILABILITY.—The map referred to in subsection (b) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

(d) ACQUISITION OF LAND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Secretary is authorized to acquire lands and interests in lands within the boundaries of the historic site by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or exchange.

(2) U.S. VIRGIN ISLAND LANDS.—The Secretary is authorized to acquire lands and interests in lands owned by the U.S. Virgin Islands or any political subdivision thereof only by donation or exchange.

SEC. 4. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall administer the historic site in accordance with this Act and with laws generally applicable to units of the National Park System, including—

(1) the National Park Service Organic Act (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.); and

(2) the Act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U.S.C. 461 et seq.).

(b) SHARED RESOURCES.—To the greatest extent practicable, the Secretary shall use the resources of other sites administered by the National Park Service on the Island of St. Croix to administer the historic site.

(c) CONTINUED USE.—In order to maintain an important feature of the cultural landscape of the historic site, the Secretary may lease to the University of the Virgin Islands certain lands within the boundary of the historic site for the purpose of continuing the university's operation breeding Senepol cattle, a breed developed on St. Croix. A lease under this subsection shall contain such terms and conditions as the Secretary considers appropriate, including those necessary to protect the values of the historic site.

(d) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—Not later than three years after funds are made available for this subsection, the Secretary shall prepare a general management plan for the historic site.

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

The Chair now recognizes the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO).

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. 3726, sponsored by my good friend and colleague from the Virgin Islands, DONNA CHRISTENSEN, establishes the Castle Nugent National Historic Site as a new unit of the National Park System on the island of St. Croix in the United States Virgin Islands.

The lands to be included in this new historic site represent the largest undeveloped natural area remaining on the island, and there is very strong local support for protecting it as parkland for future generations.

The new park, Mr. Speaker, encompasses about 11,500 acres, three-quarters of which are submerged lands containing one of the largest and healthiest coral reef systems in the region. The National Park Service has studied the site and testified that it meets their criteria for addition to the system.

Congresswoman CHRISTENSEN is to be commended for her commitment to preserving the unique history and the culture of the beautiful island of St. Croix. So we urge our colleagues to support passage of H.R. 3726.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We have concerns with H.R. 3726. As of today, the National Park Service has yet to complete the congressionally authorized study of this proposal. In fact, the agency has asked that we defer consideration until the study is completed.

These studies are not without cost in both personnel and funds, and they take several years to complete and can drain as much as $500,000 from the Park Service budget. What use are these feasibility studies if we simply choose to ignore them, or, in this case, rush to pass legislation before the study can be finalized? Typically, these studies contain information that could be useful in crafting better legislation.

For example, it would be nice to know what process the National Park Service went through to consult with all private property owners who may be harmed or impacted by this designation. The National Park Service testified that the cost to acquire the private property to establish this park could be as much as $50 million, in addition to nearly $1 million a year to operate the park.

□ 1415

Most of us are aware of the estimated $9 billion in maintenance backlog created currently with the National Park Service. Consequently, it becomes very difficult to justify why additional land acquisition is advisable at this particular time. How do we explain to taxpayers that, while unemployment soars, their government is conspiring to buy beach-front property in the Caribbean? Is adding these luxurious 2,900 acres to the Federal land inventory the priority of this particular Congress?

Nearly every acre of the dry land that is to be acquired is privately owned. It's our understanding the majority of this land is owned by one family. According to testimony heard by the Committee on Natural Resources, this family is supportive of the proposal and even initiated this process. We heard that it is their desire that this land not be developed, but be preserved in its current condition. It seems to me that they are in a perfect position to accomplish that goal as landowners. May I suggest that they also possess the power to determine the future of the property without any interference of Congress.

In addition, to complicate the issue further, sources within the Park Service have told us that there is discord within the family itself over whether this designation is indeed in the family's best interest. Apart from this family, we have heard nothing from the other property owners affected by this bill, both on land and in the water. Is it fair for us in Washington, D.C., to place them in a restrictive designation without their consent and also not knowing whether the consent exists or not?

It is not only these 2,900 acres of dry land that's affected by this legislation. In addition, this bill includes the park-associated submerged lands out to the 3-mile territorial limit of the Virgin Islands. This could mean that fishing in the area would be prohibited, just as it is at the Virgin Islands National Park that surrounds two-thirds of the island of St. John.

I hope that this will not impact struggling fishermen, but it is a possibility that deserves attention and has yet to be addressed, but would have, had the feasibility study been completed.

Again, these are questions that need to be answered, and I would hope that some of them will be answered in the final study when it is finally signed by Secretary Salazar. If this legislation does move forward today, I hope the current landowners and their descendents are aware that the National Park Service will now be their zoning board.

I would also like to note that there is no ''willing seller'' provision in this legislation. While ''willing seller'' provisions are minimum at best protections, at least with this language Congress is on record that landowners should not be hounded or harassed into selling their land to the National Park Service.

I cannot in good conscience support this legislation, yet that does not guarantee the right of private property owners. Our constituents deserve better than that. If the intent of this proposal is to preserve historic landscapes, certainly that can be done locally without Federal funds, interference, or bureaucratic red tape.

So I urge my colleagues to demonstrate some fiscal responsibility and demand respect for property rights that are not yet in this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN).

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Thank you, Madam Chair, for yielding.

Today, I rise to speak on behalf of H.R. 3726, a bill that I introduced to establish the Castle Nugent National Historic Site on St. Croix, in my district in the U.S. Virgin Islands. The introduction of this bill continues an effort started in 2006 to build upon that great precedent set by our Forefathers when Yellowstone in Wyoming became the first national park. The establishment of Castle Nugent National Historic Site would provide an excellent opportunity to preserve a very special and unique landscape for the people of St. Croix and visitors to the islands for generations to come.

H.R. 3726 calls for the preservation of 2,900 acres, which include a Caribbean dry forest, pristine coastal barrier coral reef system, and a pre-Columbian, as well as a post-European, settlement. The property has a long agricultural history dating back to the 1730s, when the Danish estate house, now listed on the National Register of Historic Places, was constructed. The farm is one of the last working cattle ranches on St. Croix and one of the ranches instrumental in the development and exportation of Senepol cattle throughout the Caribbean and the rest of the world.

H.R. 3726 would ensure the continued rearing of Senepol cattle with a provision that guarantees a continued relationship with the University of the Virgin Islands to support ongoing scientific research. In addition to guaranteeing the protection of one of the most ecologically sensitive areas on the island, H.R. 3726 would also preserve a rich part of our historic and cultural past by preserving the archaeological remains of the indigenous inhabitants of St. Croix.

The family which owns the majority of this property has been incredibly patient—the pressure to sell their land to developers has been overwhelming—and yet they have continued to try to do what they feel, and I agree, is best for all concerned. There is no intent here to interfere with privately held property. The sole purpose of this bill is to protect and preserve the historic, cultural, and environmental assets and the opportunity for the people of the Virgin Islands as well as their fellow Americans to continue to enjoy the area and to preserve it for future generations.

Even the person who purchased about 400 acres of this property a few years back is on record in support of preserving this area. Longtime neighbors of Castle Nugent support the bill. Both the Bush and Obama administrations have supported this designation every step of the way. The current administration has testified that the study is completed and that it fully supports the designation that we're seeking. The designation is supported by my constituents, including some of those who originally questioned the expansion of the park. As far as I'm aware, no one is challenging the conclusion of the study or the wisdom of preserving the area.

There's no substantive reason to oppose the legislation. The bill contains no intergovernmental mandates, as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act; would impose no cost on State, local, or tribal governments; and would impose no private sector mandates either, as defined in the UMRA. This is a beautiful and important cultural and natural resource that is in danger of being lost to the Nation's public forever. If we don't move forward, there's a real risk that when the study is formally transmitted to Congress, supporting the designation, the land will already have been sold and condominium owners will be the only people who ever get to visit the area.

At this time, I'd like to take the opportunity to thank Chairman RAHALL and Subcommittee Chairman GRIJALVA for their support in ushering this bill through the Resources Committee. I'd also like to thank the numerous community members who wrote in support of this bill, including our national park superintendent, Mr. Joel Tutein; Mr. Olasee Davis, who traveled from the Virgin Islands to testify in favor of the bill; the Gasperi family, and to thank them again for their patience in holding out for this day; and the Trust for Public Lands, who's given them their support.

I just wanted to add a few other things. While it would be ideal to wait until spring when the study would be formally transmitted to Congress, there are certain examples where this committee and the Congress have moved forward with designations before studies were completed or, in some cases, without studies at all. I'd just like to mention two examples. The legislation designating President Reagan's boyhood home in Illinois and the

Oklahoma City Memorial were enacted without studies at all. Both were sponsored by Members from the other side of the aisle. So precedent has been set for bills to be acted on prior to the study being completed or even without studies.

In addition, on November 17, I want to just remind my colleagues that the National Park Service testified in the committee to the fact that Castle Nugent has met their criteria for suitability and national significance. We're confident in the National Park Service's testimony and that the final opinion will reflect what was testified to; but it is necessary for us to act expediently, as there is risk of losing the property if we don't move quickly.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. In closing, whether this cattle ranch becomes part of our national inventory or not may indeed be a good idea. But one of the things I think we are saying right now is the scope these processes have to go through—and the process does become important. Poor process produces poor policy. What we are arguing in this particular case is if we should allow the process to go through to its completion. There are questions that still have to be asked that yet have a quantified answer to them. Neighbors may be in support, but we want those things quantified, which should be part of the process that is there.

There should be private property rights in this particular document for the protection of private property owners, and that should be boilerplate language we add in all legislation—not just this, but the rest that comes through. The question that we should be asking, which is what the study should be asking as well, is not necessarily do we go forth in this particular one but should we look at this as the only way of preserving or moving forward on this cattle ranch in the future? Is this indeed the best way? Are there other concepts that could be used? And should this be the $50 million budget priority of this particular Congress? Those are the types of questions that should have been answered in the committee before this bill moved forward, and that's what we asked in committee and we're asking again on the floor.

This may indeed be the proper use of turning this former cattle ranch into a national asset, but there are still questions that should have been asked in a proper process to make sure that this is the right policy at this particular time. And that's why we have objections to this particular bill, not necessarily the substance of it, but the manner and mechanism of what we are doing, because there are still too many unanswered questions.

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

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I again urge the Members to support the bill, H.R. 3726, 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. 3726, 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. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

BLM CONTRACT EXTENSION ACT

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3759) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant economy-related contract extensions of a certain timber contracts between the Secretary of the Interior and timber purchasers, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3759

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

SECTION 1. QUALIFYING TIMBER CONTRACT OPTIONS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) QUALIFYING CONTRACT.—The term ''qualifying contract'' means a contract that has not been terminated by the Bureau of Land Management for the sale of timber on lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management that meets all of the following criteria:

(A) The contract was awarded during the period beginning on January 1, 2005, and ending on December 31, 2008.

(B) There is unharvested volume remaining for the contract.

(C) The contract is not a salvage sale.

(D) The Secretary determined there is not an urgent need to harvest under the contract due to deteriorating timber conditions that developed after the award of the contract.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of Bureau of Land Management.

(3) TIMBER PURCHASER.—The term ''timber purchaser'' means the party to the qualifying contract for the sale of timber from lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management.

(b) MARKET-RELATED CONTRACT EXTENSION OPTION.—Upon a timber purchaser's written request, the Secretary may make a one-time modification to the qualifying contract to add 3 years to the contract expiration date if the written request—

(1) is received by the Secretary not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) contains a provision releasing the United States from all liability, including further consideration or compensation, resulting from the modification under this subsection of the term of a qualifying contract.

(c) REPORTING.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report detailing a plan and timeline to promulgate new regulations authorizing the Bureau of Land Management to extend and renegotiate timber contracts due to changes in market conditions.

(d) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall promulgate new regulations authorizing the Bureau of Land Management to extend and renegotiate timber contracts due to changes in market conditions.

(e) NO SURRENDER OF CLAIMS.—This section shall not have the effect of surrendering any claim by the United States against any timber purchaser that arose under a timber sale contract, including a qualifying contract, before the date on which the Secretary adjusts the contract term under subsection (b).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) 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, the Nation's recent economic downturn has dramatically affected the forest products industry, especially those companies reliant on wood from Federal lands. Currently, the Forest Service has several options for helping timber companies amend the terms of timber contracts that are no longer economically viable. However, the Bureau of Land Management does not have the same authorities.

H.R. 3759, introduced by our distinguished colleague from Oregon, Representative DEFAZIO, would help rural economies and struggling timber companies by allowing the Secretary of the Interior to add 3 years to the expiration date of certain BLM timber contracts. This authority is similar to the Forest Service authority and would enable companies to wait for a better economic climate.

□ 1430

Mr. Speaker, we commend Representative DEFAZIO for his efforts to support rural communities by proposing this legislation. We support the passage of H.R. 3759 and urge its adoption by the House today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This particular bill has been well explained by the distinguished gentlelady from Guam. Up front, I would like to say that I have basically favored this bill introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Oregon. In concept, it is a good bill, and I actually will be voting for it on the floor. However, I do want to state that there are two particular problems, once again, with the process, which are very perplexing and

concerning to me, and I think it's something we ought to discuss.

This bill has been changed—I think significantly—since it left the committee on November 18. An amendment was added at 12:58—that is the date on it, today. Admittedly, we knew about it maybe an hour before that, but an amendment that changes this bill significantly was added today. That is not the process you go through. Once again, poor process will equate to poor public policy.

The amendment that was added in here took out salvaged sales on BLM land. That is not what was in the bill when it went through committee, and I would suggest that I am not in favor of that change to a very good bill. We will be told, I'm assuming, that this change was made to conform what practices we do on BLM with national forest land. However, what we are doing is changing the law to conform to an agency regulation, which is, indeed, backwards.

Congress should be establishing what our requirements are and what our practices are, not forcing Congress to try to regulate ourselves and relate ourselves to what an agency of government, through its own internal regulations, does. So I am opposed to this amendment, which was added within the very last 2 hours. That should not be there and was not discussed in committee.

I am also opposed in one particular way to the concept that this was made from a ''shall'' to a ''may.'' I would like it very much more had it been with the original language that Representative DEFAZIO proposed in making this a ''shall'' issue as opposed to simply making this or any other bill that comes before us today into a ''may,'' to make it at the whim of the Secretary.

Now, with those two conclusions, I will say that this is still a good bill. This is still a bill that I think should go forward. This is a bill that should have gone forward in the way it came out of committee, in which it was a stronger and better bill, and I will still vote on it on the floor. But I am perplexed with these changes that have been made that weaken this bill and do not improve it and, more importantly, with the process we are going through to make these last-minute changes when they should have been done with full committee hearing, with full committee discussion, and full committee markup.

In closing, let me just apologize for making a misstatement in the first place. I am told now that there is a statute that since has been done by the National Forest Service, so the statutes are consistent. They are consistently wrong, but they are still consistent here. It is still the wrong thing to do, and those salvaged sales should have been approved on both BLM as well as national forest land, and I still resent the process that went through, even though what I said was technically wrong earlier.

With that, I intend to vote ''yes'' because I think the DeFazio bill is a good bill. It needs to go forward. It is the right thing to do, but we could have done a whole lot better if we had really put our minds to it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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. 3759, as amended.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant market-related contract extensions of certain timber contracts between the Secretary of the Interior and timber purchasers, and for other purposes.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INDIAN ARTS AND CRAFTS AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2010

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 725) to protect Indian arts and crafts through the improvement of applicable criminal proceedings, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 725

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 ''Indian Arts and Crafts Amendments Act of 2010''.

SEC. 2. INDIAN ARTS AND CRAFTS.

(a) CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS; CIVIL ACTIONS; MISREPRESENTATIONS.—Section 5 of the Act entitled ''An Act to promote the development of Indian arts and crafts and to create a board to assist therein, and for other purposes'' (25 U.S.C. 305d) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 5. CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS; CIVIL ACTIONS.

''(a) DEFINITION OF FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.—In this section, the term 'Federal law enforcement officer' includes a Federal law enforcement officer (as defined in section 115(c) of title 18, United States Code).

''(b) AUTHORITY TO CONDUCT INVESTIGATIONS.—Any Federal law enforcement officer shall have the authority to conduct an investigation relating to an alleged violation of this Act occurring within the jurisdiction of the United States.

''(c) CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS.—

''(1) INVESTIGATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Board may refer an alleged violation of section 1159 of title 18, United States Code, to any Federal law enforcement officer for appropriate investigation.

''(B) REFERRAL NOT REQUIRED.—A Federal law enforcement officer may investigate an alleged violation of section 1159 of that title regardless of whether the Federal law enforcement officer receives a referral under subparagraph (A).

''(2) FINDINGS.—The findings of an investigation of an alleged violation of section 1159 of title 18, United States Code, by any Federal department or agency under paragraph (1)(A) shall be submitted, as appropriate, to—

''(A) a Federal or State prosecuting authority; or

''(B) the Board.

''(3) RECOMMENDATIONS.—On receiving the findings of an investigation under paragraph (2), the Board may—

''(A) recommend to the Attorney General that criminal proceedings be initiated under section 1159 of title 18, United States Code; and

''(B) provide such support to the Attorney General relating to the criminal proceedings as the Attorney General determines to be appropriate.

''(d) CIVIL ACTIONS.—In lieu of, or in addition to, any criminal proceeding under subsection (c), the Board may recommend that the Attorney General initiate a civil action under section 6.''.

(b) CAUSE OF ACTION FOR MISREPRESENTATION.—Section 6 of the Act entitled ''An Act to promote the development of Indian arts and crafts and to create a board to assist therein, and for other purposes'' (25 U.S.C. 305e) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (d);

(2) by redesignating subsections (a) through (c) as subsections (b) through (d), respectively;

(3) by inserting before subsection (b) (as redesignated by paragraph (2)) the following:

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) INDIAN.—The term 'Indian' means an individual that—

''(A) is a member of an Indian tribe; or

''(B) is certified as an Indian artisan by an Indian tribe.

''(2) INDIAN PRODUCT.—The term 'Indian product' has the meaning given the term in any regulation promulgated by the Secretary.

''(3) INDIAN TRIBE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'Indian tribe' has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b).

''(B) INCLUSION.—The term 'Indian tribe' includes, for purposes of this section only, an Indian group that has been formally recognized as an Indian tribe by—

''(i) a State legislature;

''(ii) a State commission; or

''(iii) another similar organization vested with State legislative tribal recognition authority.

''(4) SECRETARY.—The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of the Interior.'';

(4) in subsection (b) (as redesignated by paragraph (2)), by striking ''subsection (c)'' and inserting ''subsection (d)'';

(5) in subsection (c) (as redesignated by paragraph (2))—

(A) by striking ''subsection (a)'' and inserting ''subsection (b)''; and

(B) by striking ''suit'' and inserting ''the civil action'';

(6) by striking subsection (d) (as redesignated by paragraph (2)) and inserting the following:

''(d) PERSONS THAT MAY INITIATE CIVIL ACTIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A civil action under subsection (b) may be initiated by—

''(A) the Attorney General, at the request of the Secretary acting on behalf of—

''(i) an Indian tribe;

''(ii) an Indian; or

''(iii) an Indian arts and crafts organization;

''(B) an Indian tribe, acting on behalf of—

''(i) the Indian tribe;

''(ii) a member of that Indian tribe; or

''(iii) an Indian arts and crafts organization;

''(C) an Indian; or

''(D) an Indian arts and crafts organization.

''(2) DISPOSITION OF AMOUNTS RECOVERED.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), an amount recovered in a civil action under this section shall be paid to the Indian tribe, the Indian, or the Indian arts and crafts organization on the behalf of which the civil action was initiated.

''(B) EXCEPTIONS.—

''(i) ATTORNEY GENERAL.—In the case of a civil action initiated under paragraph (1)(A), the Attorney General may deduct from the amount—

''(I) the amount of the cost of the civil action and reasonable attorney's fees awarded under subsection (c), to be deposited in the Treasury and credited to appropriations available to the Attorney General on the date on which the amount is recovered; and

''(II) the amount of the costs of investigation awarded under subsection (c), to reimburse the Board for the activities of the Board relating to the civil action.

''(ii) INDIAN TRIBE.—In the case of a civil action initiated under paragraph (1)(B), the Indian tribe may deduct from the amount—

''(I) the amount of the cost of the civil action; and

''(II) reasonable attorney's fees.''; and

(7) in subsection (e), by striking ''(e) In the event that'' and inserting the following:

''(e) SAVINGS PROVISION.—If''.

SEC. 3. MISREPRESENTATION OF INDIAN PRODUCED GOODS AND PRODUCTS.

Section 1159 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

''(b) PENALTY.—Any person that knowingly violates subsection (a) shall—

''(1) in the case of a first violation by that person—

''(A) if the applicable goods are offered or displayed for sale at a total price of $1,000 or more, or if the applicable goods are sold for a total price of $1,000 or more—

''(i) in the case of an individual, be fined not more than $250,000, imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both; and

''(ii) in the case of a person other than an individual, be fined not more than $1,000,000; and

''(B) if the applicable goods are offered or displayed for sale at a total price of less than $1,000, or if the applicable goods are sold for a total price of less than $1,000—

''(i) in the case of an individual, be fined not more than $25,000, imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both; and

''(ii) in the case of a person other than an individual, be fined not more than $100,000; and

''(2) in the case of a subsequent violation by that person, regardless of the amount for which any good is offered or displayed for sale or sold—

''(A) in the case of an individual, be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 15 years, or both; and

''(B) in the case of a person other than an individual, be fined not more than $5,000,000.''; and

(2) in subsection (c), by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

''(3) the term 'Indian tribe'—

''(A) has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b); and

''(B) includes, for purposes of this section only, an Indian group that has been formally recognized as an Indian tribe by—

''(i) a State legislature;

''(ii) a State commission; or

''(iii) another similar organization vested with State legislative tribal recognition authority; and''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) 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, on behalf of the Natural Resources Committee chairman, Mr. NICK RAHALL, and myself, I would like to commend the gentleman from Arizona, Representative ED PASTOR, for sponsoring the pending measure and for working with the committee to bring it before the full House.

The sale of misrepresented and counterfeit American Indian jewelry, pottery, baskets, rugs, and other items cheats the consumer, degrades the entire native market, and robs talented, hardworking native artisans of their living. This has been a growing problem that Mr. PASTOR's legislation will effectively address.

H.R. 725 would amend the Indian Arts and Crafts Act of 1990 to authorize any Federal law enforcement officer to conduct an investigation of an offense involving the sale of any good that is represented as an Indian-produced good. The legislation also requires that the findings of an investigation of an alleged offense be submitted to a Federal or State prosecuting authority or to the Indian Arts and Crafts Board.

Again, I want to commend my colleague Mr. PASTOR of Arizona for his hard work and dedication to this piece of legislation. He is addressing a longstanding problem with this bill, and I ask my colleagues to support its passage.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I rise to slowly yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans have no objections to H.R. 725, and indeed, we support appropriate law enforcement efforts to stop illegal counterfeiting of Indian arts and crafts. However, I would like to note a concern for the record, because this bill could have been written in a way to increase its effectiveness.

At the committee hearing on H.R. 725, it became clear that the Bureau of Indian Affairs' Office of Law Enforcement is contemplated to be the primary agency to investigate and enforce any violations of this new Indian Arts and Crafts Act. As written, this bill, H.R. 725, authorizes any Federal law enforcement officer to enforce the act. That is the issue. It authorizes any Federal law enforcement officer to authorize the act. This would include law enforcement officers who may or may not have expertise in dealing with tribes, with artists, counterfeit art or crafts.

So I certainly hope that the President takes appropriate steps to delegate this overly broad law enforcement authority only to the agency or the agencies that have the funding, manpower, time, and expertise to enforce this important but somewhat complex area of law. It would be nice if Congress were to actually take that responsibility to ourselves. Indeed, the very goal of stopping this illegally counterfeited Indian art should not be turned over to law enforcement agencies who are strained with other duties, other kinds of investigation of crime, acts of terrorism, fraud, or any other kind of scheme that takes place.

Finally, in addition to the fact that this has not been specified where it should be, I do want to note that there is a largely identical bill, sponsored by the Senator from Arizona, that is in the House. If we had taken up that bill today, it could probably be signed into law this particular week. I have no idea why we did not take up the Senate bill rather than pushing this bill forward, and for whatever reason it is. If, indeed, it is simply because it's a Senator's bill, that may be good enough for me. But if there are other concepts that may be there, there are still questions as to why we are not passing Senate Bill 151 rather than this one. However, by passing H.R. 725 today, we are simply delaying the enactment of this particular bill.

So once again, I think we missed the opportunity of trying to narrow in our particular focus on the enforcement powers, and there are still some questions on why this bill is taking precedence over others that may speed up the actual date of enactment of this, but with the substance of the bill, I am in support.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

In 1935, Congress enacted legislation to establish the Indian Arts and Crafts Board. The Indian Arts and Crafts Board, an agency within the U.S. Department of the Interior, is responsible for promoting the development of American Indian and Alaska Native arts and crafts, improving the economic status of the members of the Indian tribes, and helping to develop and expand marketing opportunities for arts and crafts produced by the American Indians and Alaska Natives.

The 1935 legislation adopted criminal penalties for selling goods with the

misrepresentation that they were Indian produced. This provision, currently located in section 1159 of title 18, U.S. Code, set fines not to exceed $500 or imprisonment not to exceed 6 months or both. Although this law was in effect for many years, it provided no meaningful deterrent to those who misrepresented imitation arts and crafts as Indian produced. In addition, willful intent was required to be proved. Therefore, very little enforcement took place.

So H.R. 725 seeks to address this continuing problem by strengthening the penalties associated with misrepresentation of Indian-produced goods and by empowering Federal, tribal, and local authorities to undertake investigations and enforcement. A Senate companion bill, S. 151, passed the Senate on July 24, 2009.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the very complete and thorough analysis that the gentlelady from Guam did on this particular bill. It was well done.

I will ask at this time if the gentlelady from Guam has any more speakers for this particular bill.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, we do not have any additional speakers.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Sadly, neither do I. So at this time, I will simply go forward and say that we still support it. We still think this bill could have been done better. We are still very curious on why the Senate bill was not being pushed forward, but we support the purpose and the goals of this particular piece of legislation, and we will be very happy to support it here on the floor as well.

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. 725, 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.

IDAHO WILDERNESS WATER FACILITIES ACT

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3538) to authorize the continued use of certain water diversions located on National Forest System land in the Frank Church-River of No Return Wilderness and the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3538

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 ''Idaho Wilderness Water Facilities Act''.

SEC. 2. TREATMENT OF EXISTING WATER DIVERSIONS IN FRANK CHURCH-RIVER OF NO RETURN WILDERNESS AND SELWAY-BITTERROOT WILDERNESS, IDAHO.

(a) AUTHORIZATION FOR CONTINUED USE.—The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to issue a special use authorization to each of the 20 owners of a water storage, transport, or diversion facility (in this section referred to as a ''facility'') located on National Forest System land in the Frank Church-River of No Return Wilderness or the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness (as identified on the map titled ''Unauthorized Private Water Diversions located within the Frank Church River of No Return Wilderness'', dated December 14, 2009, or the map titled ''Unauthorized Private Water Diversions located within the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness'', dated December 11, 2009) for the continued operation, maintenance, and reconstruction of the facility if the Secretary determines that—

(1) the facility was in existence on the date on which the land upon which the facility is located was designated as part of the National Wilderness Preservation System (in this section referred to as ''the date of designation'');

(2) the facility has been in substantially continuous use to deliver water for the beneficial use on the owner's non-Federal land since the date of designation;

(3) the owner of the facility holds a valid water right for use of the water on the owner's non-Federal land under Idaho State law, with a priority date that predates the date of designation; and

(4) it is not practicable or feasible to relocate the facility to land outside of the wilderness and continue the beneficial use of water on the non-Federal land recognized under State law.

(b) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—

(1) EQUIPMENT, TRANSPORT, AND USE TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—In a special use authorization issued under subsection (a), the Secretary is authorized to—

(A) allow use of motorized equipment and mechanized transport for operation, maintenance, or reconstruction of a facility, if the Secretary determines that—

(i) the use is necessary to allow the facility to continue delivery of water to the non-Federal land for the beneficial uses recognized by the water right held under Idaho State law; and

(ii) after conducting a minimum tool analysis for the facility, the use of nonmotorized equipment and nonmechanized transport is impracticable or infeasible; and

(B) preclude use of the facility for the storage, diversion, or transport of water in excess of the water right recognized by the State of Idaho on the date of designation.

(2) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—In a special use authorization issued under subsection (a), the Secretary is authorized to—

(A) require or allow modification or relocation of the facility in the wilderness, as the Secretary determines necessary, to reduce impacts to wilderness values set forth in section 2 of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131) if the beneficial use of water on the non-Federal land is not diminished; and

(B) require that the owner provide a reciprocal right of access across the non-Federal property, in which case, the owner shall receive market value for any right-of-way or other interest in real property conveyed to the United States, and market value may be paid by the Secretary, in whole or in part, by the grant of a reciprocal right-of-way, or by reduction of fees or other costs that may accrue to the owner to obtain the authorization for water facilities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) and the gentleman in Utah (Mr. BISHOP) 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, prior to the designation of the Frank Church-River of No Return and the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness areas in Idaho, private landowners received permits to maintain and repair water diversions on national forest land now included in those wilderness areas. Many of those permits have since expired, leaving those who own the water diversions without options for mechanically maintaining their water systems.

The bill before us, H.R. 3538, would give the Secretary of Agriculture the authority to issue special use authorizations to owners of specific water storage, transport, or diversion facilities within these wilderness areas. The permits would only be issued if the owner can prove that the water facility meets certain criteria specified in the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, we support the passage of H.R. 3538, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1445

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This bill, as introduced by Mr. SIMPSON of Idaho, would require the Forest Service to issue special use permits to owners of small, existing water systems in two Idaho wilderness areas. And although these water diversions continue to operate, their owners currently lack the authority to maintain or repair these facilities. Failure to maintain or repair these facilities would harm not only the farms and ranches that need to be assured of having access to water that they own to be viable, but also will be important for the Forest Service to maintain the environmental needs and watersheds on these particular Forest Service lands.

This bill, H.R. 3538, will allow the owners of the existing water systems to do this necessary maintenance.

Let me just say this legislation has been very narrowly tailored to apply to

only a small number of sites that are within the wilderness areas and meet a very specific criteria. So to qualify for this bill, they would have to be a water diversion facility that was in existence before the wilderness area was designated. It has to be continuously used since the wilderness area was designated. The owners have to have a valid water right under Idaho law that predated the wilderness designation, and the sites only can be covered in this bill if there is no other alternative than to continue the use of these facilities within the wilderness designation. And so it is beneficial not only to the Forest Service but to these private property owners individually for the water rights that they have recognized that are valid.

Let me say that this bill illustrates one of the problems that we here in Congress have. Wilderness designation is the most inflexible and restrictive of any of the land use weapons that are at our disposal and in our arsenal. Too often we find after the fact of that designation that there are simple activities that are denied because of that designation that should not have been there in the first place. We ought to be wise enough to devise a conservation practice for our lands without creating unintended consequences to neighboring families that were poorly thought out when the designation was originally made. There is no reason we cannot be both good stewards and good neighbors. This shows one of the problems we have when we rush into designation of land without doing a thorough understanding of what the consequences of that designation of land will be.

I understand also there was another change in this particular bill. And although I stand, as I did on the other, to support it, I want to make public that we do not approve of the change that was made in that bill. Just as in the DeFazio bill, the word ''shall'' would have made it a better bill, and it should have remained, and that was the concept that the committee voted, so in this bill the word ''shall'' was changed to more permissive language after the committee voted on the bill. That ''shall'' should have been in here, which would have been the better language for this particular piece of legislation.

Even though I support the bill with the change, that change was done in a poor process. That change should have been done before the committee actually allowed this bill to leave their jurisdiction. And in all sincerity, the mandate would be the appropriate policy we as Congress should have insisted upon. So I am not happy with that particular change, but I still support the bill because overwhelmingly it does a great deal of good in areas where otherwise there would be a great deal of harm done by the unexpected consequences of some rash action many years before. So I support this bill as well.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3538, the Idaho Wilderness Water Resources Protection Act. This bipartisan, non-controversial legislation is a technical fix intended to enable the Forest Service to authorize and permit existing historical water diversions within Idaho wilderness.

Last year, one of my constituents came to me for help with a problem. The Middle Fork Lodge has a water diversion within the Frank Church-River of No Return Wilderness Area that has existed since before the wilderness area was established and is protected under statute. The diversion was beginning to leak and is in desperate need of repairs to ensure that it does not threaten the environment and watershed, but when the Forest Service began the process of issuing the Lodge a permit to allow them to make the necessary repairs, we discovered that the Forest Service did not have the authority to issue the required permit.

As we looked into this issue, we discovered that the Forest Service lacks this authority throughout both the Frank Church-River of No Return Wilderness, where there are 22 known water developments, and the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness, where there are three. These diversions are primarily used to support irrigation and minor hydropower generation for use on non-Federal lands.

The damage to the water diversion at the Middle Fork Lodge is severe enough that the Forest Service had to do temporary emergency repairs last fall, but without authority to issue them the necessary special use permit, they will be unable to do the work needed to permanently fix the problem. While the urgent situation at the Middle Fork Lodge brought this issue to my attention, it is obvious to me that this problem is larger than just one diversion. At some point in the future, all 20 of these existing diversions will need maintenance or repair work done to ensure their integrity.

H.R. 3538 authorizes the Forest Service to issue special use permits for 20 qualifying historic water systems in these wilderness areas. I believe it is important to get ahead of this problem and ensure that the Forest Service has the tools necessary to manage these lands.

For these reasons I have worked with my colleague, WALT MINNICK, to introduce H.R. 3538. This legislation allows the Forest Service to issue the required special use permits to owners of these historic water systems and sets out specific criteria for doing so. Providing this authority will ensure that existing water diversions can be properly maintained and repaired when necessary and preserves beneficial use for private property owners who hold water rights under state law.

I have deeply appreciated the cooperation of the Forest Service in addressing this problem. Not only have they communicated with me the need to find a system-wide solution to this issue, but at my request they drafted this legislation to ensure that it only impacts specific targeted historical diversions—those with valid water rights that cannot feasibly be relocated outside of the wilderness area.

H.R. 3538 is bipartisan and non-controversial. It is intended as a simple, reasonable solution to a problem that I think we can all agree should be solved as quickly as possible. I was encouraged that the bill passed out of Committee without objection and am hopeful that we can move it through the legislative process without delay so that the necessary maintenance to these diversions may be completed before the damage is beyond repair.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), for managing the bills this afternoon with me, 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. 3538, 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.

Ms. BORDALLO. 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.

COMMENDING THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1007) commending the University of Alabama for winning the Bowl Championship Series National Championship Game.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1007

Whereas, on January 7, 2010, the University of Alabama Crimson Tide defeated the University of Texas Longhorns, 37–21, in the Bowl Championship Series (BCS) National Championship Game in Pasadena, California;

Whereas the University of Alabama located in Tuscaloosa, Alabama, has become one of the premier athletic and academic institutions in the country;

Whereas the University of Alabama has been the Southeastern Conference (SEC) Football Champion a record-setting 22 times;

Whereas the University of Alabama has made an NCAA-record 57 bowl appearances;

Whereas the Crimson Tide players won many individual accomplishments throughout the season including, Mark Ingram as the first player from the University of Alabama to win the Heisman Trophy, Rolando McClain as the Butkus Award Winner, and 6 players selected as Associated Press First Team All Americans;

Whereas Mark Ingram rushed for 116 yards and 2 touchdowns to be named the Offensive Most Valuable Player of the BCS National Championship Game;

Whereas Marcell Dareus returned an interception for a touchdown and was named the Defensive Most Valuable Player of the BCS National Championship Game;

Whereas the Crimson Tide defense held the University of Texas to 276 offensive yards and forced 5 turnovers during the BCS National Championship Game;

Whereas Nick Saban in his third year as head coach led the University of Alabama to its first National Championship since 1992; and

Whereas residents of Alabama and Crimson Tide fans worldwide are to be commended for their longstanding support, perseverance, and pride in the team: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) commends the University of Alabama for winning the Bowl Championship Series National Championship;

(2) recognizes the achievements of the players, coaches, students, and support staff who were instrumental in the victory; and

(3) directs the Clerk of the House of Representatives to transmit a copy of this resolution to University of Alabama President Dr. Robert E. Witt and head coach Nick Saban for appropriate display.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend and insert extraneous material on H. Res. 1007 into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the University of Alabama football team for their victory in the 2010 Bowl Championship Series National Championship Game.

On January 7, football fans all across the country were treated to an exceptional game as the University of Alabama Crimson Tide defeated the University of Texas Longhorns to win the national title. With the defeat of the Longhorns team by a score of 37–21, the championship game marked an NCAA record of 57 bowl appearances for the Crimson Tide.

This was the Crimson Tide's first title since 1992, its eighth since the advent of the polls in the 1930s, and its seventh number one Associated Press title. This year's team earned a 14–0 season record and won the Associated Press title unanimously. The team's win brought a fourth consecutive title back to the Southeastern Conference. The Crimson Tide had won all season on the strength of their defense and running game, and they did so again in the championship game.

The outstanding players and coaches produced a great season, winning numerous awards and gaining exceptional praise from all over the athletic world, including the National Football Foundation and the Football Writers Association. Both rewarded the team with honorary awards.

Congratulations to Mark Ingram, who received the Heisman Trophy, becoming the first University of Alabama player and the third sophomore in history to win the award. Ingram won the award by only 28 points, the closest finish in the Heisman award's 75-year-long history. A Dean's List student at the University of Alabama, Ingram excels both on and off the field. He ran 116 yards in the championship game and scored 2 touchdowns on 22 carries, leading his team to victory and to his being named the offensive most valuable player of the game.

Congratulations are also due to defensive end Marcell Dareus, also a sophomore at the university, who was named defensive most valuable player of the game. Dareus made the game's key defensive play in the second quarter with an interception return for a 28-yard touchdown run.

I want to extend my congratulations to Head Coach Nick Saban. In the short span of 3 years, Saban took a program that had struggled to find success and brought it back to championship caliber. A two-time National Coach of the Year, Saban has achieved resounding success as a head coach. Over the years, he has earned a reputation as an outstanding leader, organizer, and motivator. His commitment to rebuilding the total college football program at the University of Alabama, paired with his conviction to make his players the best that they can be, has led his team to be leaders on and off the field. His team has repeatedly exhibited grit, determination, and resilience, often overcoming adversity to achieve victory.

The extraordinary achievement of this year's team is a tribute to the skill and dedication of all the players, as well as coaches, students, alumni, families, and fans that have helped to make the University of Alabama a premier football program. Winning the national championship, finishing the season with a 14–0 overall record, and leading the Southeastern Conference to another championship has brought national acclaim to the University of Alabama and great pride to those that care for the school. I know the fans of the university will revel in this great triumph as they look forward to the 2010 season.

Mr. Speaker, once again I congratulate the University of Alabama football team for their tremendous success.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 1007, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today commending the University of Alabama for winning the Bowl Championship Series National Championship Game in Pasadena. It is special to me for three quick reasons, among others. One, my brother is a graduate of the University of Alabama, both the undergrad and the law school, in Tuscaloosa. And really good friends of mine had a son, number 75, Barrett Jones, the right guard—I think he played both sides—but an outstanding young man. His mother was a high school classmate of mine, and his father and his father's family are good friends of ours, and I wish them a lot of luck.

Another thing is, there have been two coaches in the SEC to win SEC championships from two different schools. One is Nick Saban, who won it at LSU and now at Alabama, and Bear Bryant who won it at Alabama and the University of Kentucky.

The University of Alabama is located in Tuscaloosa. It was founded in 1831. The University of Alabama is the oldest and largest of the State's major research universities, with student enrollment of approximately 29,000. The university has 12 academic divisions and houses the only publicly supported law school in Alabama.

The University of Alabama is widely recognized as a premier university. The university is consistently ranked among the top 50 public universities by U.S. News & World Report and has the most students of any institution named to the USA Today All-USA College Academic Team. The University of Alabama is widely known as one of the Nation's flagship public universities. And one special person to be affiliated and attend the law school is Harper Lee, who wrote ''To Kill a Mockingbird,'' a very special lady to the citizens of Alabama and the country.

The University of Alabama's athletic program has excelled throughout the history of the institution. The Alabama Crimson Tide football program was started in 1892 and is the university's most nationally known athletic program. The program has won 22 SEC titles, 13 national championships, and, this year, one Heisman Trophy. The Crimson Tide has also produced 18 Hall of Famers and 96 All-Americans.

On January 7, the University of Alabama won the 2009 BCS championship game against the University of Texas. Sophomore running back and Heisman Trophy winner Mark Ingram was named the team's offensive MVP, and sophomore defensive end Marcell Dareus was named the defensive MVP.

I congratulate the University of Alabama, the team, and Head Coach Nick Saban on winning this BCS championship. And I congratulate Mark Ingram and the team for winning the 2009 Heisman Trophy. After Alabama won the 1978 national championship in a very famous and legendary college game against Penn State in the Sugar Bowl on December 31, 1978, just the previous spring the University of Kentucky had won the national championship in basketball; so immediately the next weekend or so they played each other in basketball, and I will never forget the University of Kentucky fans unfolding a banner that said ''Congratulations from one champion to another.''

□ 1500

It showed a lot of class for my fellow Kentuckians to do that to another school. But it showed a lot of spirit in the SEC and the pride we have in each other. And of course after last night, and we expect this weekend, the University of Kentucky's basketball team will be ranked number one. So hopefully, after this spring, the University of Alabama fans, like my friend from Birmingham here with me today, will

be able to congratulate our team, the University of Kentucky, on winning the national championship following Alabama this year. That is our hope. And I endorse this resolution. I urge my colleagues to support it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I notice my friend, Mr. BACHUS, the introducer of this resolution, probably awaiting a chance to make some remarks. So I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to Mr. BACHUS from Alabama.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlelady from Hawaii and the gentleman from Kentucky, and the Education and Labor Committee for expediting this resolution, and for your kind words in support of the University of Alabama and its fine football team upon winning the national championship.

And Mr. Speaker, I thank you and the Congress for giving the Alabama delegation the opportunity to congratulate the University of Alabama and its football team for winning the national championship. All members of the Alabama delegation have joined with me and Congressman ARTUR DAVIS. I and he are the lead cosponsors of this resolution.

This is a celebration of the culmination of a very successful season on and off the field of play. And as I say, it culminated in the game between the University of Alabama and University of Texas, two teams that exemplify college football and college athletics at its best.

In the previous year, Alabama was undefeated, but then lost to Florida in the SEC championship game and Utah in the Sugar Bowl. Disappointing losses like that might tear some teams apart. Instead, it made the university's coaching staff and players even more committed and determined to put in the hard work and dedication needed to make it all the way to the top. The hard work started in spring practice and continued through the long fall schedule.

One important lesson is never allow your defeats to hold you back. Last week we honored Mark Ingram, who also has overcome challenges to win the Heisman Trophy. Alabama did this, they put the last two defeats of the former season behind them and dedicated them to the year ahead.

To make it to the national championship game, you must have the discipline to win in the regular season week in and week out. Alabama always came prepared to play to the very end, whether it was in the season opener against a talented Virginia Tech team, or against the demanding competition in the SEC, which many believe is presently the toughest football conference in the Nation, although I am sure some of my colleagues would debate that.

There were games won by comfortable margins, and there were close calls against the University of Tennessee and Auburn University. There was the return match-up with Florida, the defending SEC champion and the defending national champion, and its outstanding quarterback, Tim Tebow, in the SEC title game.

Each game and each victory was a building block towards the BCS championship game on January 7, where the team achieved its ultimate goal. The match-up in Pasadena was fitting because the University of Alabama and the University of Texas both have proud football histories, with legendary coaches, with coaches like Paul ''Bear'' Bryant and Darrell Royal.

The fans on both sides were avid and dedicated, who came out so to support their teams in great number and with great enthusiasm. But in doing so, they were very respectful and hospitable towards each other. That is the way college athletics should be. That is the way that things should be on the floor of this House. And we should all be committed to that. And I think that we are.

The game itself had inspiring personal stories. The quarterback for Texas, Colt McCoy, is a fine young man. When he was injured, his team took from his example and never gave up, fighting until the end. Alabama's quarterback, Greg McElroy, quietly played with two broken ribs. Alabama running back Mark Ingram, the MVP of the game and the first Heisman Trophy winner in school history, is a student-athlete of outstanding character and spirit. But it was a team effort. In the end, Alabama came out on top, and finished the season with a perfect 14–0 record, and its first national championship season since 1992, under Coach Gene Stallings.

There was another undefeated team, and that was Boise State University. And I congratulate coach Chris Peterson of Boise State. When someone said they should be invited to the White House together with the University of Alabama, he graciously said there is only one national champion, that is the University of Alabama, and they should be invited. So I congratulate Boise State University on their successful undefeated year, as do all citizens of Alabama.

The passionate fans in Alabama can be very proud of the way that their student-athletes have represented both the university and the state. I commend President Dr. Robert Witt and his administration, and Coach Nick Saban and his fine staff, for setting high standards on and off the field. And last but not least, we congratulate the alumni, the fans, and the students of the University of Alabama for their support.

But most of all, it was the players, the athletes, each and every one of them. Through their hard work, these players have earned the right to be called champions. We at Alabama salute them, are proud of them, and we appreciate the opportunity to honor them with this resolution.

Ms. HIRONO. I would like to ask whether the gentleman from Kentucky has any further speakers.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I have no further requests for time.

In closing, and I should have said before about Boise State, they had an outstanding team this year. And I also want to close with Texas. I didn't mention the University of Texas. What a quality program, quality athletes, quality coach. And there was a special relationship with a Colt McCoy, the quarterback, and Jordan Shipley, the wide receiver. If people had a chance to watch the game, Colt McCoy I think went out on the second possession injured.

If the story that I have heard is correct, which has been told to me, is their fathers played together at Abilene Christian University in Abilene, Texas. And so these kids have known each other their entire life, and probably were sitting on the stage that they had always dreamed of played together their entire life, and then within the second series Colt McCoy was injured. If you watched the game, there was nobody that played as well on the field that night as Jordan Shipley. And I imagine he just increased his game to make up for his friend. And that just shows the class of Texas. Those are two athletes I mentioned. All of them are wonderful and fantastic young men. And I want to congratulate them as well.

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

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, once again I would like to congratulate the University of Alabama for their tremendous win. And I in particular would like to thank my friend, Mr. BACHUS, for his comments about how good sportsmanship should be played on all fields, including this field.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1007.

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.

CONGRATULATING THE NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY FEINBERG SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1004) congratulating the Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine for its 150 years of commitment to advancing science and improving health.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1004

Whereas, on March 12, 1859, the origins of Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine began with Drs. Hosmer A. Johnson, Edmund Andrews, Ralph N. Isham, and David Rutter signing an agreement to establish the medical department of Lind University, which provided the first graded curriculum in a United States medical school;

Whereas, on October 9, 1859, the medical school marked its first session;

Whereas, on April 26, 1864, the medical department of Lind University became Chicago Medical College;

Whereas in 1870, Chicago Medical College entered into an agreement with Northwestern University to serve as the University's Department of Medicine;

Whereas in 2002, Northwestern University Board of Trustees renamed the medical school in honor of benefactor Reuben Feinberg;

Whereas the Feinberg School of Medicine is one of the Nation's pre-eminent medical schools, producing the next generation of leaders in medical and related fields through its innovative research and educational programs;

Whereas the Feinberg School of Medicine supports the provision of the highest standard of clinical care by its clinical affiliates for their patients;

Whereas the Feinberg School of Medicine is cited annually by national college rankings as one of the top medical schools for research;

Whereas Feinberg School of Medicine alumni are leaders in their fields;

Whereas the Feinberg School of Medicine is a leader in aligning experts from various disciplines to create a collaborative research enterprise that explores the fertile discovery space between disciplines; and

Whereas Feinberg School of Medicine faculty are nationally and internationally prominent physicians and scientists who have an impact on our most pressing medical and research issues: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) congratulates the Feinberg School of Medicine on the momentous occasion of its 150th anniversary, and expresses its best wishes for continued success;

(2) recognizes and commends the Feinberg School of Medicine for its dedication to educating world class physicians and scientists, sponsoring cutting edge medical research, and providing highly specialized clinical care; and

(3) directs the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make available enrolled copies of this resolution to the Feinberg School of Medicine for appropriate display.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend and insert extraneous material on H. Res. 1004 into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of H. Res. 1004, which congratulates the Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine for its the 150 years of commitment to advancing science and health through educating students and supporting significant research in the medical field.

The Feinberg School of Medicine started their first classes in 1859, and is now one of 11 colleges at Northwestern University. Feinberg School of Medicine enrolls over 4,130 students; 1,600 full-time, 200 part-time, and 284 research students, and has established itself as one of the most premier medical schools in the Midwest.

Much has changed at Feinberg School of Medicine over its 150-year history, but the core principles have remained constant. The school still strives to empower its students to make a difference and use their education to positively impact the world around them. As one example, Feinberg's free community health outpatient medical clinic, located on the west side of Chicago, provides medical care to low-income patients, while offers Feinberg students a practical environment in which to learn from one another and attending physicians. Through the clinic's interactive learning style and commitment to public service, the community health clinic gives students a taste of clinical medicine and prepares students to be successful by giving them practical, firsthand experience in the field of medicine.

The Feinberg School of Medicine is also part of the McGraw Medical Center of Northwestern University. Nearly all of its attending staff members have faculty appointments at the school, and many medical students and residents receive some of their education at this center and the community health clinic. Because of these connections, medical students and residents have an opportunity to apply the knowledge learned in the classroom to real patients, situations, and medical settings.

Through its research initiatives, state of the art clinical facilities, consistent outreach to the local community, and innovative curriculum, the medical school attracts bright and talented individuals to its faculty and student body. Feinberg School of Medicine produced a number of leaders and innovators in the medical field, including Mary Harris Thompson, Northwestern's first female medical graduate, and by some accounts, the first female surgeon in the U.S.; John A. D. Cooper, who was among the most prominent medical educators of the 20th century; Debi Thomas, the first African-American figure skater to win a medal at the Winter Olympics in 1988. She completed Feinberg School of Medicine in 1997, and has since become a leading orthopedic surgeon. These are only a few of the school's notable alumni changing the medical profession as we know it.

I want to express my support for Northwestern University's Feinberg School of Medicine and thank Congressman DAVIS for bringing this bill forward. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

As well as the previous resolution, I actually have another brother who graduated from Northwestern University, along with my sister-in-law. That is where they met, but the undergrad school, not the medical school. But they certainly loved and enjoyed their time at Evanston next to one of our world's great cities, Chicago.

I rise today in support of the House Resolution 1004, congratulating Northwestern University's Feinberg School of Medicine for its 150 years of commitment to advancing science and improving health.

□ 1515

The Feinberg School of Medicine was founded in 1859 as the Medical Department of Lind University. The department became Chicago Medical School in 1864. The medical school affiliated with Northwestern University in 1870 and was renamed the Feinberg School of Medicine in 2002.

The School of Medicine has exemplified excellence since its founding in the 19th century. It was founded with the intention of leading the reform of the medical education system. Northwestern School of Medicine led reform by demanding an extended program, correlated hospital instruction, a graded curriculum, and rigorous graduation requirements. The school also premiered the honors program in medical education in the combined M.D./Ph.D. program.

Today, the Feinberg School of Medicine remains at the forefront of medical education. It is ranked among the top 20 American medical research schools by U.S. News & World Report and accepts only 6.5 percent of applicants. The Feinberg School of Medicine is also part of the McGaw Medical Center of Northwestern University, one of the Nation's leading academic medical centers focused on research, education, and clinical services.

Today, with an increasing need for health care and constantly changing resources and technology, the demand for high-quality, innovative medical schools is high. Feinberg School of Medicine provides this challenging education based on ongoing research and the latest developments.

I am happy to congratulate the Feinberg School of Medicine on the 150th anniversary of their founding and ask my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlelady from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

Mrs. BIGGERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today also in strong support of House Resolution

1004, a resolution recognizing the 150th anniversary of the Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine. I thank the gentleman from Illinois, Congressman DANNY DAVIS, for introducing this resolution.

I am an alumni of Northwestern University School of Law, and I am pleased to see that the School of Medicine is continuing the Northwestern tradition of excellence. As was mentioned, according to U.S. News & World Report, Feinberg is now ranked in the top 20 medical schools in the country. When I attended law school, in the downtown campus was the School of Medicine, the School of Law, and then the business school, which moved out to Evanston. But the complex has grown, certainly in the medical school, since 1859 as the Medical Department of Lind University, then the Feinberg School of Medicine becoming a part of Northwestern University in 1870. People now that would see the complex in Chicago, it is huge and continues to grow and to provide the excellence for education for so many students.

A couple of other notable alumni that went to the school there are Charles Mayo, one of the founders of the Mayo Clinic, which is certainly well known—it's nice to have that distinguished type of graduate from the school—and John Cooper, the first president of the Association of American Medical Colleges. So the illustrious 150-year history of Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine is such that we have to commend the administration, the doctors, the faculty, and all that are involved in making the School of Medicine one of the best in the country. I am proud to have gone to the school, and I am proud to support this resolution.

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

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, once again, I congratulate the Feinberg School of Medicine for their leadership in medicine and science and urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1004.

The question was taken.

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

Ms. HIRONO. 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.

CONGRATULATING THE DARTMOUTH OUTING CLUB OF HANOVER, NEW HAMPSHIRE

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 776) congratulating the Dartmouth Outing Club of Hanover, New Hampshire, for 100 years of service to the United States and its wilderness, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 776

Whereas, December 14, 2009, marks the centennial of the founding of the Dartmouth Outing Club (DOC) at Dartmouth College in Hanover, New Hampshire;

Whereas the DOC, the oldest and largest collegiate outing club in the Nation, was founded by Fred Harris, Dartmouth Class of 1911;

Whereas the DOC has continually promoted environmental stewardship through student leadership;

Whereas the DOC has promoted environmental stewardship by caring for over 100 miles of hiking trails, including over 70 miles of the Appalachian National Scenic Trail from Route 12 in Woodstock, Vermont, to Route 112 in Woodstock, New Hampshire, as well as maintaining cabins and shelters and teaching wilderness skills, sports, and safety to students and community members;

Whereas the DOC is a student-run club and has consistently focused on student leadership by providing students with the opportunity to lead by carrying out projects which have included constructing the Class of '66 Lodge, organizing the largest freshman trips program in the country, and directing subclubs that together allow students to learn about, appreciate, and experience the natural environment year-round;

Whereas a division of the DOC which promoted environmental sustainability and conservation has displayed leadership in environmental conservation by testifying before Congress regarding the Alaska National Interests Lands Conservation Act in the spring of 1977;

Whereas the DOC has promoted sustainability by having Dartmouth students buy and re-engineer a passenger bus into the DOC's Big Green Bus, powered by vegetable oil and solar energy;

Whereas, on June 16, 2009, 15 Dartmouth College students began the Big Green Bus' fifth annual cross-country trip, traveling 11,300 miles to promote environmental awareness; and

Whereas throughout 2009, the Dartmouth Outing Club, along with current members and alumni of Dartmouth College, took part in Centennial Celebrations for the organization by participating in a 100-mile hike of Outing Club trails, a Riverfest on the Connecticut River, the 63rd annual Woodsmen's Weekend, and a hike of the entire Appalachian National Scenic Trail from Georgia to Maine by students and alumni simultaneously in different sections: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives congratulates the Dartmouth Outing Club of Hanover, New Hampshire, for 100 years of service to the United States and its wilderness, and commends the Club's ongoing commitment to further environmental stewardship and student leadership.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend and insert extraneous material on H. Res. 776 into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. HIRONO. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 776, celebrating the Dartmouth Outing Club of Hanover, New Hampshire, for 100 years of service to the United States and its wilderness.

Dartmouth has a rich history. In his arguments in 1818 to the Supreme Court in the Dartmouth College case, Daniel Webster said: ''It is, sir, as I have said, a small college, and yet there are those who love it.'' Dartmouth is no longer small, yet many continue to admire the important contributions of Dartmouth's faculty, students, and organizations, including those of the Dartmouth Outing Club of Hanover.

Founding in 1809, the club set out to pique students' interest in the vast arctic sports that New Hampshire's winter has to offer. However, by the end of the school clear, it had grown to encompass the students' year-round recreational activities. This resolution proudly acknowledges and celebrates the club's century of contributions. These contributions include the establishment of many programs and projects which have provided opportunities for students to learn about, appreciate, and experience their natural environment year round. The club teaches wilderness skills and sports and safety know-how. The Environmental Studies Division of the club also offers lessons in environmental sustainability and conservation.

With over 1,500 student members, the Dartmouth Outing Club of Hanover is the largest collegiate outing club in the Nation. The club organizes trips in the out-of-doors and is also tasked with maintaining over 70 miles of the Appalachian National Scenic Trail.

The club has been a pioneer for environmental sustainability. In the spring of 1977, the club testified before Congress regarding the Alaska Lands Act, which led to the establishment of the Dartmouth Organic Farm. In addition, Dartmouth's Outing Club built a carbon-neutral greenhouse and re-engineered the club's big green bus to run on vegetable oil and solar energy.

This resolution encourages us all to join in the celebration of the Dartmouth Outing Club's 100 years of exemplary service to our Nation's wilderness and the Dartmouth community.

Mr. Speaker, once again, I express my support of H. Res. 776 and urge my colleagues to support this measure.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 776 and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Dartmouth Outing Club on 100 years of service to the United States and its wilderness.

The Dartmouth Outing Club was formed in 1909 to stimulate interest in out-of-door sports. Club membership increased steadily, and by 1920 two-thirds of Dartmouth's student body were members of the outing club. Today the club has over 1,500 student members and is the largest collegiate outing club in the Nation.

Due to its large membership, the club is organized as an umbrella organization in which smaller clubs that specialize in an aspect of outdoor recreation are housed. These specialized clubs include Outward Bound, Bait and Bullet, and the Ledyard Canoe Club. Every year, the Outing Club organizes freshman trips during pre-orientation to encourage freshman class bonding and membership in the club.

The Dartmouth Outing Club, or DOC, has consistently focused on promoting outdoor activities. DOC provides students with the opportunity to participate in outdoor projects, trips and classes. DOC cares for over 100 miles of hiking trails, organizes projects such as the building of the Class of '66 Lodge, and organizes winter sport trips such as ski and snowboard trips.

On the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Dartmouth Outing Club, it is important to recognize their contributions to the students, alumni and New Hampshire wilderness. The DOC encourages students to be active and to remove themselves from the stresses of collegiate life and participate in outdoor activities.

For over 100 years, the Dartmouth Outing Club has provided a service connecting the students of Dartmouth with the New Hampshire wilderness to benefit both. I congratulate the students and alumni associated with the Dartmouth Outing Club on the occasion of their 100th anniversary. I have visited Dartmouth's campus, and the wilderness around there is absolutely stunningly beautiful both in New Hampshire and Vermont, which is just across the river. I think it is worthy of support, and I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

Ms. HIRONO. Once again, I congratulate the Dartmouth Outing Club. At a time when environmental and outdoor issues in protecting our wilderness are such major concerns to so many of us, especially the young people, I thank them for their 100 years of leadership in these areas.

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 Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 776, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF CATHOLIC SCHOOLS

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1008) honoring the contributions of Catholic schools, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1008

Whereas Catholic schools in the United States are internationally acclaimed for their academic excellence, but provide students with more than an exceptional scholastic education;

Whereas Catholic schools ensure a broad, values-added education emphasizing the lifelong development of moral, intellectual, physical, and social values in young people in the United States;

Whereas the total Catholic school student enrollment for the 2008–2009 academic year was nearly 2,200,000 and the student-teacher ratio was 14 to 1;

Whereas Catholic schools teach a diverse group of students;

Whereas nearly 30 percent of school children enrolled in Catholic schools are from minority backgrounds, and nearly 15 percent are non-Catholics;

Whereas Catholic schools produce students strongly dedicated to their faith, values, families, and communities by providing an intellectually stimulating environment rich in spiritual, character, and moral development;

Whereas in 2000, the Catholic high school graduation rate was 99 percent, with 80 percent of graduates attending four-year colleges and 17 percent attending two-year colleges or technical schools;

Whereas in the 1972 pastoral message concerning Catholic education, the National Conference of Catholic Bishops stated: ''Education is one of the most important ways by which the Church fulfills its commitment to the dignity of the person and building of community. Community is central to education ministry, both as a necessary condition and an ardently desired goal. The educational efforts of the Church, therefore, must be directed to forming persons-in-community; for the education of the individual Christian is important not only to his solitary destiny, but also the destinies of the many communities in which he lives.'';

Whereas the week of January 31, 2010, to February 6, 2010, has been designated as Catholic Schools Week by the National Catholic Educational Association and the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops;

Whereas the Nation's Catholic schools emphasize the lifelong development of moral, intellectual, physical, and social values in addition to academic excellence;

Whereas Catholic schools educate a diverse group of students from all regions of the country; and

Whereas the theme for this year's Catholic Schools Week 2010 is ''Dividends for Life—Faith, Knowledge, Discipline, and Morals'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals of Catholic Schools Week, an event co-sponsored by the National Catholic Educational Association and the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops and established to recognize the vital contributions of the thousands of Catholic elementary and secondary schools in the United States;

(2) applauds the National Catholic Educational Association and the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops on their selection of a theme that all can celebrate; and

(3) congratulates Catholic schools, students, parents, and teachers across the Nation for their ongoing contributions to education, and for the key role they play in promoting and ensuring a brighter, stronger future for this Nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend and insert extraneous material on H. Res. 1008 into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 1008, which recognizes the contributions of our Nation's Catholic schools.

The Nation's first Catholic school was established in 1606 in present day St. Augustine, Florida. Since then, Catholic schools have become a critical part of America's education system. Today, the U.S. boasts more than 7,000 Catholic elementary and secondary schools that educate more than 2 million students from diverse ethnic, cultural, and religious backgrounds.

America's Catholic schools are an important education alternative for many families. Their private status provides them with the ability to implement rigorous curricula that incorporate moral values and ethics. Though not all of its students identify as Catholic, each one receives a quality education experience filled with academic rigor, character development, and spiritual lessons.

Catholic schools are known for their commitment to the academic and moral development of their students. Their students consistently demonstrate high levels of achievement. In 2000, Catholic high schools graduated 99 percent of their students, with the majority of these students continuing their academic careers at trade schools and other 2- and 4-year institutions. In the 2008/2009 school year, Catholic schools maintained a 14–1 student-teacher ratio, giving the students the benefit of a small classroom environment.

The week of January 31, 2010, to February 6, 2010, is designated by the Catholic Educational Association and the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops as Catholic Schools Week.

Catholic Schools Week honors these important educational institutions and celebrates their many achievements.

Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution and ask that my colleagues join me in reaffirming Congress' commitment to education excellence and diversity with the passage of the National Catholic Schools Week resolution. I also want to thank Representative LIPINSKI for bringing this bill forward.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1530

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 1008, honoring the contributions of Catholic schools.

January 31 through February 6 has been designated Catholic Schools Week. 2010 marks the 36th annual Catholic Schools Week, jointly sponsored by the National Catholic Education Association and the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops. Supporting Catholic Schools Week and the work of Catholic schools demonstrates support for the vital role that Catholic elementary and secondary schools play in providing a quality education to the 2.2 million students enrolled across the Nation.

The U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops states Catholic schools have a graduation rate of 99 percent, and about 97 percent of Catholic high school graduates go on to postsecondary training, to 4-year colleges, to community colleges, or to technical schools. In addition to academic success, Catholic educators place an emphasis on the importance of moral and social character development. By emphasizing the importance of developing character as well as academic knowledge, Catholic school educators help students become good citizens as well as academic leaders.

The theme for Catholic Schools Week 2010 is ''Dividends for Life.'' This theme highlights the good work done by the Nation's Catholic schools, and it reminds parents that the dividends of a Catholic school education—students prepared in faith, knowledge, morals, and discipline—last a lifetime. The investment in a Catholic school education yields a lifetime of knowledge, moral and social guidance and community.

I recognize and appreciate the work of Catholic schools, their administrators and teachers, parents, and volunteers in providing a quality academic, moral, and social education. Catholic schools are an invaluable resource to students, parents and to communities.

I have the great privilege of representing the Second District of Kentucky. Throughout the Second District, there are settlements from migration into Kentucky that have traditional Catholic backgrounds, wonderful school systems, and wonderful people who are teaching in the school system, who are maintaining the school system, and who are ministering at the schools, and there are the local citizens who fund-raise and who do things for the schools. Their principal areas are throughout the district. There's Bardstown, Kentucky, which is a beautiful city, and then there's Owensboro, Kentucky, a great vibrant city on the Ohio River. Both of their Catholic high schools are very successful in students, in athletics, and in serving their communities. I also have a section of Louisville. Though the schools are not in my district, Louisville has a great tradition of great Catholic high schools and of the Catholic education.

On behalf of the people of the Second District, which has such a great tradition, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the sponsor of this legislation, my friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 1008, honoring Catholic Schools Week and recognizing the outstanding contributions that Catholic schools have made to America.

As a proud graduate of St. Symphorosa Grammar School and St. Ignatius College Prep and as a strong supporter of Catholic education, I am honored to sponsor this resolution again this year. I would like to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) for joining me in working on this resolution as well as on many other important issues.

Since 1974, Catholic Schools Week has celebrated how Catholic schools have positively impacted our country, and it has recognized their outstanding contributions in providing a strong academic and moral education, as well as teaching the importance of responsibility to one's family and community.

The National Catholic Educational Association and the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops have provided exemplary leadership in conceptualizing and organizing Catholic Schools Week. This year's theme is timeless in scope and universal in its values. ''Catholic schools—dividends for life: faith, knowledge, discipline, morals.''

This theme perfectly embodies the call of America's Catholic schools, always emphasizing the necessity of a well-rounded educational experience. Nearly 95 percent of Catholic schools have a service program, and the average student completes approximately 80 hours of public service. My desire to serve was fostered by the dedicated teachers whom I had in 12 years of Catholic school.

Today, almost 2.2 million elementary and secondary students are enrolled in nearly 7,500 Catholic schools. By maintaining an excellent student-teacher ratio and through dedicated efforts, Catholic school students, on average, surpass other students in math, science, and reading in the three grade levels tested by the NAEP test. The graduation rate for Catholic high schools is 99 percent, and 97 percent of Catholic high school graduates go on to college or to technical school. In a country where poor educational reports have sadly become an annual tradition, these statistics are truly remarkable and should be greatly commended.

Catholic schools are known for embracing students from all walks of life and are highly effective in providing excellent educational opportunities for minority students and disadvantaged youth. Almost 15 percent of students in Catholic schools are not Catholic, and over the past 30 years, the percentage of minority students enrolled in Catholic schools has more than doubled. Despite exceptional results, the success of Catholic schools does not depend on selectivity, accepting nine out of every 10 students who apply.

In addition to producing well-educated students, Catholic schools save American taxpayers billions of dollars every year by lessening the number of students in already overburdened public schools. In fact, it is estimated that taxpayers save over $1 billion from students attending Catholic schools in the Chicago area alone and $20 billion nationwide. The importance of this savings is undeniable to American taxpayers.

Unfortunately, the current economic climate, combined with decades-long travails of the middle class, have been hard on Catholic schools in some areas. Like me, my wife, Judy, attended Catholic schools for 12 years, graduating from St. Patrick's Grade School and Bishop McCort High School in Johnstown, Pennsylvania. Unfortunately, last year, St. Patrick's closed. This closing has proven to be a great loss, not just for the students of St. Patrick's but for the entire community of Moxham, demonstrating just how important Catholic schools are to the greater community.

I was born and raised and live in the Chicago archdiocese, which still has one of the most successful school systems in the country. More than 96,000 students attend 258 schools. In my district alone, there are seven Catholic high schools and approximately 50 grammar schools, including one of the best in my home parish of St. John of the Cross in Western Springs.

My experiences have taught me the important spiritual, moral, and intellectual foundations that Catholic schools provide to students. A Catholic education has granted me the knowledge, discipline, desire to serve, and a love of learning that has enabled me to achieve my doctorate degree and become a teacher before being elected to Congress. In recognizing Catholic Schools Week, we pay a special tribute to the dedicated teachers and administrators who sacrifice so much, in many cases working for less than they would earn elsewhere.

Many of my formative memories are of teachers who taught me the values

of faith and service. When I come down to this House floor, I can't help but remember the coach of my Student Congress team, Sister Diane Wiefenbach. I cannot forget in high school the impact that she had on me. That's something that I will always remember. Throughout the United States, millions of others have similar memories of the dedicated sisters, priests and lay teachers who gave their hearts and souls to touch the lives of their students.

Mr. Speaker, American Catholic schools deserve our praise, our support, and our gratitude. I would like to thank everyone who cosponsored this resolution. To share our congratulations in support for Catholic schools, I urge my colleagues to pass this resolution.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from one of our great national treasures, the city of New Orleans, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CAO).

Mr. CAO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 1008, to honor the contributions of Catholic schools in providing excellent academic opportunities for our youth.

Catholic schools throughout the United States provide an exceptional education for our children. They produce students strongly dedicated to their faith, values, families, and communities by providing an intellectually stimulating environment which is rich in spiritual, character, and moral development.

Statistics confirm the success of Catholic primary and secondary schools. The Catholic high school graduation rate is 99 percent, with 80 percent of graduates attending 4-year colleges and 17 percent attending 2-year colleges or technical schools.

The National Conference of Catholic Bishops stated, ''Education is one of the most important ways by which the church fulfills its commitment to the dignity of the person and building of community.'' They continue by saying, ''Education of the individual Christian is important not only to his solitary destiny but also the destinies of the many communities in which he lives.''

Having spent 6 years studying to become a Jesuit priest and having served as a professor in a Jesuit institution, I have a deep appreciation for the importance of education guided by principles embodied by the Catholic church. Education has always been a priority for me as a student, professor, and now as a Member of Congress.

Representing a district still recovering from Hurricane Katrina, my mission in Congress is to ensure that children in the Second District of Louisiana get the education they need. It is unacceptable that almost half of the students displaced by Hurricane Katrina were unable to complete their education.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the Representative from Illinois for bringing this important resolution honoring the contributions of Catholic schools throughout the United States. I strongly support this resolution honoring the contributions of Catholic schools and Catholic Schools Week, and I would urge my colleagues to do the same. In the words of my Jesuit brothers, ''Ad majorem Dei gloriam.''

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

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, to attest to the diversity of a Catholic education, I, too, have a degree from a Catholic school.

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Catholic Schools Week 2010.

From January 31 to February 6, 2010, nearly 2.2 million students who attend the nation's 7,248 elementary, middle and secondary Catholic schools will celebrate Catholic Schools Week.

More than 48,000 students attend Catholic schools in the Archdiocese of St. Louis, which includes 10 counties and the City of St. Louis. Over 21,000 additional Catholic students are served through 122 parish schools of religion.

I applaud the efforts of faculty and parents who provide our nation's children with an excellent education focused on faith and values.

The 2010 theme, ''Catholic Schools—Dividends for Life: Faith, Knowledge, Discipline, Morals'' reminds parents of the dividends that a Catholic school education offers. Students are prepared in faith, knowledge, morals and discipline which last a lifetime. There is no better way to invest in a child's future—and the future of our nation.

Recently, 10 Catholic schools in my congressional district joined together and raised more than $200,000 for the Key Player Initiative, which provides permanent, supportive housing to the homeless in the St. Louis region. Dan Buck, the head of St. Patrick Center, which provides services for the homeless and indigent in the St. Louis area, said the efforts of these students amazed and humbled him. He went on to say ''We learn to never underestimate the power of children and the support of our community.'' At the same event, George Henry, the superintendent of Catholic education for the Archdiocese of St. Louis said, ''our students put into practice what they are taught about treating others as Jesus would. Through the Key Player Initiative, they learned that the homeless and poor are right here in St. Louis and did their part to make this city a better place for all of us to live.'' This initiative is just one of many examples of the efforts catholic schools in my district have become involved in, and there are similar stories from many other districts throughout the country.

Catholic Schools Week is a testament to the outstanding work by the Archdioceses across the country.

The Archdiocese of St. Louis has a longstanding tradition of leadership. I thank the Archdiocese for their commitment to enriching the lives of children by providing an education based on family, values, and faith.

For that reason, I rise today in support of H. Res. 1008, honoring the contributions of Catholic schools and I am pleased to honor them in their continuing endeavors.

Vote ''yes'' on H. Res. 1008.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 1008 to honor the contributions of Catholic schools.

The tradition of Catholic schools in America dates back to settlement of the New World, and through the centuries, Catholic institutions have been incredibly effective at educating young people in the United States. Today, enrollment in Catholic institutions numbers at above 2 million students across the country with a student to teacher ratio of approximately 14 to 1. Additionally, Catholic schools graduate roughly 99 percent of their students with 97 percent of those graduates pursuing degrees at institutions of higher education.

Mr. Speaker, as we become a more interconnected and global society, the education of our young people will become increasingly important. Catholic institutions help to ensure that those same young people receive quality educations, and I ask my fellow colleagues to join me today in supporting H. Res. 1008 to honor the contributions of Catholic schools.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 1008 to honor the contributions of Catholic schools across the country, and in honor of 2010 National Catholic Schools Week from January 31st through February 6th. I want to thank my colleagues—Mr. LIPINSKI of Illinois and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey—for their leadership in bringing this resolution to the House floor today, and I am proud to join them on this important resolution as an original cosponsor.

As a graduate of Catholic elementary and high schools—Sacred Heart Academy and Aquinas High School in Augusta, Georgia—I am keenly aware of the contributions that they provide to the 2.2 million students educated in Catholic schools across the country every year. These include close to 1,200 students at three Catholic schools in my District: St. Catherine of Siena in Kennesaw, St. Joseph's in my hometown of Marietta, and St. Mary's in Rome.

Not only do Catholic schools—like Sacred Heart and Aquinas—provide a strong and competitive academic environment, they also teach moral and ethical standards, skills for living and self esteem, and a Christian integration of spirit, mind, and body in each of their students.

Upon graduating from Aquinas, I thought that the Catholic school curriculum would be what best prepared me for my future. However, I must admit that I was wrong. While the strenuous academics at Sacred Heart and Aquinas did lay the foundation for success at Georgia Tech and the Medical College of Georgia, it was the faith and ethical standards taught at these schools that truly prepared me for life's struggles.

Mr. Speaker, while opening and running my medical practice, the respect for life taught at Sacred Heart and Aquinas led me to value and care for life at all stages, indeed from the moment of conception until natural death. Now that I have left my medical career to serve as a Member of Congress, I find the lessons learned from my days in Catholic schools more valuable now than ever. On a daily basis, I am confronted by difficult questions that affect millions of lives. If it were not for the moral standards and faith in God taught at Sacred Heart and Aquinas, I do not believe that I could properly represent the people of Northwest Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, our education system is only made stronger by Catholic schools in Northwest Georgia and throughout the nation which

fully prepare their students for a brighter future. I urge all of my colleagues to support H. Res. 1008, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 1008. This resolution honors the contributions that Catholic schools make to our communities and, in particular, recognizes the annual Catholic Schools Week, celebrated from January 31 to February 6 of this year. I thank Mr. LIPINSKI of Illinois for introducing H. Res 1008, for recognizing Catholic Schools Week, and for his ongoing support for Catholic schools nationwide.

Catholic Schools Week is an event co-sponsored by the National Catholic Educational Association and the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops. The week honors the principals, teachers, coaches, and parents who educate more than 2.2 million children in Catholic Schools. This year, the Conference of Catholic Bishops selected ''Dividends for Life—Faith, Knowledge, Discipline, and Morals'' as the theme.

Guam's association with the Roman Catholic Church dates back to Ferdinand Magellan's arrival on our island in 1521. Guam became an important port-of-call along trade routes through the Pacific sailed by Spanish galleons. Padre Diego Luis de San Vitores, a Spanish Jesuit missionary, arrived in Guam in 1662 during his journey from Mexico to the Philippines. Padre San Vitores vowed to return to Guam upon leaving the island.

Three years later, through his close ties to the royal court, he persuaded King Philip IV of Spain and Queen Maria Ana of Austria to order the establishment of a Catholic mission in Guam. Padre San Vitores established a mission in the village of Agaña, which later became the site of the island's first Catholic Church. It is now the seat of the Metropolitan Archdiocese of Agaña, canonically erected in 1911 and elevated to a Diocese in 1965—300 years after Padre Diego Luis de San Vitores kept his promise to return to the island. The Diocese was further elevated in 1984 to a Metropolitan Diocese. Today it enjoys a congregation of 101,000 strong throughout Oceania.

The Roman Catholic faith grew strong on Guam over the years. This strength is represented in the quality of Catholic school education on the island. Our island has six elementary and middle schools, and four high schools that teach the Catholic faith along with strong academic curriculum.

The Catholic school tradition on Guam began with Bishop Appollinaris Baumgartner. He recognized our island's need for quality education inspired by the Catholic faith. In 1946, he invited three Sisters of Mercy from North Carolina to Guam. They established The Academy of Our Lady, the first all girls' Catholic high school on Guam. This school remains in operation today. Also, Bishop Baumgartner invited the School Sisters of Notre Dame of La Crosse, Wisconsin, to come to Guam in 1949. Soon after arriving on the island the Sisters founded Notre Dame High School, a Catholic co-educational high school. Notre Dame High School also remains open today. Father Dueñas Memorial High School is the third Catholic high school on Guam. Its namesake, Father Jesus Baza Dueñas, was executed on July 11, 1944, by the Japanese forces occupying Guam. Father Dueñas was killed along with his nephew because he would not betray the location of an American sailor hiding on the island. Father Dueñas Memorial High School continues his legacy of courage and integrity. Lastly in 2008, the Archdiocese of Agaña opened St. Thomas Aquinas Catholic High School, to further educate Guam's students. The school is a co-educational high school offering a college preparatory academic program that challenges and develops its students to become moral and productive citizens with global perspectives firmly rooted in the Gospel of Jesus Christ through the teachings of the Catholic Church. All four schools offer rigorous curricula to prepare students for college while instilling strong moral values and an understanding of the Catholic faith.

Today, the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Agaña remains committed to serving the people of Guam. Under the direction of the Most Reverend Anthony Sablan Apuron, OFM Cap, DD, Metropolitan Archbishop of Agaña, Catholic educational institutions on Guam provide quality academic instruction to students. The contributions of the Catholic school system to the people of Guam are reflected in our local leaders in the clergy, government, and private-sector who are alumni of the Catholic schools.

I recognize and commend the Catholic schools in Guam for their commitment to a rigorous education, sound moral values, and respect and understanding for the Catholic faith. It is my hope that the tradition of Catholic schools education on Guam and around the United States will remain strong for generations to come.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 1008, which recognizes and honors the dedication and academic excellence of Catholic schools in all 50 states as well as the District of Columbia. Catholic schools provide each and every student with a quality education and life skills training through the commitment, professionalism, and faith of their teachers and administrators. I would like to thank Mr. LIPINSKI for his leadership in bringing this resolution to the Floor and I ask my colleagues to join me supporting its passage.

The impact of Catholic education in the United States is tremendous, as over 2 million elementary and secondary students, including more than 100,000 students in my home state of New Jersey, continue to receive a values-added education with an emphasis on academic excellence, advancement beyond high school, fundamental morals and community reinvestment. The graduation rate for Catholic school students is outstanding at 99 percent with 97 percent of these graduates choosing to continue their education through college studies.

The week of January 31, 2010 to February 6, 2010, marks the annual national celebration of Catholic Schools Week. An event which began in 1974, this year's theme of ''Catholic Schools—Dividends for Life: Faith, Knowledge, Discipline, Morals,'' exemplifies the broad spectrum of Catholic education. Students are taught to strive for scholastic excellence, the importance of an integrated focus on the transcendent importance of God, the skills of personal and academic discipline, and to recognize and defend moral imperatives.

Catholic schools, Mr. Speaker, are an integral part of our nation's commitment to education and serve a cross-section of American students. Catholic schools have a rich history of welcoming, serving and educating new immigrants. With close to 30 percent of Catholic school enrollment from minority backgrounds and approximately 15 percent from non-Catholics; it is evident that this extraordinary institution meets the needs of a highly diverse group of young people.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read a few words which sum up the unique and extraordinary vision of Catholic education from a 1972 pastoral message by the National Conference on Catholic Bishops: ''Education is one of the most important ways by which the Church fulfills its'' commitment to the dignity of the person and building of community. Community is central to education ministry, both as a necessary condition and an ardently desired goal. The educational efforts of the Church, therefore, must be directed to forming persons-in-community; for the education of the individual Christian is important not only to his solitary destiny, but also the destinies of the many communities in which he lives.''

Again, I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this important element of faith-based education which serves alongside America's public and private schools to strengthen and reinforce our education system.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today in support of H. Res. 1008, ''Honoring the contributions of Catholic schools.'' I would like to begin by thanking my colleague Representative LIPINSKI for introducing this resolution in the House, as quality education should be at the top of our priority list. I urge my colleagues to support and acknowledge Catholic schools and their students, parents, teachers, and administrators across the United States for their ongoing contributions to education and improving and strengthening our communities and our nation as a whole.

Catholic schools deliver high-quality education, challenge students to reach their full potential, and provide thousands of families throughout the United States with outstanding educational options for their children. Today, there are over 6,000 Catholic schools serving around 2,200,000 school children across the nation. In addition to their service to our nation as a whole, Catholic schools also play an important role in the education of over 18,000 school children in my home city of Houston, Texas. Within the city of Houston there are currently 39 Catholic schools, which educate children from kindergarten through high school, and there are 24 other Catholic schools within the greater Houston metropolitan area.

Catholic schools have consistently demonstrated their commitment to high academic standards, small class sizes and new and innovative approaches to education. Many parents choose Catholic schools due to their small class sizes with an average student-teacher ratio of about 14 to 1. Catholic schools have also continually demonstrated their success in educating students, boasting a 99 percent high school graduation rate with 97 percent of Catholic high school graduates going on to higher education. This impressive rate of students that go on to higher education has served as a great resource not only to the communities in which these students live, but also to our nation as a whole.

Our nation's Catholic schools are engaged in educating an increasingly diverse group of students with nearly 30 percent of enrolled

students representing a minority group and about 15 percent of students from non-Catholic backgrounds. The diversity and educational excellence of students that can be found in Catholic schools across the nation has helped to produce students and citizens with a strong understanding of the many cultures and values that make up our community and nation. I ask my colleagues for their continued support of Catholic schools and urge them to support this resolution.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 1008, honoring the contributions of America's Catholic schools. These institutions provide an education that goes beyond simple arithmetic and basic grammar, instilling in children a faith and purpose that continues to serve them long after graduation. Catholic schools thrive on a sense of community and offer children and their neighborhoods high-quality education and a nurturing environment to grow beyond the classroom. This is on display everyday in the 5th District at schools like St. Benedict, Mt. Caramel, Gordon Tech and so many more.

With more than two million students across the U.S. attending Catholic schools, their efforts are felt in countless neighborhoods and in the communities they serve. They hold their students to a strict standard of excellence by graduating 99 percent of high school students—a shining example of what our high schools are capable of achieving.

Further, Catholic schools' contributions are not limited to those within the Catholic faith. Almost 15 percent of attendees are not Catholic, offering us lessons in diversity and inclusion. These ideals are extended further by minority students comprising almost a third of Catholic schools' student bodies.

I want to thank Representative LIPINSKI for introducing this resolution and urge all my colleagues to support it this afternoon. Catholic schools have and will continue to provide valuable educational experiences for our nation's youth and we must thank them and recognize these institutions for all they do.

Ms. HIRONO. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1008, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONGRATULATING THE PENN STATE WOMEN'S VOLLEYBALL TEAM

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1015) congratulating the Penn State women's volleyball team on winning the 2009 NCAA Division I national championship.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1015

Whereas the Penn State Nittany Lions continued a 102 match winning streak, the longest Division I women's streak, to win the 2009 NCAA Division I women's volleyball championship;

Whereas head coach Russ Rose has 1,001 wins to his name, all of which have come at the helm of the Penn State program;

Whereas the Penn State women's volleyball team has won 65 consecutive Big Ten matches and owns the top 3 winning streaks in league history;

Whereas Megan Hodge, Alisha Glass, and juniors Blair Brown and Arielle Wilson were named AVCA First Team All-Americans and Megan Hodge was the 2009 ESPN the Magazine Academic All-American of the Year;

Whereas the Nittany Lions women's volleyball team has won 74 straight home matches and the program also owns the NCAA's longest road winning streak at 50 straight matches;

Whereas the Nittany Lions women's volleyball team has amassed at least 20 wins 33 times; and

Whereas the athletic excellence demonstrated by the Penn State women's volleyball team is one example of the athletic, academic, and collegiate excellence of Penn State's students, faculty, administration, and alumni: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) congratulates the Penn State women's volleyball team and the university's athletes, coaches, faculty, students, and alumni on the winning of the 2009 NCAA Division I women's volleyball championship; and

(2) recognizes Penn State for its recognized excellence as an institution of higher education.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes gentlewoman from Hawaii.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. HIRONO. 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 on H. Res. 1015 into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. HIRONO. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Penn State women's volleyball team on winning the 2009 NCAA Division I women's volleyball championship tournament.

On December 19, 2009, the top-ranked Penn State women's volleyball team made history by becoming the first team to win three consecutive national titles and four overall NCAA national championships. The Penn State Nittany Lions entered the tournament ranked as the top seed and defeated the Texas Longhorns in dramatic fashion. After trailing 0–2 in the championship match, Penn State put together an amazing come-from-behind effort, eventually winning 3–2. The Penn State women's volleyball team holds the Nation's longest winning streak with 102 matches.

□ 1545

With a 30–0 record, a top-ranked season, and a national championship, Penn State has much to be proud of.

Senior Megan Hodge led the Nittany Lions with 21 points, while both junior Blair Brown and freshman Darcy Dorton contributed 13 points in the championship match. Brown made 14 saves, Hodge had 13, and senior setter Alisha Glass had 12. Hodge, Brown, Glass, and Arielle Wilson, a junior, were named American Volleyball Coaches Association First Team All-Americans, and Hodge was the 2009 ESPN, the Magazine Academic All-American of the year. Quite a feat considering the demands of an elite Division I athletic program.

Congratulations are also in order for Coach Russ Rose. After this year, he posted 1,001 wins in his career at Penn State. Heading one of the most successful programs in the country, Russ Rose collects wins at a staggering pace. Never having posted less than 22 wins in a season, he understands how to bring the best out of his athletes and coaching staff.

Volleyball demands extreme focus and composure. The Penn State women's volleyball team earned the highest athletic honor, a national championship. I know the fans, alumni, students, faculty, and athletes will relish this experience and look forward to next year's season.

Mr. Speaker, once again I congratulate the Penn State women's volleyball team for their success, and thank Representative THOMPSON for bringing this resolution forward.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 1015—Congratulating the Penn State women's volleyball team on winning the 2009 NCAA Division I National Championship.

Pennsylvania State University, or Penn State, as it is widely known, is a public research university founded in 1855 as the Farmers' High School of Pennsylvania. In 1875 the school became Pennsylvania State College and in 1989, became Pennsylvania State University. Today, Penn State offers 160 different majors and has over 43,000 students enrolled at the main campus.

Penn State has a strong reputation for its academic excellence. It is known as one of the "Public Ivies" and as a premier research institution. Notable alumni can be found in every region of the nation and abroad.

Penn State athletics are also known for their excellence. The Nittany Lions have won 65 national collegiate championships, 37 of which are NCAA championships. The women's volleyball team won one of Penn State's most recent national titles.

The Nittany Lions women's volleyball team has a long history of winning. In the national championship, the Nittany Lions continued their long-standing winning streak to 102 wins, the longest NCAA Division I winning streak. During the 2009 season, Penn State clinched its 7th consecutive Big Ten title and its 13th Big Ten title in its history. The Nittany Lions

also own the longest road winning streak with 50 straight road wins. Head coach Russ Rose led the team to his 1001st career victory in the championship game.

In the championship game against the University of Texas, senior Megan Hodge led the team with 21 kills, while Blair Brown and Darcy Dorton contributed with 12 kills each. Megan Hodge, Blair Brown, Alisha Glass and Arielle Wilson were also named All-Americans.

I congratulate Penn State and the team, the players, head coach Russ Rose, the students, faculty and alumni. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H. Res. 1015, a resolution congratulating the Penn State women's volleyball team on winning the 2009 NCAA Division I national championship.

Exactly 1 month ago today, the Pennsylvania State University women's volleyball team staged a stunning come-from-behind victory against the University of Texas Lady Longhorns and took home their third consecutive NCAA national championship.

Their record is long and distinguished, starting with a 102-match winning streak that began in September 2007. It is the longest Division I women's winning streak and the second longest in NCAA history. The Nittany Lions volleyball team has won 65 consecutive Big Ten matches.

The women were led by superwomen seniors Megan Hodge and Alisha Glass, who own a career record of 142 wins and only 5 losses. Theirs is the best 4-year winning percentage of any graduating class at Penn State.

Hodge finished her career ranking second on Penn State's career kills list with 2,142. She is just the second Lady Lion in the program's history to reach the 2,000 career kills milestone. Glass finished her career fourth on Penn State's career assists list with 5,799.

Hodge, Glass, and juniors Blair Brown and Arielle Wilson were named the American Volleyball Coaches Association First Team All-Americans. Hodge was also named the Coaches Association National Player of the Year for 2009.

Freshman Darcy Dorton was named the Big Ten Freshman of the Year and the Coaches Association Mideast Region Freshman of the Year.

Nittany Lion Coach Russ Rose reached his 1,000th career victory against Hawaii in the national semifinals, and he heads into the 2010 season with 1,001 wins, all at the helm of the Penn State women's volleyball program.

All the members of the Pennsylvania Congressional delegation and Penn State alum Congressman FRANK Wolf signed a letter to President Obama asking that he and the First Lady host this remarkable team at the White House. These young women have shown a tremendous dedication to both their sport and their academic endeavors, and are true ambassadors for Pennsylvania State University and all college athletes.

Mr. Speaker, today I ask support for the resolution in honor of a team with the spirit and drive to lead and to win, the Penn State women's Nittany Lion volleyball team.

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

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to end my remarks by thanking Mr. THOMPSON, the introducer of this resolution. I heard him mention the University of Hawaii, which, as you know, is also a powerhouse volleyball women's team. So it just goes to show how far we have come with title IX. And that title was named for my friend and predecessor, the late Patsy T. Mink.

Ms. HIRONO. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1015.

The question was taken.

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

Ms. HIRONO. 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.

COMMENDING THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA MEN'S SOCCER TEAM

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 991) commending the University of Virginia men's soccer team for winning the 2009 Division I NCAA National Championship.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 991

Whereas the University of Virginia men's soccer team won the 2009 Division I national championship, defeating the University of Akron at WakeMed Soccer Park in Cary, North Carolina, on December 13, 2009;

Whereas the University of Virginia played through 2 sudden-death overtimes and a penalty-kick shootout to defeat the University of Akron;

Whereas goaltenders Diego Restrepo from the University of Virginia and David Meves from the University of Akron held both teams scoreless through regulation and overtime;

Whereas Sean Hiller scored the game-winning goal in the penalty kick shootout;

Whereas goalkeeper Diego Restrepo made 3 saves in regulation, 1 save in the penalty kick shootout, and was named defensive most valuable player of the College Cup;

Whereas midfielder Jonathan Villanueva earned recognition as offensive most valuable player of the College Cup; and

Whereas head coach George Gelnovatch led the University of Virginia to its sixth national championship and first since 1994: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives congratulates the University of Virginia men's soccer team for winning the 2009 Division I NCAA National Championship.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend and insert extraneous material on H. Res. 991 into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of H. Res. 991, which commends the University of Virginia's men's soccer team for winning the 2009 Division I NCAA National Championship.

The UVA men's soccer team, ranked second in the Nation, collected its sixth NCAA championship and its first since 1994. The Cavaliers defeated the top-ranked University of Akron team in a penalty kick shootout after a scoreless regulation and double overtime play. This game was extremely competitive, and highlighted the athletic prowess of all the players on the field. After 110 minutes of grueling play, the game was ultimately decided with an extremely intense shootout. The UVA soccer team was able to accomplish its goals, edging out Akron 3–2 in the shootout. Their effort and talent deserves to be recognized.

The UVA Cavaliers posted a 19–3-3 regular season record and finished the season with an amazing 16-game unbeaten winning streak. The victory also gave UVA its 19th school national championship. The team applied the lessons learned during the season and displayed their outstanding athletic skills and cohesive team strategy, allowing fewer goals to be scored against them than any other team in the Nation. Entering the title game, their last goal allowed was on October 17, in a 3–1 victory over Virginia Tech.

Five Cavaliers were named to the All-Tournament team. Diego Restrepo, Jonathan Villanueva, Brian Ownby, Mike Volk, and Tony Tchani. Villanueva was also named Most Outstanding Offensive Player, while Restrepo was named Most Outstanding Defensive Player of the game. Tchani and Restrepo were named the first team All-Americans, and Tchani was drafted by the New York Redbulls in

the Major League Soccer Superdraft. Even with all the individual accolades and awards, the 2009 national championship contained a total team effort, and each member of the team should be commended for athletic excellence.

Special congratulations are due to Coach George Gelnovatch. He wrapped up his 14th season as head coach and led his talented defensive team to a historic championship. He earned his 200th career victory during the regular season and led UVA to its fourth ACC tournament title during his tenure. Additionally, Soccer America named Coach Gelnovatch Men's Coach of the Year.

Mr. Speaker, once again I congratulate the University of Virginia's men's soccer team for winning the 2009 Division I NCAA Championship title. I want to thank Congressman PERRIELLO for bringing this bill forward. I wish the program much success in the 2010 season.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 991, commending the University of Virginia's men's soccer team for winning the 2009 Division I NCAA National Championship.

The University of Virginia, located in Charlottesville, Virginia, was founded in 1819 by Thomas Jefferson. UVA has been synonymous with excellence throughout its history. It was the first educational institution to offer many academic programs that are common today. Eighty-five percent of today's freshman students were in the top 10 percent of their high school classes, and the university is known as a ''Public Ivy League.'' UVA was also ranked the ''Number 1 Best Value'' for public universities by USA Today and The Princeton Review, and ranked the number two ''National University'' in the country by U.S. News & World Report.

The level of excellence exemplified by UVA and its students also extends to its athletics. The Virginia Cavaliers have won 20 national championships and numerous regional titles. The men's soccer and men's lacrosse teams are two of the most successful athletic teams at UVA.

The Cavaliers men's soccer team won the most recent national championship for the university. The UVA men's soccer team captured its sixth national championship on December 13, 2009. During the championship game, the Cavaliers battled the previously undefeated Akron Zips in two overtime periods in a shootout. It was the second time a national championship for the team was decided in a shootout.

I congratulate the University of Virginia, the team, the players, Head Coach George Gelnovatch, and the students, faculty, and alumni. I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 991.

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

Ms. HIRONO. Once again, Mr. Speaker, I urge everyone to support this resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 991.

The question was taken.

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

Ms. HIRONO. 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.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. this evening.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. HALVORSON) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3254, TAOS PUEBLO INDIAN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT; FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3342, AAMODT LITIGATION SETTLEMENT ACT; AND FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1065, WHITE MOUNTAIN APACHE TRIBE WATER RIGHTS QUANTIFICATION ACT OF 2009

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111–399) on the resolution (H. Res. 1017) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3254) to approve the Taos Pueblo Indian Water Rights Settlement Agreement, and for other purposes; for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3342) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Commissioner of Reclamation, to develop water infrastructure in the Rio Grande Basin, and to approve the settlement of the water rights claims of the Pueblos of Nambe, Pojoaque, San Ildefonso, and Tesuque; and for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1065) to resolve water rights claims of the White Mountain Apache Tribe in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PROVIDING FOR A JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS TO RECEIVE A MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged concurrent resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 228

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Wednesday, January 27, 2010, at 9 p.m., for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H. Res. 1004, by the yeas and nays;

H. Res. 1015, de novo;

H. Res. 991, de novo.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

CONGRATULATING THE NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY FEINBERG SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1004, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1004.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 397, nays 0, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 6]

YEAS—397

Abercrombie	Becerra	Boustany
Ackerman	Berkley	Boyd
Aderholt	Berman	Brady (PA)
Adler (NJ)	Berry	Brady (TX)
Akin	Biggert	Braley (IA)
Altmire	Bilirakis	Bright
Andrews	Bishop (GA)	Broun (GA)
Arcuri	Bishop (NY)	Brown (SC)
Austria	Bishop (UT)	Brown-Waite, Ginny
Baca	Blackburn	Buchanan
Bachmann	Blunt	Burgess
Bachus	Boccieri	Burton (IN)
Baird	Boehner	Butterfield
Baldwin	Bono Mack	Calvert
Barrow	Boozman	Camp
Bartlett	Boren	Campbell
Barton (TX)	Boswell	Cantor
Bean	Boucher	

Cao
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
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
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Guthrie
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
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
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
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—36

Alexander
Barrett (SC)
Bilbray
Blumenauer
Bonner
Brown, Corrine
Buyer
Capito
Crenshaw
Davis (AL)
Deal (GA)
Edwards (TX)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Higgins
Hinojosa
Hoekstra
Johnson, E. B.
Kissell
Lewis (CA)
Maloney
Markey (MA)
Moran (VA)
Murphy, Patrick
Oberstar
Perlmutter
Radanovich
Reyes
Rohrabacher
Rush
Schrader
Teague
Tiahrt
Tsongas
Woolsey
Young (AK)

□ 1858

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONGRATULATING THE PENN STATE WOMEN'S VOLLEYBALL TEAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 1015.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1015.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 396, noes 0, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 7]

AYES—396

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
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
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Guthrie
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
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
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
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Oberstar

NOT VOTING—36

Alexander
Barrett (SC)
Bilbray
Bonner
Brown, Corrine
Buyer
Capito
Crenshaw
Davis (AL)
Deal (GA)
Diaz-Balart, L.
Edwards (TX)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Higgins
Hinojosa
Hoekstra
Johnson, E. B.
Kennedy
Kissell
Lewis (CA)
Maloney
Markey (MA)
McDermott
Moran (VA)
Murphy, Patrick
Perlmutter
Radanovich
Reyes
Rohrabacher
Rush
Schrader
Teague
Tiahrt
Tsongas
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1907

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMENDING THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA MEN'S SOCCER TEAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 991.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 991.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HARE. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 398, noes 0, answered ''present'' 2, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 8]

AYES—398

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
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
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Guthrie
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
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
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
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—2

Boccieri
Oberstar

NOT VOTING—33

Alexander
Barrett (SC)
Bilbray
Bonner
Brown, Corrine
Buyer
Capito
Crenshaw
Davis (AL)
Deal (GA)
Edwards (TX)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Higgins
Hinojosa
Hoekstra
Johnson, E. B.
Kissell
Lewis (CA)
Maloney
Markey (MA)
Moran (VA)
Murphy, Patrick
Perlmutter
Radanovich
Reyes
Rohrabacher
Rush
Schrader
Teague
Tiahrt
Tsongas
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1914

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from this Chamber this evening. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall votes 6, 7 and 8.

FILIBUSTER HAS CREATED MINORITY RULE

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, tonight I am introducing a resolution to urge the Senate to change its filibuster rule.

The filibuster has in effect created minority rule. It wasn't the intent of the framers of the Constitution to allow any one person the power to bring the legislative process to a halt, which is exactly what the filibuster has given each Senator the ability to do. The framers very clearly outlined the five instances when they believed a supermajority was needed. The day-to-day business of Congress was not one of them. But the use of the filibuster has

become such common practice that it now requires a supermajority in the Senate to pass virtually every piece of legislation, no matter how mundane. The filibuster has begun to erode the integrity of our democratic process.

My colleague, Senator TOM HARKIN from Iowa, who has been a leader on this issue since 1995, recently announced he will introduce legislation to change the filibuster rule, and I am offering a resolution urging the Senate to do the same.

The filibuster was not intended by the framers of the Constitution, and it is certainly not good for the country when we try to solve the difficult problems that face us today. The time has come for the Senate to change its rules.

CONGRATULATING THE CUBAN-AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I would like to recognize the Cuban-American Bar Association for its success and contributions to our south Florida community.

For nearly 40 years, the Cuban-American Bar Association has served the public interest by increasing awareness of the study of jurisprudence, fostering respect for the law, and increasing diversity in the judiciary and the legal community.

Given the tragic example of Castro's lawless regime, the members of the Cuban-American Bar Association are keenly aware of the importance of the rule of law and have dedicated their professional careers to its implementation and preservation.

This Saturday, the Cuban-American Bar Association will celebrate its installation of a new executive board. Incoming President Manuel Garcia-Linares and president-elect for 2011 Victoria Mendez will build upon the example of leadership left by outgoing President Roland Sanchez-Medina, Jr. Their dedication and professionalism are not only testaments to their characters but also to the Cuban-American community and to Hispanics in general.

I would also like to congratulate the incoming 2010 Board of Directors:

Nelson Bellido, Raul Chacon, Vivian De Las Cuevas-Diaz, Isabel Diaz, Sandra M. Ferrera, Monica Gordo, Anna Marie Hernandez, Javier Lopez, Ricardo M. Martinez-Cid, Nicole Mestre, Jennifer Perez, and Monica Segura.

CREDIT CARD COMPANIES SHOULD SUSPEND FEES ON CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS

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

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, as the world watches the crisis, the tragedy in Haiti, many people are coming forth with charitable contributions to help different organizations that are sponsoring efforts, and it is commendable and wonderful. But what was discovered is that the credit card companies are charging their customary 3 percent fee on those credit card contributions. That is wrong. And the credit card companies, I believe, saw it was wrong, and they put that off for 60 days on contributions given to certain groups.

What I am looking into introducing is legislation, and-or through a letter of request to the administration, suspending credit card fees, except those for processing, on contributions to 501(c)(3) charities.

When people make contributions to charities, and contributions are down now because of the recession, the full amount should be going to that 501(c)(3). Complete charitable contributions should be permitted, and the credit card companies should work with us, at least if it is a disaster like Katrina, like what we have experienced in Haiti or with the tsunamis or with tornados in our Nation.

NEW ORLEANS SAINTS' HISTORIC SEASON

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

Mr. CAO. Madam Speaker, the New Orleans Saints' historic season continued this past Saturday with a 45–14 playoff victory. Next week, they will compete for the NFC championship title, and they will win.

Their success has benefited our city and inspired our district, so I have provided my constituents with a chance to honor them.

Today's statement is from Tripp Roy of New Orleans, Louisiana. Tripp writes:

''The Saints' positive impact on our city is immeasurable. They have done more for New Orleans than any other professional sports franchise has done for any other American city.

''Aside from the short-term joy the team's success has brought to New Orleans, the Saints' record has put the city back on the map, displaying to the Nation that we are back for the long term.

''The endless media coverage, nonstop showcasing of the region's unique culture, and undeniable camaraderie created among the New Orleans 'Who Dat' nation are all the results of the Saints' incredible season.

''This is just the rallying cry the city needed. New Orleans is better than ever, thanks in large part to the Saints.''

HAITIAN ORPHANS

(Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I am overwhelmed as I have seen the outpouring of support for the Haitian people and also the concern of this Congress. I would ask that we move forward on one particular interest and concern, and that is the orphans of Haiti.

Already before the earthquake there were 1.5 million orphans. Now, we have seen hundreds of thousands of children who are now without parents.

Over the weekend, I was able to secure and be able to send two planeloads of doctors and nurses and supplies. Thank you, Texas. In that they were operating on a number of individuals, particularly children, 150 surgeries, 600 patients, it is important that we are able to airlift the most badly injured of children and others, particularly children, out of Haiti.

I will be introducing legislation and working with the administration to establish refugee status so these children can be airlifted in an organized manner to have surgery; otherwise, they will die. It is important for us to join together, both sides of the aisle, to find constructive ways to expedite caring for those who are now dying. Our children are our priority. As Chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, that will be my focus, to save the children of Haiti.

WAR WITH AL QAEDA

(Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Madam Speaker, there are a lot of issues that are before this Congress, very, very serious issues. But on Christmas Day, we were reminded of one that we do not always think about, and that is the fact that we are still the subject of those who would use terror to take away our liberty.

I would hope that, as the President has found it appropriate to use the word ''war'' and talk about the war with al Qaeda, that we would understand that it is more than words, it is actions; that we need to treat those who would attempt to kill us in this way as what they are, unlawful enemy combatants, not common criminals. We should not turn them over to our criminal justice system. We should allow them to be interrogated by the military.

Madam Speaker, those who say that they are attacking us because of Guantanamo do not understand history, both long-term and short-term. They are not attacking us because of Guantanamo. They are attacking us because of the Statue of Liberty.

CONGRATULATING OAK GROVE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Oak Grove Presbyterian Church of Bloomington, Minnesota, for receiving the

2009 Omar Bonderud Human Rights Award.

Named for the first chairperson of the Bloomington Human Rights Commission, the award is given to individuals and organizations that have made a significant contribution to improving the rights of people in their community.

The selfless works of Oak Grove Presbyterian Church include tutoring for the economically disadvantaged, as well as improving dialogue and understanding across different religions and cultures.

In a letter to the Human Rights Commission, Oak Grove was described as ''an outstanding community organization with a long history of working with community partners to improve the lives of the diverse residents of Bloomington.''

This award shows the dedication of Oak Grove to the pursuit of justice and freedom, rights that we can all aspire to protect. I am honored to congratulate them today.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

INVESTING IN SMART SECURITY

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, President Obama is certainly doing the right thing when it comes to the humanitarian crisis in Haiti. He's responded quickly, he's responded effectively, and he's pledged that the United States will do all that we can do to alleviate the suffering of the Haitian people and to help them rebuild their lives. President Obama has shown that America stands for hope, decency, and human rights, which is, of course, the kind of moral leadership that the President of the United States must always show. But while the administration is getting it right in Haiti, we still have a lot of work to do in Afghanistan, where the President plans to ask Congress for $33 billion in emergency funding to pay for the escalation of the war there.

Madam Speaker, we do need to appropriate more funds for Afghanistan, but not for more troops, because there is no military solution to the problem there. Sending more troops makes us look like occupiers, which will surely help the Taliban recruit more violent extremists, who will attack their own Afghani neighbors and the United States. So instead of investing in the military in Afghanistan, we need to invest in SMART security, which means investing in economic development, health, infrastructure, humanitarian aid, better law enforcement and governance. SMART security also includes helping the Afghan people to build schools so girls and women can be offered an education as well as the boys.

Madam Speaker, General McChrystal, our commander in Afghanistan, recently said that the Taliban looks for young people with no education when they are looking for new recruits. That's why I believe that investing in books, not bombs, is the way to stop violent extremism in Afghanistan and actually in every other part of the world as well. We also need to invest in our own economy and our own people right here at home, because we can't keep our country safe unless we have a strong economy, well educated, and with everybody having jobs that they can afford to support their families on.

So that's why we must invest in jobs. We must invest in housing. We must invest in child care and health care. And we must especially be concerned about those facing their own humanitarian crisis in our communities.

So just consider some of these facts, Madam Speaker: one in every 50 Americans is living in a household where food stamps are the only source of income. The effective unemployment rate today is really over 17 percent. And middle class families are now earning less than they did a decade ago, adjusted for inflation.

The economic disaster right here in our own country is unprecedented in American history. Unfortunately, the Congress will soon be presented with a record Pentagon budget, however, for the next fiscal year. I would suggest that instead of increasing the Pentagon budget, we should reduce it by cutting out funds for useless Cold War weapons, which would slash the defense budget by 25 percent. Isn't that amazing? We could slash the defense budget by 25 percent if we would just stop building useless Cold War weapons. We can make those dollars available to invest right here at home to put SMART security to work in Afghanistan as well.

Madam Speaker, the best way to keep our country safe is to stick to our fundamental American values of peace and compassion for the people of the world. We must put these values to work in Haiti, in Afghanistan, and right here at home. I urge all of us and our President to do just that.

DON'T LET THEM FLY

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, an al Qaeda jihadist committed an act of war over the skies of Detroit on Christmas Day. Umar Farouk Abdulmutallab, working with al Qaeda in Yemen, sewed explosives into his underwear. He tried to blow up the plane over Detroit, but the detonator failed and the terrorist was captured by passengers. Counting on faulty detonators is not a sound national security policy. We should be stopping terrorists from boarding planes in the first place.

The underwear bomber got on the plane with a valid United States visa. Even though he was on a terrorist watch list, he boarded a plane for the U.S. anyway. After the 9/11 attacks, the State Department was ordered to open visa security units at all of our embassies. Eight years later, only 14 of the 220 American embassies have visa security units. Why is that?

The underwear bomber got his U.S. visa in London. He got to keep his visa even though his father told our embassy in Nigeria that his son was a dangerous radical. American embassies in London and Nigeria don't have a visa security unit. And when the bomber's own father told us he was dangerous, the information was ignored by our State Department.

The underwear bomber paid cash for a ticket, had no luggage, and he was on that watch list. The United States State Department was warned by the bomber's father that he was a threat. He had even previously been denied entry into the United Kingdom because he applied for a visa to go to a college that doesn't exist in the United Kingdom. But U.S. authorities let him fly the friendly skies anyway. He should not have been allowed on that airplane. The American people have the right to know why our Nation allowed this person to enter the United States with a visa, knowing all of these facts.

After the failed attack, Abdulmutallab bragged about 20 more terrorists preparing to attack the United States. He said they were also training in Yemen. According to Slade Gorton, a member of the 9/11 Commission, He was singing like a canary, then we charged him in Federal court, he got a lawyer, and he quit talking. Instead of turning the terrorist over to the military authorities for interrogation, or even letting him just keep on talking, the administration treated this individual like a 2-bit car thief. They told him he had the right to remain silent, and then they got this jihadist a lawyer on the public dime and he quit talking.

Under the new ''try the terrorists in Federal court'' policy, America has lost the ability to get vital information about al Qaeda. America is probably less safe as a result. The bomber could and should have been tried in a military court. There are legal allowances for enemies like the underwear bomber. And as an enemy combatant, he should have been held and interrogated by military officials under existing law.

In Federal court now they're even talking about offering this terrorist a plea deal to get some information that he was willing to offer earlier with no deal. Now we are making a deal with the Devil. So the terrorists can avoid justice and get leniency by making a backroom agreement with authorities.

Another problem these jihadists have, they are not your average, everyday criminals. They are radical jihadists on a mission to kill themselves and every American they can take with them. A few years in prison is not going to deter their mission. To the contrary, these who kill in the name of religion try to kill their prison guards. It's happened in the United States.

Louis Pepe was once a prison guard at the Metropolitan Correctional Center in New York. Ten months before the 9/11 terrorist attack, two al Qaeda inmates were held there. These are the ones who bombed the American Embassy in East Africa in 1998, killing over 200 people. A weak-kneed Federal judge gave these two al Qaeda terrorists permission to buy hot sauce in the penitentiary. So what they did is made it into mace to incapacitate the guard. They stabbed him in the eye with a knife they made by filing down a hair comb. They kicked and beat Pepe and smeared a cross on his chest in his own blood. He was left permanently blinded, partially paralyzed, and he lost most of his ability to speak. These terrorists were trying to get the keys to the cell block to take more hostages. Now, isn't that lovely?

Jihadists are at war with this Nation and, when captured, they should be treated like military criminals. But first and foremost, when radicals are on a threat list, don't let them on the airplane. Why is that so difficult to comprehend? Meanwhile, Madam Speaker, the band keeps playing while the ship of common sense is sinking in the ocean.

And that's just the way it is.

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

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF DR. DENNIS WEST

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. We commemorate extraordinary people and events on the floor of this House. Madam Speaker, there's no more extraordinary person that I have known than Dr. Dennis West. To everybody he was just ''Denny.'' No pretension, low-key, insightful.

Dennis West had a remarkable career. Over the last 40 years, the city of Portland has gained a reputation as a unique community: well-planned, thoughtfully governed, providing cutting-edge initiatives, and creating a model of livability. Our community has been characterized by citizen involvement and getting the most out of scarce resources. There have been many heroes, elected officials, civic leaders, and philanthropists who've helped create this unique and renowned city. No one has done more as a public servant than Dennis West.

He started his public service as an intern in the office of one of my predecessors, Congresswoman Edith Green. I first met Denny 40 years ago when he was a professor at Portland State University's School of Urban Studies, which he helped found and guide. Over the course of these four decades, Portland State, now Oregon's largest university, has emerged as one of the centers of urban scholarship and practical application, a laboratory of livability, a Mecca for planning and sustainability, and a critical driver of vitality for Portland.

Denny then played a critical role as chief of staff to Lloyd Anderson, Portland's Commissioner of Public Works, in an era where the city of Portland was taking bold action with the development of its downtown plan, its transit system, and the creation of a 38-acre waterfront park instead of a riverfront freeway. Denny helped play a role for his engineer boss, developing the vision and becoming an effective and respected political leader.

Then Denny was recruited by Multnomah County's new chairman, Don Clark, to establish the financial and budgetary systems to help modify personnel procedures and give coherence to what had been an old-style, typical county operation. During this time the county did not just modernize its administration and finance. It was involved in innovative justice, health, environmental, and transportation initiatives. Dennis West was the intellectual force helping guide and implement that vision.

Then Denny was a deputy director of the Port of Portland, a quiet agency with a powerful reach to deal with critical freight and transportation movements, the airport, the docks, and economic development. Again, he played a critical role in the development of the port capacity and the professionalism of its staff as a key element in the evolution of our metropolitan area.

The Oregon Health Science University has played a critical role in the last 25 years in research breakthroughs, medical innovation, economic development, and the delivery of high-quality health care. Denny West was a key administrator for research and economic development, helping create the academic, economic, and health care powerhouse that is one of our State's most important institutions and our city's largest employer.

Denny concluded his career serving 10 years as the director of the Portland Housing Authority, one of the Nation's premier public housing agencies, dealing with the problems of homelessness, special needs, low-income housing, and community revitalization. Under his leadership, Portland won national recognition awards for its innovation, cost-effective delivery, and perhaps the capstone of his career was the acclaimed Columbia Village, a spectacularly successful HOPE VI housing project making a deteriorated World War II-vintage housing project into a point of pride.

Denny West was an extraordinarily gifted administrator. In agency after agency so important to our community, he played a critical role, often as the go-to guy, the person who perhaps didn't have the title but made things work. With the Housing Authority of Portland, he was also the guy in charge, and the results are a testament to his extraordinary vision, administrative skill, sensitivity, and compassion.

Over these last 40 years the half-dozen agencies provided the infrastructure, the drive, the national recognition, all of which blended to make Portland a unique community. While Dennis West's name might not be well known, his fingerprints were on the critical developments in all of these organizations. Denny's career and achievements were made while being an extraordinary human being, a friend, and determined civic advocate. Even though his later years were marked by debilitating illness, he never lost his spark and drive. He willed himself to do things that younger, healthier people could not even imagine.

All sympathy goes out to Denny's wife, Sue, his life partner, who played such an extraordinary role, especially in his difficult later years, and to his circle of friends who provided unbelievable support, who revere his contributions and his memory. We all join in celebrating the life of this extraordinary man, Denny West.

□ 1945

ISRAELI PEACE TALKS

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. Madam Speaker, a year ago Israel was engaged in defensive operations to protect its citizens from terrorist attacks. In doing so, Israel was exercising the most basic right and responsibility of a state, to protect one's citizens. Troubling, many in the international community condemned Israel's actions. Many more refused to recognize Israel's right to self-defense.

As we begin this new year, I'm here to speak up for the right of sovereign nations to defend their people. Israel has a right to defend itself. The U.S., as a strong ally of Israel, must be vigilant in supporting this most basic right.

I just read a story in The Jerusalem Post about life in Israel a year after Operation Cast Lead. Before the war, Israelis were enduring relentless rocket and mortar attacks in Gaza. Terrorists launched more than 12,000 rockets

and mortars across borders in Gaza at Israel's civilians over the course of 8 years. These rockets were not aimed at military targets, but the goal was to try to kill civilians and instill a sense of fear in the Israeli people.

Thousands of Israelis living within range of Hamas rockets had their whole lives changed. Locating the nearest shelter as they went around town became second nature to them. Israelis living in the time of Sderot have just 15 seconds from the time a warning is sounded to take shelter from missile attacks. Young children did not know that this way of life was not normal.

When I visited Israel last year, I had the opportunity to meet with several Israeli families from Sderot. They told me compelling stories about living under the constant barrage of terrorist activity and the challenges of raising a family under these conditions, yet their attitude was, This is our home. This is our community, and we are going to stay and surmount this adversity. The families under attack faced difficult circumstances, but they were not willing to give up on a place they considered home, nor should they have to.

Since Operation Cast Lead, things have improved for Israelis living within the range of Hamas rockets, yet we should know, the attacks still occur. Since the end of the war, there have been an additional 300 attacks. This is, of course, far less than the 3,200 attacks in 2008 but, still, 300 too many.

At the time the story in The Jerusalem Post was written, 242 attacks had occurred since the end of Operation Cast Lead. The writer said that it was both shocking and sad that her friends would say, Only 242 attacks. She asked, In what other country do you think that it's a reasonable number of rocket attacks aimed at civilian targets in 1 year? Any terrorist attack is unacceptable.

Israelis hope for peace. They do not want war or conflict with their neighbors, but peace is a two-way street. Israeli Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu has reiterated Israel's commitment to peace. He has said that he is ready to resume peace talks now and without condition. He even placed a 10-month moratorium on the construction of new homes in the West Bank to jump-start the peace talks.

It is my sincere hope that Israel's willingness to make peace will be reciprocated and that the terrorist attacks will cease. But if attacks continue, Israelis must be allowed to defend their homes, and we in the United States must assist in that effort and support their basic right to do so.

HONORING CARLOS HERNANDEZ GOMEZ

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Speaker, Isaac Asimov once said, ''If my doctor told me I had only 6 minutes to live, I wouldn't brood. I'd type a little faster.'' For our dear friend and journalist Carlos Hernandez Gomez, it wasn't a matter of if. A year ago he was diagnosed with cancer, and tragically this week, he lost his battle. He was 36 years young.

For a year, Carlos never allowed a disease destroying him inside to show outside. He wrote, he reported, he lived. He never brooded. His courageous fight showed his strength as a person and a journalist committed to the ideals of a more responsive and transparent government.

There have been countless tributes to Carlos this week, both humorous and tearful, from the interns he graciously mentored at Public Radio to the President of the United States, whom he tenaciously covered when no one outside of Springfield knew his name or how to pronounce it. That's because Carlos treated everyone like a person and made it impossible not to adore him. Whether it was a witty nickname or a spot-on impression of a politician, Carlos brought everyone down to Earth with his disarming sense of humor.

He had an encyclopedic memory and an irrepressible hunger to learn. As a political reporter, those came in handy. He could remember names and details from election cycles and court cases as if it happened yesterday. As a person, this was just his nature. He asked his nurses about their families and could recall lyrics to obscure Beatles' songs without missing a beat.

His energy was infectious, and his passion for life was unmistakable. To know him was to love him.

Carlos attended Quigley Preparatory Seminary—no relation—and then studied philosophy at DePaul University. He once said that if he wasn't a reporter, he would have been a priest. He went on to work Extra News, Los Angeles' La Opinion, the Chicago Reporter, Chicago Public Radio, the Chicago Reader, and most recently, CLTV. With his trademark fedora and thick-rimmed black glasses, he was a throwback to a bygone era of journalism.

Carlos had such an insatiable need to cram details, insight, and vivid description into his reports that his producers tried to slow down his quick delivery. While he heeded those words, he would sneak in at the very end of his pieces, seemingly reducing ''Carlos Hernandez Gomez'' to one syllable with a heartwarming Puerto Rican lilt. It was a trademark that became just as recognizable as his hat. His signoff was so familiar that taxi drivers who listened to him loyally on public radio and recognized his distinctive voice would often give him free rides.

He was an old-school reporter, and he was a consummate Chicagoan who loved his town like family. He loved the official facets of the job, interviewing officials, pounding the pavement, working the political and court beats he knew so well. But he also knew that he could often get people at their most real on a barstool at the Billy Goat Tavern or over a pastrami sandwich at Manny's Deli.

He covered the famous and the infamous, from Mayor Daley to Rod Blagojevich, from mob bosses to George Ryan, the news of whose indictment he was the first to break. He wasn't afraid to criticize the status quo, but he did so with such credibility that even the powers that be, whose feathers he'd ruffled, respected him. He was determined not to dumb down the news. He would rather do a thorough story about a complicated issue than a quick, superficial hit.

His commitment to the truth was matched only by his unwavering faith, which he would tell you were one and the same. He also loved Star Wars, Italian beef, the guitar, and his beloved wife, Randi. At the hospital this weekend when someone said that he was leaving us too soon, that 36 years wasn't enough, his brother Jason and his cousin Mark agreed but pointed out that he packed more life into 36 years than many of us could hope to do in twice the time. Today, it is hard to find solace in that revelation. For his family, friends, and all of us who knew Carlos, this is no way to begin 2010.

On Sunday night, I heard some news about questionable choices made by a local candidate and smiled. This is exactly the kind of story that Carlos would have loved to cover, to find the truth and report it, meticulously and with panache.

Even in death, Carlos Hernandez Gomez will brighten our days, and for that, we tip our fedoras and lift our bowed heads back up. He will be missed.

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 addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

U.S. SENATE ELECTION IN MASSACHUSETTS

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, in 8 minutes the polls will close in Massachusetts. I don't know whether Mr. Brown is going to win or whether he is going to lose, but one thing I do know is that this shows very clearly that the people across this country—moderate, liberal, conservative—are all concerned about what we're doing in this Chamber and the Chamber across the Capitol.

You know, a lot of people will say, Well, it's all about health care. I don't think it's just health care. I think health care's a big part of it, Madam

Speaker, but I think it's also the kind of chicanery that we're seeing going on right now.

When you buy somebody's vote with $300 million in Louisiana and you buy somebody's vote in Nebraska, and then when the unions start squealing because they think they're going to be paying too much for health insurance, you give them a $60 billion tax break, break on their premiums, people across the country start saying, Hey, what's going on? Is anybody up there honest? You're buying votes with taxpayers' money. That $60 billion break that the unions are going to get is going to be made up in part from a new tax or an additional tax on prosthetic devices and wheelchairs. The people who really need help are going to have to pay higher taxes for those things because you're giving a $60 billion break to the unions.

So, Madam Speaker, I'm not going to talk for the whole 5 minutes tonight. I just want to make this point very, very clear, and I hope my colleagues back in their offices are listening as well. There is a message being sent to Members of Congress. There is a message being sent to the Senators across the Capitol, and it is that people want honest, fair government. They don't want a socialist government. They don't want the Congress controlling their lives. They don't want to have a bureaucrat between themselves and the doctors that they go see on a regular basis. In short, they don't want that health care bill, and they certainly don't want more taxes, and they certainly don't want Members of the Senate and the House being bought off by bribes that are being given to them by the leadership in order to get their vote on this health care bill.

Regardless of what happens in, now, 6 minutes, I think that the people of this country have got the message. They don't want socialized medicine. They don't want more government control over their lives. So I hope my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, who may not be here right now, that they will take a hard look at the polling results and what happens tonight. Win, lose, or draw, it's going to show very clearly that an awful lot of Democrats, an awful lot of Independents as well as Republicans are very concerned about what's going on here in Washington.

I hope that down the road my colleagues who have political goals in mind will take all this to heart when they start casting their vote on this health care bill when it comes back from the Senate.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the Senate or its Members.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I beg to differ. I think that as long as I am speaking in a generic term, it's not something that's not allowed. We talk about the Senate all the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members may not engage in unparliamentary remarks toward the Senate collectively or its Members.

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.)

HONORING PRIVATE FIRST CLASS GEOFFREY A. WHITSITT

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

Mr. INGLIS. Madam Speaker, I rise to remember Private First Class Geoffrey A. Whitsitt, a 21-year-old of Travelers Rest, South Carolina, Army Airborne, serving in Afghanistan, headed for Special Forces training and hoping to become an Army Ranger.

Geoff was 2 weeks shy of his 22nd birthday when, on January 13, an improvised explosive device was detonated near the Humvee he was driving, killing Geoff, his sergeant, and seriously wounding their gunner. Some Taliban or al Qaeda operative out there might be thinking that they killed an infidel. They didn't. They failed at three levels.

First, Geoff was no infidel. He was a believer. He was a believer in America and a believer in the King of all creation, a citizen of the freest, most blessed land in the world, and a citizen of the kingdom of heaven. Geoff wanted that kingdom to come. He prayed for that kingdom to come. He worked for that kingdom to come. He served for that kingdom to come. In the end, he went there before the invisible became visible here.

Those who detonated that IED failed at another level. They think they frightened Geoff's family, his friends and his countrymen. They're wrong. My wife and I visited the Whitsitts last night. Their faith in America, their faith in the author of our salvation, the Prince of Peace, the King of Kings is undiminished. They know that other Geoffs will run the hills and woods that Geoff loved to run in the northern part of our county. They know that another Geoff will come in last in his first cross-country meet and finish 16th in the State by the end of the season.

□ 2000

They know that another Geoff will take what he learned of love and books and faith in his home school and at Greenville Tech Charter High School and volunteer to serve his Nation.

They know that another dad will take another Geoff to the banks of the Middle Saluda River for fishing and for talks about the essence of life. Those who detonated that IED failed at a third and higher level. They think that Geoff is dead. He isn't. He lives. He lives in our hearts and minds because he is one of our heroes.

He lives in the heart of his older brother, Steven, serving with steely determination in the United States Navy.

He will always live in the hearts of his mom and dad. They loved him, led him, admired him, and gave him up for the rest of us.

Their gift reminds us of the gift of all gifts—a father who had sovereign control over all aspects of His Son's substitutionary death, and who gave Him up for us all. Geoff lives in the nail-pierced hands of that Savior, and no one can snatch him out of those hands.

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

(Mr. GRAYSON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mrs. SCHMIDT addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. MCCLINTOCK addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ISSUES OF THE DAY

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 as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, it is an honor again to be here on the floor of the House of Representatives to talk about the issues of the day and talk about changes that have happened in our country over the course of the last year due to the leadership of President Obama and the Democratic Congress.

I know in today's world, in today's media-driven world where we like to talk about and have fights about different issues and let those fights kind of permeate society, sometimes it is very difficult for us as leaders in the country to talk directly to our constituents and to the American people about some of the changes that have been put in place.

If we look at just a little over a year ago, in the fall of last year, October of 2008, the difficulties facing our country, on the economic side, the collapse

of the stock market, the collapse of the job market, Wall Street run amuck, no regulations, no rules, fancy packaging of different accounting schemes and creative financial packages that ultimately led our country to one of the greatest crises we have had since the Great Depression. And were it not for the programs that were started during the Great Depression, it would have been the Great Depression. And if it weren't for extraordinary acts on behalf of the Federal Government to support the banking industry, and I remember getting calls from local businesses, local banks, community banks, saying we need to do something, things are collapsing, we had a vote here on the floor to pass billions of dollars worth of aid to the banks and the vote failed and the stock market dropped 800 to 900 points. Subsequently we came back and passed it and took a lot of political heat for it.

Months later, under the leadership of President Obama after he was sworn in, we passed the stimulus package. In January of last year, we had 700,000-plus jobs that were lost in January of last year. And every economist was saying, Presidential candidate MCCAIN's top economist was saying, the top Democratic economist, were all saying there was a $2 trillion to $3 trillion hole in the economy, and we have to fill that hole. And the only entity left to put some money into the economy is the Federal Government. Thus, the stimulus package—which quite frankly I didn't think was big enough. We put the stimulus package in place.

Now let's fast forward a year. Nobody is happy, of course. I represent Youngstown and Warren, Ohio, and they have the worst unemployment rates in the entire State. A lot of that has to do with the manufacturing base and losing manufacturing jobs. But the bottom line is this: in November, we lost thousands of jobs as opposed to 750,000 jobs. And I think in December, the numbers are not completely official, but 70,000 or 80,000 jobs were lost in December. So from 750,000 in the month of January to only losing 80,000 in December—nobody is happy with that, but we are clearly moving in the right direction.

When you look at the fact that the stock market is up 55 to 60 percent since it bottomed out, we are clearly moving in the right direction.

Now, a lot more has to be done, and I think we have got to make some tremendous investments, but one of the things that is strangling the economy right now is health care costs on businesses and health care costs on families. And so the health care reform proposal is here to say that even if you don't morally believe that we should cover every American, we can all make those arguments from a religious perspective or values arguments or ethical arguments that we maybe need to do that, let's set that aside and let's talk economics and let's talk about the fact that if we do nothing, health care costs will continue to strangle small businesses in the United States, will continue to further increase their grip around the throats of families in the United States, and all we hear when we go back to our districts is about the cost of health care.

This is President Obama's attempt and the attempt of the Democrats to try to fix this problem. By doing absolutely nothing, we are going to see an $1,800 a year increase in the average family of four's health care costs next year, and then another $1,800 the following year and another $2,000, and it will just keep escalating to the point where it eats up the whole family budget and you are paying more and getting less in coverage, really. So it is eating up the whole family budget. There is less money to spend on tuition or go on vacation or increase your family's quality of life, maybe move into a better neighborhood, a better school district. All of these things are not available to families because of the increased cost of health care.

So doing nothing allows that to continue because we are afraid to make tough political decisions. We didn't get elected to come to this body, Madam Speaker, to make the easy decisions. We didn't run just to make sure that we got elected in 2 more years. We got hired by the American people to solve very difficult, very complex problems. And we are attacking those problems because that's the mission that they gave us. We set out to do it with energy, and we set out to do it now with health care reform.

Let me just say finally before I kick it to my friend, who people all across the country now know of because of his heroic works in Haiti, if we do nothing in 10 years, $1 of every $5 in the United States of America will be spent on health care. And in 30 years, $1 of every $3 will be spent on health care in the United States of America. That is unsustainable. That is an unsustainable road for us to go down. People will look 10 years from now and 20 years from now and 30 years from now and they will ask, Who was representing western Pennsylvania when they had a chance to tackle health care reform? Who was representing Connecticut and who was representing northeast Ohio when the bell rang to step up and make these changes?

I yield to my friend from western Pennsylvania.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I thank the gentleman and I thank him for his kind words as well. He hit the nail right on the head, Madam Speaker, I think it is appropriate today to take a look at what was happening 1 year ago today. A year ago today, the budget deficit was forecast by the Congressional Budget Office for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2009, to be $1.8 trillion. The jobs that were lost in the month of January were more than 700,000 jobs 1 year ago in January. The stock market was trending straight down, and it bottomed out in March at 6,500. We had just had a loss of 6 percentage points for the quarter in GDP, one of the largest in recent memory drops in gross domestic product. That is what we were facing 1 year ago today.

As the gentleman from Ohio said, this Congress was elected to make difficult decisions. This Congress was elected to work together and do give and take. Look, every bill that you pass is going to have some things that you like and some things that you don't like, but when the country is staring into the abyss, literally facing economic calamity if we fail to act, 1 year ago moving into the spring of 2009, this Congress did act. In fact, February of 2009.

What has happened since then compared to 1 year ago today? I talked about how the budget forecast was expected to be $1.8 trillion in deficit. Well, we ended at about $1.2 trillion in deficit. Now I am not going to have a big party here, because that is the largest deficit that we have ever faced because of some of the circumstances that the gentleman described that were beyond control and unforeseen because of the economic catastrophe, but we saved $600 billion from the deficit because the economy was starting to rebound in a way that the Congressional Budget Office did not foresee.

The gross domestic product, instead of losing 6.5 percentage points in a quarter like a year ago, we are on the verge of announcing back-to-back quarters of positive growth in GDP, and we expect a very strong number for the last half of 2009.

We talked about all of these factors relating to our economy, and things are starting to improve. We are certainly not out of the woods yet. But it was the actions of this Congress, instead of sitting on our hands and saying, Well, let's just let everything solve itself. That is how we got here in the first place. That is how we found ourselves in the hole that we are in the process of digging our way out of.

What I would say to the gentleman is, you cannot solve our long-term budget circumstance, our deficit, as the gentleman eloquently said, without addressing the cost of health care. Health care affects everybody in this country, every business, every family, every level of government—Federal, State, and municipal. We are at a competitive disadvantage to all of the nations that we have to do business with. The gentleman represents a district similar to mine. He is in the Youngstown area; I have southwestern Pennsylvania, very hard-hit by losses in manufacturing. A lot of that has to do with health care costs. A lot of the competitive disadvantage that America has with foreign nations is because of the cost of health care. But businesses every day struggle to make that decision: Are they going to be able to continue to offer coverage to their employees for one more year facing another 20 percent rate increase?

Senior citizens in my district on average saw a 45 percent increase in their

Medicare Advantage plans. A 45 percent 1-year increase. That is simply unsustainable, and the government certainly is never going to balance its budget without addressing the cost of health care.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I would like to say that this just didn't happen. We didn't just end up here a couple of Octobers ago and all of a sudden things just happened. Our government was controlled by a conservative, neoconservative ideology for most of the first decade in this century. From 2000 to 2008 they controlled the White House, and 2000 to 2006 they controlled the Congress. They implemented their economic philosophy, hook, line, and sinker. It got implemented. They controlled all of the levers of government. They passed their supply-side economics. They cut taxes for the wealthiest, saying that will stimulate the economy and everything will take care of itself. Deregulate Wall Street; everyone will be honest with each other, no one would possibly do anything wrong if we are not watching them, and they will behave themselves. They forgot to factor in that people get greedy when you don't watch them, and that is what happened on Wall Street.

□ 2015

So my point on top of what the gentleman just said is this didn't just happen. We had leaders in Washington, D.C., who implemented an extreme ideology. That ideology got implemented here in the United States Congress. It was their ideology that was governing or not governing Wall Street. It was the lack of investments in jobs, education, health care that needed to be made.

And all of a sudden fast forward a few years, the Ponzi scheme ends, the house of cards collapses, and it is not just Wall Street that has problems, it ripples throughout the economy, and now we have in some cities 15, 20 percent unemployment. We have health care costs zooming out of control, energy costs zooming out of control, we continue to be dependent on foreign sources for our energy, which is a national security issue, because these problems weren't addressed.

And the initiatives that we have put forth over the last year have begun to shift the trends at least away from losing hundreds of thousands of jobs a month to only losing 80,000, from 700,000 to 80,000. From the stock market ending up at 6,500 a year ago now up to over 10,000, up 55 percent. So things aren't perfect, but they certainly are moving in the right direction.

And if we can get the health care plan implemented, start reducing costs for businesses that they have money to free up to invest into their small businesses, into their capital, into their machinery, into their workforce, into their technology, then I think we can begin to really drive the economy forward and put the middle class back front and center where they belong.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Thank you, Mr. RYAN, Mr. ALTMIRE. And let's just talk about health care during that 6-year period in which the Republicans controlled every piece of the apparatus down here in Washington. By allowing them to set a health care agenda for this country which made a really good deal with the insurance companies and the drug companies and a lot of the for-profit health care entities, what we saw over that decade of time, where the Republicans were driving the agenda here in Washington, was for businesses in my district and in your district, 120 percent increase in the amount of money that they were paying for health care.

Now, it would have been nice if revenues for those same companies were going up by the same percentage, but they weren't. Revenues couldn't keep pace with the health care inflation that businesses, many of them small mom and pop shops, manufacturers that maybe employed only 10 or 20 people, it couldn't keep up with the rising costs of health care. And so businesses went under. We lost manufacturing and industrial capacity to countries overseas that spend half as much as we do on health care, and approach it in a very different way. Workers during that same period of time saw their wages remain largely flat because every bit of extra money that the company that they worked for made went straight into health care costs.

For small businesses it was even worse. During that same time, as insurance companies gathered and gathered more power by virtue of the I think very, very bad decisions made here in Washington, small businesses ended up paying about 20 percent more than large businesses did, forcing more of them to go out of business. Our health care system got worse and worse and worse, and it contributed in a bigger and bigger way to the recession that we find ourselves in today.

We have got to wake up to the fact that when you hand a health care system over to the insurance companies and the drug companies, when you write a Medicare drug benefit bill that essentially guarantees lifetime profits for the insurance and drug companies, while passing down the bill to regular Americans, while you ignore the festering problems in Medicare so that you push more and more of the problem back ultimately onto businesses who are going to have to front the cost for an increased Medicare budget, you are crippling our economy.

The Republican health care agenda here in this House over the course of the last decade, and what continues to be their agenda, is part and parcel of what got us into this economic mess, Mr. RYAN. We can tell the story from the handing of the reins of economic power by the Republicans over to the banks and to the Wall Street lending community. We can tell the story with regard to our energy prices that are also crippling our economy, as we handed over the power of our energy policy to the big oil companies. But you can absolutely tell the story of where we are today with respect to our economy through the lens of the health care policy that the Republicans perpetrated on this Congress and on this country for almost a decade, and would like to bring us back to if they were ever to get control of this place again. That is part of the story.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. There is no question about it. No question about it. And I think one of the important issues that we need to talk about as a country too, along with the health care and along with a lot of the decisions that our friends on the other side made that put us here, we need to remember this in context not only of the last year, but I think of the last couple of decades. Because the arguments we are hearing today about socialism, and here comes big government and all these other things were the same arguments that they made against President Clinton in his initial budget that he passed in 1993 when he first got in. It was the same claims. And I think they passed it without any Republican votes in the House, and Democrats had to carry the water.

And look what happened in the nineties. And that is what I say even to my Republican friends who we like to tease each other back home in the district. I said how is your 401(k) doing now since President Obama has been in? Is it doing a little better than it was when President Bush was in? I think it was. So you take that number that Bush had, the same thing with President Clinton, 20 million new jobs created in the 1990s because of the Democratic economic proposals. You had the bottom 20 percent of people, their wages grow for the first time in a long, long time prior to that. You saw budget deficits turn into budget surpluses.

What we are trying to say here is there is always going to be a neoconservative Republican extreme faction that is going to say whatever we are doing is somehow going to make the sky fall. But the reality is these are sound economic principles, these are sound investments, sound reforms on health care, energy, and the like.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. ALTMIRE. The gentleman talks about the impact that policies have. And exactly right on the point of job creation. We are in a brand new decade here. Look at the decade past. It was the first decade since they started keeping the statistic on job growth over the course of a 10-year period. The first time we went through an entire decade and did not have a statistically relevant increase in jobs. Went an entire decade basically flat line. Well, that is not helping anybody.

When we talk about the Clinton budget in 1993, sometimes when I am researching different Members' positions on issues, I will go back and look at some of the things that were said on

this floor back in 1993, saying that if we passed the Clinton plan to balance the budget that we were going to cause the greatest recession in American history and collapse the economy. And some of the arguments that were made, I think it is fair to say, were proven false when the last 4 years of the Clinton administration we had four consecutive budget surpluses, the last four budget surpluses that we have had in this country.

Now, I don't want to go back and battle old battles or rehash old fights, but the point is past is prologue. And you can look at the fights that we are having today, and the same people who were predicting disaster if we passed those policies are the same people who are trying to prevent this Congress from addressing the systemic issues that we face right now.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALTMIRE. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. We could have ideological differences over an issue like health care or energy policy, but what maybe was the most remarkable to me over the course of the last year was to see that divide between Republicans and Democrats happen on the issue of financial regulatory reform. I mean when I am back in my district, you know I certainly got people who are on both sides of the energy debate, and on both sides of the health care debate, but boy, almost everybody I run into, with maybe the exception of a few people who are commuting back and forth to high-priced jobs in New York, say you got to step up to the plate and stop these Wall Street investment banks from going back and doing the same things that they did to us regular, average everyday Joes over the course of the last decade.

You got to go in and fix the problem of derivatives. You have to go in and stop these institutions from becoming so highly leveraged that they cause catastrophic failure of themselves and the entire system. Go back and fix this for us.

When I got sworn in maybe I was a little bit naive this year. I thought, yeah, we are going to have some knock down, drag them out fights on a couple of issues, but I bet you this Congress is going to come together and rein in the abuses and the excesses on Wall Street. Well, we are even fighting over that. The Republicans don't want to join us and try to curb the real abuses on Wall Street. And if they do, they kind of want to do it with a little patch here and a little Band-Aid here when President Obama said step up and listen, to the extent we are sending money to these banks to try to keep the economy afloat, well then we should ask them to help pay it back with a fee on the big banks. Republicans ran out and opposed that as well.

I mean, listen, we represent very similar districts. We have got a lot of Republicans, a lot of Democrats, a lot of liberals, conservatives. I get that they are going to fight on things, but there has got to be some fundamental issues to how we institute some fairness back in our economy and stick up for the little guy against these big Wall Street banks that have caused so much of this trouble. There has got to be places that we can agree on.

And I guess as you talk about past is prologue, you know, I think we are in for a lot of fights when it comes to sticking up for the little guy because it seems like there is only one group here, Mr. ALTMIRE, that is fighting those fights.

Mr. ALTMIRE. That is right. And as we have continued to talk about the key issues to balancing our budget have to be paying for any increase in expenditures or decrease in revenue. And the gentleman talks about his surprise to hear that people would oppose taking a look at the way Wall Street firms do business and taking a look at the way things have been run over the last several years and what that led to a year-and-a-half ago.

I was just as surprised as the gentleman to learn that there was opposition to the concept that we should have to pay for things that we pass in this House. Because I mentioned the four straight budget surpluses that President Clinton had in the last 4 years of his administration. That was due largely to pay-as-you-go budget scoring, which to give credit where credit is due, was instituted by President Bush's father in 1990. It was in effect throughout the 1990s. Wildly successful time in our economy. And as I said, four straight budget surpluses.

So this Congress, before myself and Mr. RYAN became Members, allowed it to expire, allowed pay-as-you-go budget scoring to expire. And now what have we had? Instead of having four straight budget surpluses, we are approaching 10 straight budget deficits. Deficits extended as far as the eye can see.

So in this House we had a debate on whether or not to require any piece of legislation that comes through this House that raises revenue or that raises expenditures or decreases revenue, very simple concept, you would have to have an offset for that. Find somewhere else in the budget to make a cut. Find somewhere else in the budget to come up with the money to pay for whatever the policy idea is that you are putting forward.

It is what every family and every business has to do every day in this country. If you want to spend more money on one side of the ledger, you have to find it on the other side of the ledger. Well, this Congress over the past 10 years has not operated under that commonsense accounting rule, and it has led to these enormous deficits, and in the long term the incredible astronomical debt facing this country.

So I was surprised to hear some of my colleagues on the other side oppose the concept—pretty simple—pay for what you want to spend. Pay for revenue decreases. We don't even find agreement on that in this Congress. It doesn't bode well for having a debate, an informed debate on how to solve these key problems of our economy at this important time.

□ 2030

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. We've got to make the investments that we have to make as a country. Our infrastructure around the country needs a huge shot in the arm. Trillions of dollars need to be invested in roads and bridges, high-speed rail all across the United States, airports. This all needs to be done. Our ports, waterways, those kinds of investments have been neglected for years and years and years, and we need to continue to make those investments here as well.

We have to ask those people who end up making tremendous profits from those enterprises to step up and help, who have been very successful over the course of the last few years. And I don't think we should run from the fact that we need to ask them. There has been a shift towards the middle class paying more and more of the share of revenue that's coming into the Federal Government. We need to reduce that for the middle class and ask those who are benefiting in a very big way.

I want to make one final point as we begin to close here and have a few minutes left on the issue of energy. I think it is important, as we talk about health care and health care costs, we need to also address the issue of how we are going to produce and generate energy here in the United States. This is our number one national security issue that we have in this country. We send $1 billion a day out of this country through our gas pumps into foreign countries, oil-producing countries who don't like us all that much and cause us tremendous geopolitical strife day in and day out and distract us from what we need to be doing.

We need to make sure that we create an energy system in the United States that takes that money and keeps it here in the United States of America to refurbish our homes, our businesses, our commercial buildings here in the United States, to make sure that we pump that money into battery technology, smart cars, smart grids, energy-efficient homes, energy management systems. This is the future of the United States of America.

Last week, we had a conference here where we met with several CEOs in these energy management systems now working for Wal-Mart, Home Depot, Costco, saving them 20 to 25 percent on their energy costs. Those are savings that companies like those can reinvest back into their business. But if you ask the CIA, you talk to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, this is a national security issue. Why would we want to depend on foreign sources of energy to supply our

own military here in the United States? We address our national security issue, we create jobs here in the United States, and we help to address the carbon issue here causing global climate change.

These are the issues that we need to tackle as a country, and we can't be afraid to do it. We can't be afraid, Madam Speaker, to make the tough decisions, to push the tough policies, to make sure that 10, 20, 30 years from now when people look back and say, What did they do in 2010, 2009 in the United States Congress to try to address some of these problems, we can say we answered the call, we made the tough decisions, and the country was better off for it.

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

UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF HEALTH CARE LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I can tell by looking at the proverbial clock on the wall at 8:30 that an important election that was just held today with the voting booths now closed just one half hour ago and the ballots all being collected in their boxes and brought to the appropriate places for counting, and we will see—potentially during the course of the next 60 minutes—just how that election should turn out.

Just as an aside, for those who are with us here this evening taking part in this discussion on the constitutionality, or the lack thereof, the unconstitutionality of the health care legislation that's about to come before this House again, we will be interspersing some of the election results so we can keep everyone apprised of just how those elections are turning out.

I mentioned the fact that the election was held today, and I'm sure there will be pundits on the air tonight talking about exactly what do the election results mean up in the State of Massachusetts, not just for the State of Massachusetts, but for the country as a whole; and a number of them will be saying what I have said before, that it's not so much just looking at those two individual candidates, but what their respective parties stand for, and more specifically, what the President of the United States and this administration has stood for over these last 12 months and what his seminal program, his major issue, has been, and that of course is this health care, so-called ''reform,'' the imposition of new mandates and taxes and totally changing the health care configuration and how the delivery of it is done in this country.

Some would make the case that what the election that just closed now 32 minutes ago in Massachusetts is about is whether or not the American public agrees with what the Obama administration has put forth as their major proposal is changing the health care delivery system in the United States or not. We will see the results, if not in the next 60 minutes, at least sometime tonight.

More importantly, though, than what the outcome of that one election will be is what will Congress be doing with that legislation here in the House and in the Senate this week or next week or whenever they decide to bring back that issue for a vote, and we anticipate that they will.

The fundamental issue, though—this is the one that we'll be discussing in here—is not some of the minutia of that health care legislation, not some of the small language that is buried within—first in the thousand pages that came before this House that I would hazard a guess that probably just about no one on the other side of the aisle read thoroughly and had a complete comprehension of what they were voting on when they voted ''yes,'' nor clearly in the 2,000 pages that came forth in the Senate variation and version of that health care bill.

It's not some of the minutia, not some of the small language, and not so much the details that should be the first question that any Member of Congress should be asking themselves when they're about to vote on that bill; but it's rather the fundamental issue of whether that piece of legislation is constitutional at all.

In my pocket here is my wallet, and in my wallet is my voting card—actually, I have it over here because we just finished voting a little while ago. And as you know, Madam Speaker, every time we vote, we put it in one of these little slots here before we vote red, green, or yellow.

I always suggest to my colleagues that before they vote on whatever the legislation is, they should be asking themselves one fundamental question: Is the bill that they're about to vote on constitutional or not? Does the Constitution of the United States give us, as Members of this body, the authority to pass that law that we're about to vote on?

We are all required, when we become new Congresspeople every 2-year terms, to raise our hands and to say that we support and defend the Constitution of the United States. As a matter of fact, I was just in New Jersey earlier today where now-Governor Chris Christie did the same thing, raised his hand and said that he is supporting and defending not only the Constitution of New Jersey, but also the Constitution of the United States as well. We, as Members of this body, of the House of Representatives, do that every 2 years when we have the honor and privilege of being elected by our constituents at home; we come to Washington and say we will support and defend the Constitution.

As an aside, there is one member of our delegation from Texas who has suggested that it should be a requirement that every Member of Congress and their staffs should read the Constitution at least once each term. Well, I'm not going to say that we have to mandate that; I think it would not be a bad thing for each Member to do it each term. I go through the Constitution on a regular basis, and I hope that other Members would as well. But we have all held up our hands and said that we are going to uphold it, so that is why I suggest to each Member that before they vote on any bill, that they ask themselves is that bill constitutional.

Now, the health care bill that we're talking about here is far more sweeping than just about any other piece of legislation that I have ever dealt with in my short term here in Congress. And I think it is far more devastating and sweeping than any other legislation that we have seen in generations. It would impact upwards of one-sixth of our economic activity of this country. But far more important than that, it would impact our very fundamental liberties that our Founding Fathers intended that our Constitution was designed to protect.

And so that is what our discussion is going to be tonight. And we will eagerly await the outcome of the election in the State of Massachusetts to see what the voters of that State would like to have their voices come in on. But I think the voices of that State will say, whether they support the nature or some aspects of this health care bill or not, I think all of those citizens of Massachusetts, as with the citizens of the great State of New Jersey would also agree with me, that whatever we do on health care in this country should at the very least be constitutional.

Now, one of the primary aspects of this bill that I would suggest has a flaw in it with regard to the constitutionality of it is the health care mandate. And what is that? In the bill, for the first time ever, I would suggest, in the history of the United States, Congress is going to suggest that we are not going to try to be regulating activity, but we are going to try to regulate inactivity.

For a long time now—well, basically, you can go back to the 1930s and the New Deal courts and FDR and the like—Congress has grown in its authority and had the Federal Government grow in its size as far as its reach of regulation and taxation of economic activity in this country. And so now you can see just about every aspect of your life in one way, shape or form having a little bit of a reach of the Federal Government into it as the Federal Government tries to regulate in one way, shape or form.

But that is always in the area of activity. If you're in interstate commerce some how or other, if you're a trucking firm, the Federal Government is going to reach out and regulate your activity. If you're selling some sort of product either in your State or outside of

your State, the Federal Government is going to try to come in and regulate that form of activity. If you're in any other form of business, in State or out of State, the Federal Government is going to try and step in in some way, shape or form, I would suggest, and try to regulate that activity.

But never before since our Constitution was first created in 1787 has the Federal Government said we are now going to regulate inactivity. We are going to start regulating you even if you do absolutely nothing. Even if you just stay home, don't buy anything, don't do anything, we are now going to regulate your activity. And we're going to do that regulation in a more personal and profound nature than any other aspect that we've been talking about here on the floor in the last several months or years, and that is your health care and your health insurance.

So in this legislation that the administration has proposed that has passed out of this House, that has passed in the Senate, and now is in some area of compromise on the other side of the aisle, the Federal Government, this administration says, can regulate inactivity. They can step into your house and say, because you are not doing something that the Federal Government believes you should be doing—what is that? buying insurance—we're going to penalize you and we're going to do that with a tax. We have never seen this before. And I would suggest that that is an overreach, a far overreach of what the Founding Fathers ever intended for this government, this Federal Government to be able to do.

It is, therefore, a fundamental flaw, an unconstitutional flaw in this legislation. It is one of the main reasons why I voted against it when it came in this House, and it will be a continuing reason why I will vote against it if ever it comes back on the floor of this House again.

Now, I see I have been joined by some of my colleagues from the floor who have spoken on the difficulties or the problems or the demerits of the health care bill in the past. As I said in my opening comments, there are a number of those areas that we can talk about with regard to the taxation aspect or with regard to the fact that you're putting the government—and I'm looking at a doctor now—between you and your doctor and other problems with this bill as well. There are a whole host of reasons why this legislation is bad as it impacts upon us as individuals and our health quality in this country. But as I said at the beginning, the most profound aspect of it is that it's unconstitutional, and it's unconstitutional because of this mandate.

With that, I am pleased to be joined by Ms. FOXX, who would like to speak on this topic as well.

□ 2045

Ms. FOXX. Well, thank you, Mr. GARRETT. I appreciate your taking the lead in organizing this Special Order tonight to give us an opportunity to talk about the health care bill that has been proposed by President Obama and Speaker PELOSI. It has certainly gotten a good bit of news in the last few months.

In the news that I watch on a regular basis, particularly in the last few days, we have heard a lot about the health care bill and, as you indicated, about the impact or the possible impact on the election that is being held in Massachusetts today to fill a vacant Senate seat. I think it is very important that we continue this debate, even though there may not be many people watching this, because generally people who are watching C–SPAN, I think, are very interested in what is going on politically in the country, and probably most people are watching what is happening with the outcome of the election in Massachusetts. It has been about 45 minutes now since the polls closed, and I know, when I was watching, just before I came to the floor, the comment was made that it probably won't take long to get the results of the election as Massachusetts is a rather small State, and they have good reporting mechanisms. So we will probably hear, and I think, for months, will continue to debate whether this very, very ill-advised bill that has been proposed has had an impact.

I speak often to groups, school groups, and I always like to talk about the Constitution because it is so important to our country and to why we are the country that we are. No other country in the world has had such an endearing and enduring Constitution as we have had. If you type out the Constitution on 8½-by-11 paper, double spaced, like you would a term paper, it only turns out to be about 18 pages long. It's rather short as constitutions go. Many countries have constitutions that are thousands and thousands of pages. I think one of the geniuses of our Founders was that they were able to write a very short Constitution that has stood us in good stead for over 200 years, and it continues to stand us in good stead.

One of the things I always point out to the students when I talk to them is the first three words of the Constitution. I wish I had a poster, but I don't. Even in the original document, these three words were written larger than the other words: ''We the People.'' The Founders wanted the people of this country to be in charge of our government. They knew about the tyranny of a king, and they knew about the tyranny of a parliament. They never wanted those tyrannies to be visited upon the American people again, so they wrote a preamble that started that way: ''We the People of the United States.'' That's what we need to focus on here in the Congress all the time.

I agree with my distinguished colleague from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT), which is that, every time we vote, we should ask ourselves: Is my vote going to be a vote that supports the Constitution as I swore an oath to do? I think that is very, very important.

I also think that the 10th Amendment to the Constitution doesn't get nearly the kind of attention that it deserves. The First Amendment gets a tremendous amount of attention, as it should; but all of our amendments are extremely important, and I think it's worthy to point out that in the over 200 years since the Constitution was adopted that we have only had 27 amendments to the Constitution, and we haven't needed a lot of amendments to the Constitution. We've had opportunities to adopt other amendments, and we haven't done so. I want to point out the 10th Amendment and read it, because I think, again, it's so important to this discussion that we're having on why the proposed health care bill is unconstitutional.

The 10th Amendment says, ''The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.''

The Founders did enumerate certain things that the House should do, that the Senate should do, that the President should do, and those things that are not enumerated by the Constitution are left to the people and are left to the States. Nowhere in the Constitution do we read the words: The government shall provide for health care. Nowhere. In fact, the words ''health care'' are nowhere in the Constitution. In fact, the Constitution says in the preamble that the people are ''to provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare.'' Well, the main job of the Federal Government is to provide for the common defense. Unfortunately, we have gotten far, far away from that notion.

Most of the things that have been done by the Federal Government which are unconstitutional, in my opinion, have been done for good reasons. They're not malevolent reasons, but they're wrong. We should not be funding education, for example, and some of us who are here tonight have talked about that in the past. We certainly, I don't think, should be mandating that individuals in this country purchase health insurance on penalty of being put in prison. It is ridiculous that we have people contemplating that in this country. It is a tremendous overreach of power.

I want to point out something that my good colleague has pointed out, which is the issue of our being penalized for the absence of something as opposed to actions. Not buying health insurance will get a citizen in trouble in this country. Never before has that happened.

I want to point out something that the President has said and that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle who are pushing this terrible bill have said.

They said, Oh, when the American people understand what's in this bill, then they will like it. Well, that in

itself, to me, is a condemnation of the bill. The bill that has been voted on in the Senate they didn't have a chance to read, and what's being negotiated now between the House and the Senate is being done behind closed doors by a very small group of people—all in secret. Well, if the bill were put out there now, the American people could decide: Do they like the bill or not like the bill? They're saying, from what they know and from what we know and from what had been proposed in the bills in the House, we know that the bills have bad elements in them, and that's what the American people are reacting to—the elements that we know which are bad.

The additional sad situation that we face is that there is a lot that has been agreed to by four or five or six people that nobody knows anything about. That is not the way to operate in a republic. That is not the way this Congress should be operating nor should our President be a part of that.

We have ample evidence from good constitutional scholars that this is not good.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 2, 2010]

WHY THE HEALTH-CARE BILLS ARE UNCONSTITUTIONAL

IF THE GOVERNMENT CAN MANDATE THE PURCHASE OF INSURANCE, IT CAN DO ANYTHING

(By Orrin G. Hatch, J. Kenneth Blackwell and Kenneth A. Klukowski)

President Obama's health-care bill is now moving toward final passage. The policy issues may be coming to an end, but the legal issues are certain to continue because key provisions of this dangerous legislation are unconstitutional. Legally speaking, this legislation creates a target-rich environment. We will focus on three of its more glaring constitutional defects.

First, the Constitution does not give Congress the power to require that Americans purchase health insurance. Congress must be able to point to at least one of its powers listed in the Constitution as the basis of any legislation it passes. None of those powers justifies the individual insurance mandate. Congress's powers to tax and spend do not apply because the mandate neither taxes nor spends. The only other option is Congress's power to regulate interstate commerce.

Congress has many times stretched this power to the breaking point, exceeding even the expanded version of the commerce power established by the Supreme Court since the Great Depression. It is one thing, however, for Congress to regulate economic activity in which individuals choose to engage; it is another to require that individuals engage in such activity. That is not a difference in degree, but instead a difference in kind. It is a line that Congress has never crossed and the courts have never sanctioned.

In fact, the Supreme Court in United States v. Lopez (1995) rejected a version of the commerce power so expansive that it would leave virtually no activities by individuals that Congress could not regulate. By requiring Americans to use their own money to purchase a particular good or service, Congress would be doing exactly what the court said it could not do.

Some have argued that Congress may pass any legislation that it believes will serve the ''general welfare.'' Those words appear in Article I of the Constitution, but they do not create a free-floating power for Congress simply to go forth and legislate well. Rather, the general welfare clause identifies the purpose for which Congress may spend money. The individual mandate tells Americans how they must spend the money Congress has not taken from them and has nothing to do with congressional spending.

A second constitutional defect of the Reid bill passed in the Senate involves the deals he cut to secure the votes of individual senators. Some of those deals do involve spending programs because they waive certain states' obligation to contribute to the Medicaid program. This selective spending targeted at certain states runs afoul of the general welfare clause. The welfare it serves is instead very specific and has been dubbed ''cash for cloture'' because it secured the 60 votes the majority needed to end debate and pass this legislation.

A third constitutional defect in this ObamaCare legislation is its command that states establish such things as benefit exchanges, which will require state legislation and regulations. This is not a condition for receiving federal funds, which would still leave some kind of choice to the states. No, this legislation requires states to establish these exchanges or says that the Secretary of Health and Human Services will step in and do it for them. It renders states little more than subdivisions of the federal government.

This violates the letter, the spirit, and the interpretation of our federal-state form of government. Some may have come to consider federalism an archaic annoyance, perhaps an amusing topic for law-school seminars but certainly not a substantive rule for structuring government. But in New York v. United States (1992) and Printz v. United States (1997), the Supreme Court struck down two laws on the grounds that the Constitution forbids the federal government from commandeering any branch of state government to administer a federal program. That is, by drafting and by deliberate design, exactly what this legislation would do.

The federal government may exercise only the powers granted to it or denied to the states. The states may do everything else. This is why, for example, states may have authority to require individuals to purchase health insurance but the federal government does not. It is also the reason states may require that individuals purchase car insurance before choosing to drive a car, but the federal government may not require all individuals to purchase health insurance.

This hardly exhausts the list of constitutional problems with this legislation, which would take the federal government into uncharted political and legal territory. Analysts, scholars and litigators are just beginning to examine the issues we have raised and other issues that may well lead to future litigation.

America's founders intended the federal government to have limited powers and that the states have an independent sovereign place in our system of government. The Obama/Reid/Pelosi legislation to take control of the American health-care system is the most sweeping and intrusive federal program ever devised. If the federal government can do this, then it can do anything, and the limits on government power that our liberty requires will be more myth than reality.

With that, I would like to yield back to my colleague from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I thank the gentlelady for joining us on the floor this evening and for her remarks for the last several minutes on this very most important issue. As the gentlelady who has come to the floor on numerous occasions in the past to speak to this most profound and fundamental issue, the protecting of our constitutional rights, I once again thank her.

With that, I will now just turn to the gentleman from Georgia, who is familiar, I'm sure, with James Madison and ''The Federalist Papers'' where Mr. Madison said, ''In the first place, it is to be remembered that the general government is not to be charged with the whole power of making and administering laws. Its jurisdiction is limited to certain enumerated powers.'' Congress, in other words, was not set forth free by our Founding Fathers to have unlimited grants of authority but, rather, certain prescribed ones.

With that, perhaps you could help enumerate and share on that point on which Madison was so eloquently quoted 200 years ago. The gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Thank you, Mr. GARRETT. I appreciate your yielding this evening.

In Hosea 4:6, God tells us, ''My people are destroyed for a lack of knowledge.'' Unfortunately, people all over this country have a tremendous lack of knowledge about how much liberty and freedom we've lost in this country. Now, I differentiate between freedom and liberty. I talk more about liberty than freedom. A wild dog is free. Let me define for the American people what ''liberty'' is. ''Liberty'' is freedom bridled by morality.

We have things going on here in this Congress, and we've had things going on in Congress after Congress under both Democratic as well as Republican leadership. We've had things going on with the executive branch under both Republican and Democrat Presidents, and we even have things going on in the Federal court system, all the way up to the U.S. Supreme Court, where rulings are handed down where the American people are losing their liberty.

I am a strict original intent constitutionalist. In fact, I carry a copy of the Constitution in my pocket at all times, and it's in every one of my suits. On my desk, there is a tremendous document. It's called ''The Federalist Papers in Modern Language,'' which is a transliteration of ''The Federalist Papers,'' which are very difficult to read because they're in old-style English. This is in modern-type English. It's not an interpretation. It's just a transliteration. It goes from one form of English into another.

So I highly encourage the American people to get these documents. I give copies of the Constitution to anyone who walks into my office here in Washington, D.C., and I give my constituents copies of the Constitution out of our district offices. Every Congressman can do the same. The American people need to become knowledgeable about how much liberty we've lost.

One of the greatest attacks upon liberty is what's going on here in Congress today where the leadership in

this House, where the leadership in the Senate, and where the leadership down Pennsylvania Avenue, in the White House, want to take away your liberty to see your doctor and for that doctor and you to make the decisions that you need to have made so that you have the best quality health care.

Now, Ms. FOXX was talking about the 10th Amendment. I'll go back and read it just to help educate the people because you may have not listened to Ms. FOXX, but listen up, please, Madam Speaker, to what the 10th Amendment says.

It says, ''The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution—'' in other words, those powers specifically given to Congress, the President and the courts ''—nor prohibited by it to the States.'' Those are such things as minting money and having armies and things like that. ''The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.''

So we in Congress can only technically constitutionally pass laws that are specifically given to us by the powers of this document. Article I, section 8 actually lists the things that Congress can pass laws about.

Madam Speaker, this is just a little booklet which contains the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, and every single amendment. It's just this little bitty booklet, not the thousands of pages that PelosiCare and ReidCare and ObamaCare entail. Madam Speaker, it starts right here, and it goes to right here. It's 1¾ pages in this little booklet. It's just 18 things. It says, ''The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States.''

□ 2100

Now, Madison was very specific, and Mr. GARRETT was talking about that. If you read the Federalist papers, the general welfare, which one of the clauses that has been perverted by Democrats and Republicans, courts, Presidents, and Congress alike, means the general welfare. Not direct welfare, but the general welfare of the Nation.

So we have the ability to collect taxes and pay the debts.

To borrow money on the credit of the United States.

To regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States and with the Indian tribes.

Now, Mr. GARRETT was just talking a few minutes ago about this commerce clause being utilized to make folks do something because the leadership here thinks that we have to mandate every person in this country to buy health care insurance whether you want to or not. That has never been done, and it is totally unconstitutional, as Mr. GARRETT was saying.

Actually, this commerce clause is one of the three that have been perverted, also. The original intent of that is that we don't lockbox trade within State borders. And we have done that on health insurance, which is unconstitutional in itself.

Republicans over and over again have suggested, and in fact in my comprehensive health care reform bill that I introduced, H.R. 3889, it would allow people in Georgia to buy health insurance in Alabama, which is cheaper, for the same Blue Cross-Blue Shield policy. Why shouldn't we be able to do that? This commerce clause under the original intent should allow us to do so. Republicans have proposed that. Democrats have fought against that.

Going on. To establish a uniformed rule of naturalization, and uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcies throughout the United States. So we should have naturalization and bankruptcy laws.

To coin money, to regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and to fix the standard of weights and measures.

To provide for the punishment of counterfeiting the securities and current coin of the United States. In fact, this is one of the few constitutional criminal justice things that the Federal Government is supposed to be doing. Most of the criminal justice laws that the Federal Government has on its books are unconstitutional because we don't have the authority to do them.

To establish post offices and post roads. Post roads during the Founders' time were the highway system. So we do have constitutional authority for Federal roads.

To promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries. That means patent laws. So we have constitutional authority for patents.

To constitute tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court.

Folks, there is only one Federal court that is established in this document, and that is the U.S. Supreme Court. Every single Federal court, every single Federal judge serves at the pleasure of the Congress. We need to start putting checks on these dudes, and ladies, around this country who have actually broken their oath of office when they swear to uphold the Constitution. In fact, every one of us, when we are sworn in, every Congress swears to uphold the Constitution against enemies, both foreign and domestic. Madam Speaker, we have a lot of enemies that are domestic, enemies of the Constitution. This House is overrun by many domestic enemies of the Constitution, and the Senate is full of a bunch of them also. The courts are full of a bunch of them likewise.

To define and punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas, and offenses against the law of nations. That is another one of the few criminal defense laws of the Federal Government.

To declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on lands and water.

To raise and support armies.

To provide and maintain a navy.

To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces. That is for the Army and the Navy, and the Marine Corps. I am a Marine, by the way—Semper Fi.

To provide and call forth the militia.

To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia.

To exercise exclusive legislation in all cases over the District of Columbia. So when the District of Columbia decides that they want to have homosexual marriage recognized in the District of Columbia, we in Congress are supposed to tell them no. In fact, I have got a House Resolution that says that.

To make all laws that should be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers.

That is it, folks. That is it. The 18 things that we have the authority here in Congress to pass laws about. There is absolutely nothing in this document that gives Congress the authority to take over the health care system in this country. None.

And when we see PelosiCare on this floor or when we see ReidCare, ObamaCare on this floor, there is absolutely zero constitutional authority.

Now, God says in his Word, with the multitude of counselors there is safety. And I make a challenge to the Democrats. One Democrat in this House. If one Democrat in this House or one Democrat in the U.S. Senate were to show me in this document where Congress has the authority to pass a bill that takes over the health care system in America and sets forth socialized medicine, as they are trying to do under ObamaCare, I will vote for it. If one person in this House or the Senate shows me where in this document that we have the constitutional authority to do that, I will vote for it.

I make a pledge to my Lord God, my Lord Jesus Christ up above, to the people of the United States, I pledge to vote for it if one, just one House member or Senate member will show me in this document where we have the authority to do so. I am not worried about that pledge, because there is none.

Pelosicare, Reidcare, Obamacare, secret—well, they are all secret bills. They are all in secret, with no transparency we have been promised by the Speaker as well as by the President. There is nothing in this document to give the Federal Government the authority.

Mr. GARRETT was talking about that one mandate on individuals which in itself is unconstitutional. There are so many things in this thing—in fact, in the Senate bill, Mr. GARRETT, Madam Speaker, they say we, the next Congress, can't pass laws regarding that

bill to overturn it, to amend it, or to withdraw it, appeal it. That in itself is unconstitutional. We in this Congress can't make a law that subjugates the next Congress to what we pass. That is unconstitutional. It doesn't pass the smell test, either.

The American people, Madam Speaker, are being destroyed for a tremendous lack of knowledge of this document and how much liberty we are losing.

Madam Speaker, it is up to the American people to rise up and say no to Obamacare. To say no to whatever bill.

I understand that the Majority Leader, Mr. HOYER, today said that, ''The Senate bill is better than nothing.'' So I am expecting with that comment that they are going to try to force down the throats of this House the Senate bill. I pray and hope to God, Lord Jesus Christ, please help us to not pass that bill. It is in the name of Jesus that I pray that. But I just hope and pray that we don't pass any bill that is being presented here.

I have challenged Democrats, many of them individually, to introduce a bill. I will give them the legislative language. And it is totally constitutional, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. Speaker—it has gone from Madam Speaker to Mr. Speaker. Welcome. We are glad to have you tonight—to do four things.

One is have cross-state purchasing of insurance for individuals and businesses, which is constitutional under the commerce clause. And we should be doing that under the commerce clause.

To have associations so that associations could be developed. I am a Rotarian. We could have a Rotary International pool. I am a graduate of the University of Georgia, Medical College of Georgia. We could have a University of Georgia system pool. We could have any kind of pool. We could have a construction pool. We could have a college graduate pool. We could have all these pools that anybody in the country could join and have multiple options to buy many different kinds of policies, and it would put a whole lot of market forces into the system to lower the cost.

The third thing is to stimulate the States to set up high-risk pools for those who can't buy insurance because of preexisting conditions.

And, fourth, to have 100 percent tax deductibility for every single person in this country for all health care expenses. There are a lot of people that are left out, and you can't deduct your health care expenses.

Four simple things, all constitutional. I've had many Democrats, Mr. Speaker, tell me they would love to introduce this bill. I will be the first cosponsor, and we could pass that, I believe, in this House. That would put some market forces in the system and would literally lower the cost of health care.

Mr. Speaker, I am a medical doctor. In my medical practice as a family practitioner I have seen how government intrusion in the health care system has markedly run up the cost of health care. A couple of quick examples. I don't want to hog the time, Mr. GARRETT, but let me just give this story right quick like.

I was in a solo practice down in rural southwest Georgia, and I had a small automated lab with quality controls to make sure that the results were correct for my patients. Most doctors, if not almost all doctors, want to have good lab results. Many doctors across the country had these small automated labs with quality control. Congress passed a bill called CLIA, the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Act. It was signed into law. It shut down my lab and every single doctor's lab in this country.

Prior to CLIA, if a patient came in with a sore throat, running a fever, I would do a CBC, a complete blood count, to see if they had a bacterial infection and thus needed antibiotics, or a viral infection that is not helped by antibiotics. They don't need to spend their money or even be exposed to antibiotics. I charged $12 for that test. It took 5 minutes to do it. CLIA shut my lab down. I had to send patients across the way to the hospital. It took 2 to 3 hours, cost $75 for one test.

Mr. Speaker, what do you think that did to the cost of health care across this country? What do you think that did to the cost of insurance across the country? It ran it up for everybody.

Congress a few years ago passed HIPAA. That has cost the health care industry billions, with a B, billions of dollars, and has not paid for the first aspirin to treat the headaches that it has created. It was totally unneeded.

It is government regulation in the health care system, Mr. Speaker, that has run the cost up so that it is just outrageous. The Federal Government has no business regulating what I do with my patients. It has no constitutional authority to do so.

We have to go back to the drawing boards and work on a constitutional basis and present in a step-by-step approach and a constitutional approach ways of getting the Federal Government out of regulating the health care system. Let the marketplace regulate it. Because I know without a question that the marketplace, unencumbered by taxes and regulations, is the best control of quality, quantity, and cost of all goods and services, including my services as a medical doctor.

But, again, I challenge one Democrat in this House or in the Senate to show me where it is constitutional for us to pass PelosiCare, ReidCare, ObamaCare, and I will vote for bill. They can't do it because it is unconstitutional. Thank you, Mr. GARRETT.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for his passionate statements and litany of facts with regard to the unconstitutionality of this underlying bill. And within all that, there is the question of: What does that mean to me? The unconstitutionality.

What it comes right down to is this: That the Founders were profound and wise in their thinking in establishing the Constitution, and to do so not for their generation but for posterity as well, so that our rights and our liberties would be protected. And I think that is the case you were making.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. If the gentleman would yield for 30 seconds. And I thank you for doing so, because we have some other speakers, and I have taken a long time. I apologize to the other speakers for taking so long.

But you are right. What does it mean to the American citizen about this bill? Not only that it is unconstitutional, which it is. But if you have private insurance, the cost is going to go up.

We have been told by our President: If you like your health insurance, you can keep it. But it is going to be more expensive if this is passed than it is today, and it is going to go up a lot faster, higher. Your doctor and you can't make decisions. Some government bureaucrat in Washington is going to be making those decisions for you.

Medicare people are going to have the Medicare money cut, the pot that is available for Medicare to be cut markedly so there is going to be more rationing of care. There already is some, but it is going to be worse. I as a doctor am already regulated and told who I can put in the hospital and how long they can stay there. That is going to get a whole lot worse. So it is going to affect the quality of care.

The American people need to understand: The cost of your health insurance is going up. The quality of care that your doctor can give you is going down. Markedly going down. And you are going to be mandated to be—basically, it is a process of transferring everybody into a single-payer health care system. Socialized medicine. That is what our President said. That is their objective. And so it is going to be disastrous for everybody.

□ 2115

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman for laying it out so clearly to us. I will yield in just one moment to the gentleman from Utah. But before that, I think I'll be yielding to the gentleman from Texas, because at the beginning of this hour I promised we would bring periodic updates as to how this very important vote is occurring in the State of Massachusetts.

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, in hearing the discussion about what is constitutional and what isn't, the American people are not stupid. In Massachusetts, with over 68 percent of the precincts reporting, the Republican, Brown, has about a hundred thousand votes more—53, moving towards 54 percent, to 46. Massachusetts was not fooled. They looked at the candidates, they looked at what the candidates themselves were saying to the people in Massachusetts, and

Brown made clear he wasn't voting for the health care bill. And he is doing the unthinkable: he's running away with this at this point. It's not even close. It's not even close enough that legal action and all those types of things that have been tried in other places were going to help.

The people have made clear, and I couldn't help but think about a comment of one of our Democratic colleagues down the hall when he said, You know, the further we go, the more difficult it is to pass laws that the American people don't want passed. That is the way it's supposed to be. This body is not supposed to come in here and pass laws that the American people do not want passed. They are not supposed to. That is the way it was designed.

I love what Justice Scalia said not long ago when someone asked, Is the Bill of Rights really what has made this country the greatest country of liberty in history, and he said, No; the Soviet Union had a better Bill of Rights than we do. It was because the Founders did not trust government, and they wanted to make it as difficult as they could to pass a law to put upon the people. So they created not one body, but two bodies, and created it to where either body could cancel out the other body.

And that wasn't good enough. They said, We need an executive. But we don't want a prime minister that is elected by the legislature. Oh, no. We want an executive elected separately, and then he can veto what those bodies do. Even if they don't cancel out each other, he can cancel them out. And that's not good enough. We want a judicial branch that will make it even more difficult to create laws that are crammed down the throats of the American people. He said, That is what actually has done more to preserve the rights of Americans, because it was so difficult to get laws passed.

And what we have seen the last year in here is just a complete usurpation of all of those checks and balances that were provided by the Founders, the complete, actually, elimination of them, as we saw the White House have an auto task force in secret. Cram down laws that were in violation of what were passed here regarding bankruptcy. We had a bankruptcy judge willing to just sign an order that was given to him that was in clear violation of the laws that were passed, and then a Supreme Court that didn't do anything about it. To her credit, Ruth Bader Ginsburg put a 24-hour hold, but then that was withdrawn. And so the Constitution was turned upside down; the laws were turned upside down. And now the American people have had enough. And we are seeing it in Massachusetts.

Who would have thought that a Senator in California would have a close race, much less a Senator in Massachusetts have a close race. And now it's turned out it wasn't even close. You have a Republican in Massachusetts that appears well on his way to being sworn in as the next Senator from Massachusetts. I know that those in power in Massachusetts would not be exceedingly hypocritical and delay swearing Senator Brown in. Surely they would not be that hypocritical. He ought to be sworn in just as quickly as the interim Senator was sworn in to avoid being labeled eternally as the hypocrites of the decade. So I'm sure they won't allow that to happen. They will swear in Senator Brown just as quickly as they can do that. This should spell the end, as we are told, of health care. But, here again, we have people in the House, people in the Senate, that say, Forget what the American people want, forget what the Constitution says.

It should be pointed out, as my friends have been talking about the Constitution, when you lay it out, I don't see how this could be held constitutional. And so we've tried to get a fast track in there to go straight to the Supreme Court. Here and in the Senate they don't want it in there because they know it'll be held unconstitutional.

I appreciate my friend for yielding. But it appears Massachusetts is speaking very loudly.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I appreciate the gentleman from Texas for the update, for your comments; and just as you're all hoping, as we are, that they will move quickly with the appointment, so too we hope that the rest of the Massachusetts congressional delegation will listen to the voters from the State of Massachusetts and do the right thing when the votes come here in the House.

With that, I am very pleased now to turn the floor over to the gentleman from Utah, a gentleman who is on the floor frequently speaking about constitutional issues, the gentleman who helped found the Constitutional Caucus here in the House, the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for this. You know, we are talking about a potential health care bill which, whether it is the Senate or House version, is an enormous expansion of the government. Not only is it an enormous expansion of the government in the cost for it, but it's also an enormous expansion in the amount of power.

Now, both bills are based on the commerce clause of giving them their authority to implement this program. The commerce clause, as we know, over the last 70 years has been so expanded, its shape has basically been lost. But notwithstanding even when the courts have ruled on commerce clause issues, they have two thresholds that must be maintained before something has usually been declared constitutional for them.

One is the activity has to have a significant impact on interstate commerce. I think you can argue this bill will. But the second is the willing participant threshold that must be met, which means the commerce clause has said Congress can do that which will stop an activity; but never, never have they said the commerce clause can be used to forbid inactivity or force individuals to pay a fine not only for doing nothing, but for doing the wrong kind of thing according to the Federal Government.

Now that is the problem this piece of legislation has, because if you can force people to go through this to have a certain kind of health insurance, they can force Americans to do anything at any given time. The Constitution simply says commercial activity in which people choose to engage, but cannot require that they engage in those commercial activities. So it's one of those simple concepts. Let me give an example.

We passed a Cash for Clunkers bill, which gave incentives for people to go and get a certain kind of car. We still allow people that choice and option. If you use that same program with the principles within this health care monstrosity, we don't have a Cash for Clunkers program; we simply have a clunker program, which will then have the government establish a bureaucracy, an organization not only to tell you what to buy, but when to buy it and give you the opportunity to pay for it yourself or be fined by the Federal Government.

Now that is not the way it's supposed to be. In Mack v. The United States, the Supreme Court said, The Constitution protects us against our better instincts because it divides power to help us so that we do not succumb to the temptation of concentrating power in one location as an expedient solution for crisis of the day. And that is indeed what this particular bill would do.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. With that, I will just have an update from the Cloakroom that on the Massachusetts race that the Republican candidate Brown has won and the Democrat has conceded with 53 to 46 percent on the votes. Thank you.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. That news, if I can get the time from the gentleman from New Jersey, is as amazing as the potential harm that this bill could do to all Americans that are there. We've spoken many times on the floor about the concept of the general welfare clause, which was not an expansion of opportunity for Congress. It was supposed to be a limitation. And I did at one time get a call—we spoke once on what was the interpretation of the general welfare clause—I got a call from a lady from Alabama after that, saying it was very eloquent, but these are all the things I like the government doing. And then she gave me a list of stuff.

I said, Ma'am, you basically missed our intent. It was not the government can do these things; it is which level of government should do these things. Not every issue has to rise to the importance that Congress needs to do it,

which would lead to another element of the Constitution that I think this Obama health care-Democrat-Reid-Pelosi, whatever you want to call it, is violating, which is Federalism.

But before I do that, I would yield back to the gentleman from New Jersey to allow him to at least give some comments upon this particular issue, and then if we want to go back into Federalism—you don't have a whole lot of time—I'd be more than happy to pick that up at some later date. But I'd like to yield back to the gentleman first and at least give you a shot at this thing.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. My shot is just to be able to bring this issue to the floor and to the American public and to Members of Congress as well. As my opening comment was the importance of looking at the constitutionality of any legislation, or particularly this legislation—you probably recall this—I was not the first one to bring this issue up. Reporters were actually the ones who brought this up to our leadership here in the House and to the White House as well. I wasn't there when it happened. All I know is what I read in the paper.

But when the issue of the constitutionality, whether it was the mandate provision that we are talking about principally here or the other aspects as well, my understanding from what I read in the press is when the reporter asked Speaker PELOSI about, Did you consider the constitutionality of this legislation, she just laughed it off and said, Of course not. We are not looking at that.

My understanding is, likewise, when that question was posed to the administration, Did you consider the constitutionality of the health care bill, their answer was even more emphatic: no, we didn't look at that at all. That is so profound of an answer, to think that the administration would not look at the constitutionality of a piece of legislation that is going to impact upon personal choices of the health decisions of Americans and one-sixth of the economy as well.

The Founders understood this issue as far as protecting our freedoms and our liberties and that you need a document in order to do so. One of our first Chief Justices, Chief Justice Marshall, famously observed that the powers of the legislature, here in the Congress, are defined and limited, as the gentleman from Georgia just enumerated the 18 powers in it, and that those limits may not be mistaken or forgotten in the Constitution as written.

What he said was that the Constitution—I have a copy over here—was written because we want to put down the limitations on the power of the government to go and exercise authority over the public to a limited factor so the public still has some freedom and liberty at the end of the day. He continued on with that by saying, Should Congress, under the pretext of executing its powers, pass laws for the accomplishments of objects not entrusted—perhaps some of those list of requirements or ideas that this lady who called you from Alabama, was it—that she would like somebody to take care of her for her—should Congress under the pretext of executing its powers pass laws via accomplishment of objects not entrusted to the national government—this is where I yield back to you on the Federalism issue—it would become the painful duty of this tribunal—that meaning the U.S. Supreme Court—should a case requiring such a decision come before it, to say that such an act was not the law of the land.

What does that mean? That means that Congress does not have the ability to say that something is constitutional just because we say it is. Congress does not have the ability of saying that something is necessary and proper just because we say it is. Congress does not have the ability to say something is providing the good and general welfare for the country and therefore is constitutional just because we say it is.

We have a Constitution that is a contract entered into by the people of this country with their government defining what the authority is on the various levels of government, and we here as Members of Congress must live within the terms of that contract. We cannot go outside of the terms of the contract any more than any one of us can go outside the terms of a contract that we entered into when we buy a house or buy a car or enter a contract with some store or what have you.

We are limited by what the Constitution does and says. That is what we are trying to ask that this administration keep in mind and what we are asking the Speaker to keep in mind as well when they bring forth a bill to the floor trying to do something that we all agree needs to be done, and that is to reform the health care delivery system in this country. But we would suggest that it be done in a way that is constitutional and protects the freedoms and liberties of the American people.

And with that, I yield to the gentleman whatever time remains.

□ 2130

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I appreciate you yielding again on this.

Let me just say that there are several concepts that we have talked about here. One, does it meet the threshold of the commerce clause according to the courts? I do not think it does. You have also mentioned several other concepts, that just because Congress says this is a necessary and proper act doesn't necessarily mean it is a necessary and proper act.

It also bothers me that we forget the very essence of federalism upon which this country was founded, which means simply, it is not essential for the Federal Government to have to solve every problem. In fact, sometimes it is better if the Federal Government does not. I have used that example many times before about records. When I was younger, if I wanted a song, I had to buy the entire record. Now there is an iPod that my kid can download the song that I want, too. If I want vanilla, Ben and Jerry's still has 34 flavors from which I can choose.

Every part of our lives is now based on the concept of choice and options for American people, except the government. The Federal Government is still the last bastion of one-size-fits-allism, where we tell people what they ought to be doing rather than allowing them to have choices and options. I say this because some people said, Well, if we don't do this, we have nothing. That is not true. States are moving forward. My State already has implemented a process that gives people 66 options based on the demographics of my State, and everything we are doing in Utah is stopped dead. If this Federal bill passes, they succeed, they now dictate everything that will happen.

States are different. Massachusetts has a program they seem to like. It would not work in Utah. The demographics of Utah would not allow our program to be successful in Massachusetts. But that is why there is the brilliance of federalism, so there can be 50 different innovative ideas and people have the chance to experiment and try and prove and find something that works for their particular area. In a nutshell, that is a very brief problem. This destroys the concept of federalism.

I will yield back to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I am trying to think of the quote. You can try to help me out here. ''States were created as the——''

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. ''Laboratory of democracy.''

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. ''—laboratory of democracy'' so all of those experiments could go on. Instead, what we have are the States becoming the guinea pigs for the democracy because the States are being controlled by the Federal Government in a way that is not the way the American public would like to see it.

So I thank the gentleman from Utah for, once again, joining us on the floor in an eloquent and educational format, as you always do. I appreciate that in a commonsense way that we can all understand it as well.

YEAR IN REVIEW

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURPHY of New York). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I apologize for the delay in getting down here to answer the call of the gavel.

There are some distractions taking place around America as we speak. A lot of America has been transfixed by

what has happened this year. I could go back and recap some of the events, but we pretty well know what they are: $700 billion in TARP spending. We've watched three large investment banks be nationalized by the Federal Government. We've watched AIG be nationalized, taken over by the Federal Government. We've watched Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac be taken over by the Federal Government and then by an Executive order right before Christmas, have them open up the debt ceiling on Fannie and Freddie to where every American is a guarantor of the national debt, which could be $5.5 trillion of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. We watched negotiations take place behind the scenes that told the bankruptcy court how to push our automakers through there, and both of them were nationalized, taken over by the Federal Government. Then we watched the $787 billion economic stimulus plan be passed in an urgency that hasn't produced a product and a resolve, except a debt that is going to drag down the economy for the American people. Then behind that, out of this House came hurry up and rush cap-and-trade, cap-and-tax. Pass it. It passed out of the House, and it went over there on the docket of the Senate.

The American people began to realize what was happening. They couldn't believe it. They didn't think, first, the $700 billion TARP was really real. Somehow they trusted that we knew what we were doing here, as a majority. The majority knew what they were doing. So they sat back, and something else happened, and something else happened. That's the list that I have given you, Mr. Speaker.

The American people have risen up. In the month of August, they filled up town hall meetings all across America over and over again. Hundreds and thousands of people came out so that their voice could be heard. Some of them stayed up all night long just to craft their question and do the research so that if they got a chance to ask a Member a question—you could tell there was a tremendous amount of American intensity going on all across America.

Into September and after Labor Day, we came back here and the grind began. The effort to pass a national health care act began. The socialized medicine effort wound up again, and they began pushing this through, Mr. Speaker. Speaker PELOSI's agenda, HARRY REID's agenda, and President Obama's agenda, the idea of nationalizing proud, private sector companies and taking over one-third of the private sector profits and doing so in a little more than a year in the United States.

Then taxing all of our energy and putting restrictions on America's economy, where the end result is to send jobs to India and jobs to China. The American people watched that, and they thought, Well, surely these people know what they're doing. But the more mistakes they saw and the list of misguided liberal ideas that had been passed out of the House and sent to the Senate—and some passed out of the Senate—was stacking up higher and higher and higher, Mr. Speaker. And the American people, in groups, incrementally began to realize that they knew better than the people that were in charge of Congress, and they lost their trust and their faith in the good judgment of the people that they elected in this constitutional Republic, especially when they saw that there was a determination on the part of the President of the United States, the Speaker of the House and the majority leader of the United States Senate to nationalize our bodies, to take over the management and the control of the most personal and private thing we have, that is this thing inside our skin, our bodies, and the Federal Government deciding what we were going to have for insurance and who was going to pay for it and what the premiums would be and what kind of mandates would be on it and what kind the coverage would be and the decisions that we would have.

And then on top of that, an effort to start to tax, oh, let's say, trans fats or foods that they think we shouldn't eat, or sin taxes so that they could manage our lives, regulate everything that we do, nationalize and take over the control of our very private bodies and then tell us what we can eat and probably when we can sleep. It's way, way too much government intrusion on a proud and independent people.

So when we looked across America, we looked around for, ''from whence cometh our help?'' Well, we had help from all over America. The Tea Party Patriots came up from all over America, and they had huge rallies. They came to this Capitol on 9/12, and they filled this city up with people with American flags and yellow ''Don't Tread on Me'' flags, and they cried out for relief from the overspending that's been taking place. They held up their Constitutions, and tears went down the cheeks of men and women who love this country. It happened all over, in every State, and it really packed people in here in Washington, D.C.

Still their hearts were hardened, and still they were determined to force socialized medicine down the throats of the American people. And then more people came to this Capitol, and as they came closer to a vote on health care here in the House of Representatives, a call went out one day, and 3½ days later somewhere between 10,000 and 50,000 Americans showed up here in the United States Capitol so their voices could be heard. They filled up over here on the west side of the Capitol and packed people out there with their American flags and their yellow ''Don't Tread on Me'' flags. They cried out for relief from this oppressive government that was taking their liberties away and my liberties away.

And still their hearts were hardened, Mr. Speaker. Two days later, we called people back to town. Over here on this side of the Capitol, thousands came again, and again they pleaded with the legislature and the Congress here, Give us some relief. We just want fiscal responsibility. We want our liberties. They told us, We're not Europeans. We're Americans. We're a different people. We didn't come here for dependency. A lot of people came here under the New Hampshire motto, ''Live free or die'' in the United States of America, have a chance to succeed, take the risk of failure, take your own personal responsibilities. All that they asked for was a chance to succeed, and that was taken away, taken away by a President of the United States, a Speaker of the House, and a majority leader in the United States Senate, three people.

The American people began to understand that when the House bill passed here by a vote of 220–215, that if three people changed their minds, that bill goes down in defeat on the House floor, and the rest of that saga doesn't happen, Mr. Speaker. But it went over to the Senate where they ground it out and churned it out and cut deals in back rooms. There are no longer smoke-filled rooms, I don't think. At least there are not on the House side, because by order of the Speaker, that's another freedom that you lost. And if you want to eat an omelet over here in the cafeteria, it shall be made out of the eggs of a free-range hen. Don't forget that, Mr. Speaker. That's another liberty that we've lost.

So the health care bill went to the Senate, and they cut deals. And we heard things like, Louisiana Purchase II. How do you buy off the Senator in Louisiana? And then we heard things like the Florida purchase of the Senator down there so they could be exempted from losing their Medicare Advantage. Then we saw the ''cornhusker kickback,'' Senator NELSON. I can say that now. We changed the rule. Why? Because he lost the amendment, which was the pro-life amendment, the Stupak amendment, in the Senate by a vote of 45–54, so crafted some new language that would still leave the United States Government in the business of brokering abortions through mandated health insurance premiums and got a special exemption for Medicaid increases in Nebraska, the ''cornhusker kickback.''

The American people saw this with revulsion, and still they came forward and produced 60 votes to end the filibuster in the Senate on Christmas Eve, Mr. Speaker. And about that time, I had a conversation with my senior Senator in Iowa, Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY, who is engaged in this debate in a serious way with the full intention of trying to find the best policy that could be put together in the legislative body, but he had to walk away from it at a point because they didn't need his vote. They were going to go for the most liberal, the most left-wing, the most leaning into socialism policy that they could pass, and it wasn't going to be

with Republican votes. So that's what they did. They put the votes together to end the filibuster, and the deal was made on the 23rd of December. The vote for the end of the filibuster came up on the morning of the 24th, Christmas Eve morning.

I talked to my senior Senator, and I said, What can we do now, Senator? How do we kill this bill? And he said, We have to pray, and we have to pray for a victory in Massachusetts in the special election in the United States Senate. Mr. Speaker, you know, that didn't seem very plausible at the time. I started to take a look at this, and I followed the Senator's advice. I put a little work in up there myself. I just came back from Massachusetts a few hours ago. A few minutes ago they've announced that Martha Coakley has conceded to Scott Brown.

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you, there was a shot heard around the world up there in Lexington 200-plus years ago. There is another shot heard around the world tonight. In fact, it's the Scott heard around the world tonight, and it's the American people rejecting socialized medicine. It's the American people rejecting overspending and fiscal irresponsibility and living for the now and passing out the government dole and making sure that nobody has to worry about anything except how their children and grandchildren are going to pay this massive debt that's been created in the trillions of dollars.

□ 2145

Voting here on the floor to increase the national debt by smaller increments, $300 billion, and next time it will be a big old chunk, and there is no restraint whatsoever in spending. The Blue Dogs are more groundhogs. They have gone underground, Mr. Speaker. They used to come down here and harangue Republicans about spending too much money because we would have a little deficit at the end of the year. Now, I have always been for a balanced budget, and I will vote to balance it every time I get the chance. But the Blue Dogs demagogued Republicans for a long time. Now they are groundhogs. They went out and saw their shadow and they went underground because the people on their side of the aisle are spending money irresponsibly, like crazy.

How could you possibly take away, spend enough money and take away enough liberty that the three-and-a-half to one Democrats to Republicans in Massachusetts would elect a Republican to come down to the United States Senate and vote against cloture so that the Harry Reid bill could be killed in the Senate? How could you ever spend that much money? I didn't believe it was possible, Mr. Speaker.

Some would say a miracle has taken place tonight, and I wouldn't disagree with that. I believe there has been intervention. And I am grateful for it. It is what I asked for and what I worked for.

I spent 3 days up there and experienced a lot of good people in Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to say into the RECORD that working with the very liberal agenda of the Massachusetts delegation doesn't always give a person the most positive attitude about the people that they represent. I come from Iowa, where we have the privilege of making a recommendation to America on who we think should be the next President of the United States. We take it seriously, and we have a lot to say about it, and we are grateful for that privilege and that honor, but it is only a recommendation, Mr. Speaker.

Tonight, today and tonight the people of Massachusetts not only made a recommendation, they made a decision, not just for the people of Massachusetts, they made a decision for the United States of America. And that decision is no socialized medicine in this country. Keep our liberty. Get the budget under control. Let people take care of themselves and each other. The government is not a nanny. That is the message that comes from the place where liberty began.

Yesterday I was standing at Plymouth Rock. Three hundred and ninety years ago the Pilgrims landed there. And here we are, 390 years later, Massachusetts, of all improbable places, has brought us back to that rock of liberty. I could not be happier tonight. This is all I could ask for. I am looking forward now to the battle we have ahead to preserve the liberty that we have left and restore some of that we have lost.

I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS).

Mrs. LUMMIS. I thank the gentleman from Iowa. I think it is a tribute to you that over these many months of the last year, you have been stalwart in your support of the liberties of this country and the first principles of this country. The gentleman from New York (Mr. KING) was so committed to the American people and the vote on health care that he missed his own son's wedding because the vote was taken on a Saturday, and we needed every single vote, not knowing if it would go our way or the vote of socialized medicine. And this gentleman sacrificed seeing his middle child's wedding in order to cast his vote for the American people that day. I applaud you for going up and participating in Massachusetts' election observing.

I would like to ask the gentleman before I begin to discuss budget issues. Did you talk to people in Massachusetts today and yesterday? What was on their mind? What was guiding their decisions in deciding to make a change in party after that seat had been held by Democrats since 1953. What was on their mind in casting their ballots today?

Mr. KING of Iowa. Some would say it is all about health care and socialized medicine. In fact, quite a few did say that.

But if you listened a little more closely, they are also telling people on our side of the aisle, Don't you spend too much money, either. We are tired of you being irresponsible with our tax dollars and with our children and grandchildren's future. That is definitely a core in the center of this. And underneath it is that list of things that I gave at the beginning: The TARP funding, the stimulus plan, the nationalization of eight formerly private entities. They see all of that spending, and they see government trying to manage everything. And as liberal as Massachusetts is, they said, Enough.

The first version of it is, and some have said it is all about health care. And for them it was. For others it was health care and too much spending. For others, it was health care, too much spending, and the government injecting themselves in and taking over private businesses. They don't want to have a social democracy here in the United States. They understand we are not Europe. I mean when the first people arrived here in the United States it was down at Jamestown in 1607. And then 1620, the Pilgrims landed up at Plymouth Rock. They came for freedom and liberty, for religious freedom and economic freedom. I think it is the sweetest of symmetry in history to think that the Mayflower landed at Plymouth Rock in 1620, and 390 years later in 2010, their descendants in Massachusetts said, We are going to send you somebody to defend our freedom for America.

I was asking for reinforcements. We are outmanned and we are outgunned. We are fighting a scrappy fight. We need reinforcements, and we get some reinforcements tonight.

Mrs. LUMMIS. The father of the Massachusetts Constitution, John Adams, died 50 years to the day that the Declaration of Independence was signed. And as he died, he said ''Jefferson lives.'' And ironically, Thomas Jefferson died that very same day, 50 years to the day after the Declaration of Independence was signed. These are people whose founding principles and founding beliefs carried them until the day they died. Although during the years they were political rivals, they respected and admired each other so much because of the work they had both done to help found this country, that they wanted to nurture it and guide it and see that it survived.

I believe tonight we are seeing that same nurturing and guidance and seeing the founding principles verified in Massachusetts. So it is indeed an exciting day for our country.

Among the things that you mentioned that the people of Massachusetts chose to be concerned about in casting their ballots today is the deficit. I would like to take a minute to show you a chart that explains how this deficit has grown over the last year and that the debt that our majority party here in Congress today says they inherited actually has grown to

unprecedented levels while they were in control. When they espouse the fact that during the Clinton years, the deficit was rejected and that there were budget surpluses, it actually happened when there was a Republican Congress.

But the gentleman from Iowa has given me the opportunity to bring this chart and show it to you. The Federal deficit tripled in one fiscal year as tax revenues fell and Congress pumped out large sums to stabilize financial institutions and stimulate the economy. This top line shows you where the Federal budget deficit was. Well, that is neutral. That is neutral ground. That is a balanced budget. Down here on this dotted line is the debt that the majority party inherited 1 year ago, a $459 billion budget deficit. That is the difference in money collected from the taxpayers of this country and the money spent during that year.

Now look at 2009. Below this dotted line is the amount of deficit spending that has occurred during the last year. And as the gentleman from Iowa just went through, these are the elements that have stepped that deficit to unprecedented levels: $950 billion increase from 2008, and our deficit is $1.4 trillion, almost a trillion dollars more than the Democrats inherited 1 year ago, and here is how it goes. First of all, lower tax receipts due to the recession, something that they didn't factor in. Then the stimulus money, which at $787 billion was about twice what the Republicans proposed to spend on stimulus, and our bill would have created twice as many jobs. And in fact the Democrats' bill that they said would keep unemployment below 8 percent ended up blossoming into double digit unemployment.

That is what people are worried about. They are worried about whether they will have a job tomorrow, and whether their children will have a job and whether they will be able to pay their bills and whether they will default on their mortgage. And on top of that, whether their health care benefits will be taxed or whether they will be penalized because the government hasn't approved of the health care plan they have now. But I digress.

Now let's go on to the bailouts for financial institutions and auto industries, taking it to even lower levels. Bailouts for Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, an area where the government in its wisdom decided that people who may not financially qualify for loans to own a home should have them, and this is the resultant deficit. And finally, unemployment benefits due to the recession. Plus you add other spending and here we are, $1.4 trillion in deficit spending in addition to the debt that has accumulated over the years.

Now if the gentleman from Iowa would indulge one more chart. When you hear the term structural deficit, this is the structural deficit, the difference between spending and taxes. This chart runs from the 1970s through 2019. And if you look, this dotted line is today. Look at how the gap between spending and taxes grows and separates going forward, and here is where we are today at a massive point in terms of the difference between spending and taxes.

But over the years, regardless of who was President, regardless of who was in Congress, we didn't have those abrupt and wild and dramatic swings. In fact, when the Republicans controlled Congress under a Democrat President, you actually had tax receipts higher than spending. These are the years that the gentleman from Iowa talked about, about which he is most proud and about which I am most proud as a person who was observing as a non-Member of Congress during those years.

This chart here shows you where spending went over the last period of time, 1969 to 2008. This very high number for defense, when over 40 percent of the Federal budget was going to defense, was at the height of the Vietnam War. Look at its abrupt decline after the Vietnam War into the 1970s, then back up for a little bounce during the period of the 1980s while we were ending the Cold War, and then you see it declined after the fall of the Berlin Wall, and this is the area of the so-called peace dividend, and then back up only slightly during the war after 9/11.

But the real kicker on this chart is the bottom line, the red line, Medicare and Medicaid, because before we were a welfare state, the amount of the Federal budget and in terms of the use of the Federal budget, only about 5 percent went to entitlement programs, Medicare and Medicaid. That number has been dramatically increasing with no end in sight because people of your and my age are going to move into retirement, meaning that Medicare will be more expensive. There will be more of us on it, and Medicaid benefits have increased over time.

Consequently, this is going to be eating more and more of our budget. Nondefense discretionary spending is actually down, and Social Security, more level than you would think at about 20 percent of the Federal budget. But there again, that number is going to go up unless we get a handle on entitlements. So these are the areas with which we need to grapple. These are the areas which I believe were on the minds of Americans in Massachusetts as they went to the polls today.

□ 2200

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentlelady from Wyoming for the interesting charts. I think it's important for us to refresh ourselves with these trends consistently. They have changed dramatically under this administration.

I think the American people now realize that Republicans in the majority disappeared here in November of 2006, and Democrats have been in control of this Congress ever since then. In the previous years, they all said that if you would just let them have control of this Congress, things would be better. Give us the majority, they said over and over again. The 30-something Group, which now I think is in the 40-somethings, just consistently, night after night, made the same case: the economy would be a lot better off if you had Democrats in charge.

Well, they came into control in November of 2006 and immediately what we saw was a significant decline in industrial investment. That was the first indicator of what was happening with our economy, and it happened this way: CHARLIE RANGEL became the likely, and not yet formally named, but he did become the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. And he went on the talk show circuit all over America; he was a very busy guy. And the pundits were asking Chairman RANGEL, Which one of these Bush tax cuts don't you like, or do you like them all? And CHARLIE would never be able to say that he liked any of them, but he never really answered back on which ones he didn't like.

But because of his answers and the process of elimination, from November through February it became clear to the investors in America that there wasn't any Bush tax cut that CHARLIE RANGEL liked and that he liked spending better, and he was going to do what he could do to let them expire so that the government could collect more money so they could start more programs and grow government spending.

Investment knew that; business figured it out. And as they did, the capital investment went down; the industrial investment went down almost in direct proportion to the appearances of CHARLIE RANGEL on national TV. Because capital is always smart money—it wouldn't be capital if it weren't smart—and so if the cost of investing in a business goes higher because there's a tax increase, what do you do? You invest less in business because the return isn't as likely or the margin isn't as good.

So when America and the world were promised that the Bush tax cuts were going to be, let me just say that they would say it this way, ''allowed to expire,'' which is willfully kill them and raise taxes, industrial investment dropped off. When industrial investment dropped off, of course when you invest in capital investment, you get a return in productivity. If you stop investing in industrial investment, then you start losing efficiencies.

There was a professor—actually, he was a professor that served underneath Lenin in Russia, his name was Professor Khodnev. He did a study, it's called the Khodnev study. Nobody really knew about this study until MIT University did a computer study some 25-or-so years ago analyzing what happened with capital investment and returns and how the cycles of the economy went. Somebody remembered that they read this old study from Professor

Khodnev, a Russian who was commissioned by Lenin to prove that capitalism would be self-defeating and expire.

So he went through their data and he showed that there was a decline, that unemployment would go up and gross receipts would go down, profits would go down and capital investment would go down. He showed a cycle that showed that when the capitalism of the economy peaked out, it would then drop back down over the course of about 26 years. That showed capitalism's decline. Then it would go back up again to peak out again in another 26 years. It's a 52-year cycle, Professor Khodnev's 52-year cycle.

And so he was commissioned to prove capitalism was self-defeating, but he found out that, well, it defeats itself for a while, but then when you get down to the bottom, entrepreneurs start to come up with good ideas. They all figure out what they're going to do, and they invest in research and development. They implement new ideas, new ideas improve technology, technology improves productivity, improved productivity improves profitability. And when you're down at the bottom of this trough where you're making these investments, your productivity then goes up because of the capital investment at the trough. And as it goes up, your profits go up.

Then you get up there 26 years later to the peak and you realize, this is pretty good, I'm making money, I think I'll coast awhile. They stop making capital investments like they stopped under the beginning of the Rangel term and then your productivity drops off. And you don't realize it for a while. You're not quite in a free fall, but you're coasting. I remember seeing a poster on a fellow's wall years ago of a little kid sitting on a tricycle. He's got his hands on the handlebar and his hair is flying a little bit, he's got his feet off the pedal and a great big grin on his face. He's having fun, but the bottom of the poster says, If you're coasting, you're going downhill.

And we went downhill, Mr. Speaker. We went downhill because taxes were too high and because the wrong message got sent to capital investment, apparently because of Khodnev's theory that was matched by the computer study at MIT, by the way, and you can pick your cycles within the cycles too.

But it's the nature of capitalism to invest money, improve your productivity, and then have that equipment get old. Then you can't compete so much anymore and your productivity then diminishes in the face of this competition. You still get profits because you've got the return back on your capital investment and you own your equipment, but if the profits get narrower and narrower and the harder it is to get that competitive production out of the older equipment, then you peak out and you start to slide. And then you think, what are we going to do now? Well, let's go invent some things. Let's get our productivity back, and let's compete with the rest of the world.

That's what needs to happen, but it has to happen in a competitive environment, Mr. Speaker. It needs to happen with low regulations and low taxation. And you can't be punishing business. And we can't have a President that is demagoging the capital investment in America and telling the bankers that they're greedy. Bankers will pull back.

I think this is a lesson out of Franklin Delano Roosevelt: he went around and punished capital throughout the thirties. And then he had his New Deal that he said was a good deal; I said it was a horrible deal. The President said it would have been a better deal only FDR didn't spend enough money. Well, now we're finding out what America thinks of the FDR-New Deal-President-on-steroids Obama who went to Copenhagen twice and went 0 for 2. He wanted to get the World's Fair in Chicago; that was a goose egg. Then he went to Copenhagen to get a deal for cap-and-trade. He got a fig leaf, but not a deal. So that's 0 for 2 in Copenhagen.

Then he went to Virginia to try to win the governorship down there, about three stops across the river. Well, we've got Governor McDonnell. Then he went to New Jersey to save that for the very rich and, as of yesterday, former-Governor Corzine. We have Governor Chris Christie. Then he went to Massachusetts, a place where you would never have to call the President of the United States to Massachusetts for reinforcements, never. No one could imagine a scenario like that and have the President's political capital on the line. He has a situation where he couldn't win because the race was already too close.

But this is worse than taking a black eye, this is a thumping. This is a real thumping. It is a movement along the east coast. And if it can move like this on the east coast, it can really move across the rest of the country as a dynamic sea change.

The American people reject some other things, as I said earlier. The most personal thing you have is your body. And the government comes in and nationalizes General Motors; that's like nationalizing the Dallas Cowboys. But your body? The most private thing you have, to have the government decide they're going to manage it and tell you what you're going to pay for insurance and set up a health choices administration czar to write the rules after the fact? To pass legislation that would appoint someone to have power over life and death, someone to be appointed later—maybe by, let me see, and confirmed by some Senators to be elected later. Well, they have gone way too far. And the wisdom of the Founding Fathers has been, I think, ratified and established.

While I'm here talking about how things have to change, Mr. Speaker, I, not by accident, have an acorn here in my pocket. We know what ACORN has been doing to try to redirect America's destiny. They have admitted to over 400,000 fraudulent voter registration forms. They have said that they've gone to swing States and turned up their organization. They said they're a 501(3)(C), not-for-profit, nonpartisan organization.

I went down to their headquarters at 2609 Canal Street in New Orleans. And there, where they run most of their operations out of, there was a huge ''Obama for President'' sign right smack dab in the front window of the national headquarters of not-for-profit, tax exempt, 501(C)(3) ACORN campaigning for the President of the United States. He was elected about 8 months earlier, 9 months earlier; they still had a sign in the window. The President wrote the book ''The Audacity of Hope.'' This is a lot of audacity to see what ACORN is doing. They've got to be pulled out by the roots, Mr. Speaker.

That is the next piece that comes along. The American people have to step up and make sure that our elections are legitimate, that they're not stolen, that every American citizen registered to vote that counts a ballot has their vote counted. But the rest of those people don't have any business voting, and once is enough. And the threats that came and the stories that we've heard—we will pick up more about Massachusetts; but I suspect that they're not going to look very far because on a victory you don't go examine very deeply.

□ 2210

Yet, in the close races, those that can scramble things and those that can produce fraudulent voter registration forms, those corrupt criminal enterprises will take and steal our liberty and our freedom, and I think we've seen it happen in several States. Thank God it didn't happen in Massachusetts tonight.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Wyoming.

Mrs. LUMMIS. I have a couple more questions for you.

We look at the fact that, in the health care bill, the Senator from Nebraska sought an exemption from the impacts of Medicaid expenditures in his State and at the fact that the Amish sought an exemption because their religious freedom requires them not to be mandated to have a certain health insurance program placed upon them. There were other exemptions. The unions went to the White House recently because they wanted to be exempted from the Cadillac insurance plan tax that was going to help pay for the Senate bill to create socialized medicine.

Then there was the citizen who asked: If this is such a great bill, why do so many people need exemptions? Could that be part of the reason, the very simple question: If this is such a great bill, why does everybody want to

be exempted from it? Could that have anything to do with tonight's election results in Massachusetts?

I yield back.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentlelady.

I think there are lots of things that had to do with the election in Massachusetts tonight. I think a lot of it was that the American people are fed up and that they've had enough. You know, people will rise to their responsibility. I don't know how many times I've seen a town that needs a mayor, a small town, but nobody wants to bother. Somebody else can do that. If the wrong person steps forward and says, Well, I'll be mayor, well, we've got a little syndrome—and I won't say the person's name—but it's a syndrome that says, if somebody who's going to do a lousy job steps up, somebody who'll do a good job will step up to protect them from the damage that will be caused. I think that's part of what happened in Massachusetts. I think, when this announcement was made that the Coakley candidate would support the bill, whatever it was that came out behind closed doors, that that really mobilized a lot of people.

We need to be thinking about what actually has happened here. In this House, a bill was passed, and there were amendments that were offered in committee, but there wasn't much of a process here. I offered something like 13 amendments in the Rules Committee at 1:30 in the morning, and there was nobody there to hear that. It's like if a tree falls in the forest. The Rules Committee sat there and chastised me for wasting their time for asking them if they'd give me permission to come down here to the floor and argue for the liberty of the American people. They had the audacity to chastise me for using up paper. It was a waste of paper to print these amendments because, surely, I should have known that Speaker PELOSI wasn't going to let these amendments come to the floor. So what was the point of putting them on record?

My advice to them was take that 2,000-page bill and put the paper back in the tree. The world would have been a lot better off if we'd had a few more trees and a few less 2,000- or now 4,000-page bills.

I think something else we need to talk about, Mr. Speaker, is they're not going to break the filibuster in the United States Senate on this bill anymore. So what kind of shenanigans do we have to guard against?

Are they going to delay the certification of the votes in Massachusetts to try to delay the swear-in of Senator-elect Scott Brown? I like the sound of that. I haven't said that before. Senator-elect Scott Brown. Are they going to delay that? Are they going to try to keep him off the floor?

Are they going to try to push a bill through with the 60 votes they have and defy the will of the American people?

Is Speaker PELOSI going to try to take the Senate version of the bill now, which is something that the House has lined up to reject, and bring it to the floor of the House before people figure out what's going on and send it to the President even though the American people have not just at every opportunity—and the election today was an opportunity today for the voices of the people in Massachusetts and America to be heard. Thank you, Massachusetts. Not only that, the people have stepped up to do everything they can, and they have created opportunities that their voices be heard, and I say still their hearts are hardened.

If they circumvent the will of the American people, if there's a bill from the Senate that gets brought to the floor and sent to the President because everybody over here just sucks it up and decides they're going to go ahead and lose those seats, there will be holy thunder to pay in the ballot box in November. I pray the streets will be peaceful until then, and I'm not sure they will be, Mr. Speaker.

This is a rejection. This is a referendum on socialized medicine in Massachusetts today. This is President Obama's socialized medicine agenda rejected in Massachusetts. This is heavy-handed legislation and backroom dealing rejected in Massachusetts. This is special deals for different States, exemptions, carve-outs for Florida, Louisiana and Nebraska and others rejected by the people in Massachusetts. No secret deals. That's all rejected by people in Massachusetts.

A situation that we have now is—and I said this going into the election a year ago November—excuse me. Well, it was last November actually. Going into the election, I said, If you elect Barack Obama as President of the United States and if you return majorities to the House of Representatives for Democrats and to the United States Senate—and I didn't anticipate it was going to be 60. I think, if you went back and did a recount in Minnesota, it wouldn't have been 60, but that's what it turned out to be—I predicted then that those majorities and a President Obama, the three of them—President Obama, Speaker PELOSI, and HARRY REID—could go in a phone booth and dictate to America what they wanted to do to this country. I put that in an op-ed here a couple of days ago, or at least in a press release, because I wanted to make sure it was down in print.

There is no formal function that has taken place in the House of Representatives all year long or in the United States Senate all year long that controls the negotiations on the part of the ruling troika in America—Obama, PELOSI, and REID. They plan to and strategize to draft a whole new bill, one that's not guided by anything except their judgment on whether they can get the votes to pass it and bring it directly to the floor of the House of Representatives—bypass the committee process, not allow any amendments, just write a draconian bill like King George would write. You know, he vetoed the will of the colonists, and now the colonists have vetoed the will of the President today.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. KING of Iowa. I yield.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Interestingly, over the August recess, when we were all at home having town hall meetings and the people had their opportunities to step forward and express their opinions about this bill, one of the leaders of the majority party in the Senate was quoted as saying, It's getting harder and harder to pass legislation that the American people don't want.

So they even acknowledge that the American people don't want this. They even acknowledge that it is the judgment of the leadership of the Democratic Party that this is good for the American people whether the American people know it or not.

That's what King George was doing. King George was deciding that he knew what was best for the American colonies whether they knew it or not, but they rose up, and they told King George otherwise—that they knew what was best for them, and they formed a more perfect union.

That's what, in part, tonight's election was about. That's what the elections and the discussions may be about throughout this calendar year unless there is some recognition by the majority party and by our President that ''change'' means moving more towards the center.

You and I want what's best for our country. We don't want to stand up here and bash the other party. We want to work with them to come up with solutions for our country. I come from a State where we have frequently a boom-and-bust economy. I served in the Wyoming Legislature when we were in boom years and when we were in bust years. We know how to ramp up an economy, and we know how to ramp a government down in response to a declined economy. We could work with a President and with a majority party now if they were willing to do so; but as you and I know, we've seen no indication that they're willing to do so, and you expressed an example of it.

It was the night that you were there at 1:30 a.m. in the Rules Committee to try and get an amendment. I had three amendments to that bill. I was there an hour before you were, and I was told that there were going to be two amendments allowed on the floor tomorrow to that 2,000-page bill. One would be Minority Leader JOHN BOEHNER's substitute bill, which they already knew was going to go down and that it would get the votes of all of the members of the Republican Party and none of the members of the Democrat Party. That was one of the amendments.

□ 2220

The other one was the Stupak amendment, because that was demanded by of course every Republican

and enough Democrats that they had to allow it to go to the floor in order to get that bill passed. But every other bill that was sponsored in good faith by Democrats and Republicans alike, rank-and-file Democrats and Republicans, were rejected, was not allowed to go to the floor and in fact was essentially blown off in the Rules Committee.

That is not government of the people. That is government the way that King George ran it. That is government that the people tonight rejected in Massachusetts.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentlelady. This is an exhilarating day for a lot of reasons, and many of us have poured our hearts and souls into this. I have argued that even when you are surrounded and there isn't hope, it is no time to give up because you never know when the cavalry is going to come over the hill. Well, they came over the hill in Massachusetts today.

There was a fellow that gave up, though, and I think it is important to put this into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the Washington Times]

BOOKIE PAYS OFF EARLY, PREDICTS BROWN WIN

(By Joseph Curl)

BOSTON On Monday, an Irish bookie paid off bettors who had wagered that state Sen. Scott Brown, a conservative Republican, would win the special election for the Massachusetts U.S. Senate seat held for nearly 50 years by liberal Democratic icon Edward M. Kennedy.

''Enough is enough. It seems that Senator Brown just has to get out of bed tomorrow to win convincingly. As far as we're concerned, this race is well and truly over,'' said Paddy Power, Ireland's largest bookmaker, 24 hours before the actual election.

Before shutting down the betting, Mr. Brown had gone from 5–4 odds to 1–5 (meaning if a bettor put down $5, they only stood to make $1 if Mr. Brown wins). The odds against his opponent—Democrat Martha Coakley, the state's attorney general—soared from 4–7 to win to 3–1 to lose.

''Paddy Power has also cut the odds on the Republicans winning the 2012 presidential election from 11–10 to evens and have installed Senator Scott Brown at odds of 20–1 to win the Republican presidential nomination in 2012,'' the bookmaker said.

Mr. Brown, Mrs. Coakley and Joseph Kennedy, a Libertarian who is running as an independent, entered the final day of campaigning before Tuesday's special election to fill the U.S. Senate seat left empty by the death of Edward M. Kennedy.

The Irish bookie also paid off early on the 2008 presidential election. About a week before Election Day, Mr. Power paid out more than $1 million to all bettors who wagered on then-Sen. Barack Obama, saying Sen. John McCain was too far behind in the polls to win.

One fellow gave up, and his name is Paddy Power. He is the lead bookie from Ireland. This is in the Washington Times printed today, so you can guess he capitulated sometime in the night, and it made the Washington Times. Paddy Power started to pay out the bets to the people that bet that Brown would be elected over Coakley today. And he said the polls were far enough apart that he didn't need to wait until the polls closed and they counted the votes. It was over. So Paddy paid out somewhere around—here we go. Mr. Brown had gone from 5–4 odds to 1–5. Meaning that if you bet $5 that he would win, you would pay out $1. And so Coakley went from 4–7 odds to 3–1.

Now, the people from Nevada would understand all that instinctively, but I believe that, if I read this right, Mr. Power paid out more than $1 million to all betters who wagered on the Obama race. So he paid out the bets. He just decided that he didn't need to wait for the polls to be counted. He gave up, but he predicted it right.

From my view, Mr. Speaker, I think when we have a public policy that is completely wrong, that violates the Constitution and it violates the spirit of the American people, in fact diminishes and damages, the American people should never give up, should never give up until it is all over. Then, you figure out how to start it all over again.

I had a poster in my construction company office for years, and I just found it as I cleaned out my office over the Christmas break and I was snowed in. It was of this shore bird, a tall, long-legged bird, and he was swallowing a frog. And the frog is going down the throat of this bird, but the frog has his arms out and he is holding that bird by the throat. He is not going to be let up, or if he does he will be swallowed. The message is, Never give up.

We didn't give up in this House. A lot of us stood and we fought. And we have got a lot of battles ahead of us, but the cavalry has arrived, we have got reinforcements. And now, there are people who will not be sleeping tonight trying to figure out how to pass a bill the American people don't want.

I think that this time in history, this vote and this election and this special election in Massachusetts represents the most significant congressional race in my lifetime and maybe in the history of the United States. Time will tell. Time will tell on that. But I am exhilarated to see the spirit of freedom and liberty that has emerged in a place where we didn't see a lot of that in the past.

I yield to the gentlelady, and then I will come back with any closing comments.

Mrs. LUMMIS. I thank the gentleman from Iowa. And I look forward to the day when you are in the majority party, next year on this floor, and I am in the majority party, God willing, and that we can work together with President Obama to solve the problems of this country; that we can go back as happened in the 1990s, where you had a member of the Democratic party as President and a Republican Congress, and they worked together to balance the budget.

That is what the American people, I believe, are yearning for. That is what I am yearning for. And I look forward to working with the President in a way that we can balance the budget and bring the American people back to have faith and confidence in its government because we return to founding principles.

You know, there is an old saying: When all else fails, read the directions. The Constitution of the United States is the directions. And at a time like this, when we have record deficits, when we have soaring U.S. interest payments like you see on this chart, when we have Americans concerned about their health care, about their jobs, about the ability to earn an income, when people are concerned about the growth in China and what they see in some cases as the decline in jobs in the United States, that is when you return to founding principles.

Let's look at our Constitution more often. Let's return with our President next year, as a majority party, and I hopefully will be serving with you in the majority party at that time, and get back to those founding principles. Read the directions, what made America great, and restore the confidence of the American people in this institution and in our ability to self-govern.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentlelady for joining me tonight in this Special Order.

You have heard, Mr. Speaker, my enthusiasm to put an end to this socialized medicine bill. You haven't heard what has been refreshed, at least, although I am confident you have heard, the things that the Republicans would like to do.

Republicans have introduced at least 42 different health care bills here in this Congress. We have passed good pieces of legislation in the past when we were in the majority and sent them over to the Senate, where the trial lawyers blocked any reform. And one of those is to reform lawsuit abuse in medical malpractice.

The number that I get from the health insurance underwriters is 8.5 percent of all our health care costs is wrapped up in lawsuit abuse—the litigation, the defensive medicine, and the premiums that are unnecessary because of the lawsuit abuse. That 8.5 percent represents $203 billion a year going out unnecessarily wasted out of health care.

This 4,000-page bill. And we don't know how many pages it is now. I don't know if they are back there now writing more pages, or if they are burning up pages trying to balance out their carbon footprint. But in this 4,000-some page bill, there is not anything in there that does one single thing to reduce one penny in unnecessary health care costs that has to do with lawsuit abuse.

So that is number one. We want to fix that. We have introduced legislation on it. We passed it out of the House in 2005 when we were in the majority, and sent it over to the Senate where the trial lawyers blocked it, lawsuit abuse.

JOHN SHADEGG for years has been pushing legislation to allow people to

buy health insurance across state lines. So today, in Governor Christie's state, someone who would pay a premium there, a young 25-year-old man, buys a health insurance premium for about $6,000 a year, a healthy young man, can go to Kentucky, can buy a similar—not the same, but a similar policy, for $1,000 a year. So why wouldn't we adopt the Shadegg language and let the people in New Jersey save $5,000, and let them buy that policy in Kentucky until they start to lower the premiums and lower the mandates in New Jersey?

Buying insurance across state lines does a lot to lower the cost of health care. And the President has said there isn't enough competition in the health insurance industry. Remember, he demagogued the health insurance industry mercilessly for a long time: Not enough competition. So he wanted to create a new Federal health insurance company that would offer a handful or a dozen health insurance policies.

Here are the real numbers, Mr. Speaker. There are 1,300 health insurance companies in America—1,300 companies. That is a lot of competition. The President's idea is, well, we need 1,301, then. And that will be the deciding factor. And of those companies, there are approximately 100,000 different varieties of policies. If one wanted to go shopping, you could conceivably buy 100,000 different policies. That is a lot of policies and a lot of options and a lot of companies, and they are not allowed to compete across state lines. In fact, some of them don't want to do that. Some of them want to protect their little bailiwick, and some of them are trying to establish a de facto monopoly in their States. The Shadegg bill fixes that, and it breaks that down and lets people go out of state to buy insurance. Those are two big things.

I want 100 percent deductibility of everybody's health insurance premiums. If a corporation or a company, a sole proprietorship, partnership, limited liability corporation, if they can deduct health insurance premiums for their employees, why if they don't provide that insurance can't the employee deduct 100 percent of that premium in the same way? It is completely unjust.

When I bring that up, some say it costs too much money. Well, then let's level the tax a little bit. It is $32 billion, if I remember right, on the number. That is not too much money to give people equity and give people justice.

So let's have full deductibility of everybody's premiums. Let's buy insurance across state lines, make all of the insurance companies in the country compete against each other. Let's end this lawsuit abuse, Mr. Speaker. Let's have transparency in billing, so we can start to reduce the cost shifting that takes place. Because some people underpay; others have to overpay.

And, by the way, cutting Medicare by half a trillion dollars and alleging that there is waste, fraud, abuse, and corruption out there—and they'll be able to find that all if we just let them cut Medicare by half a trillion—how is it the President of the United States can make an allegation that there is waste, fraud, and abuse, and can end corruption to the tune of hundreds of billions of dollars and not point one finger at the people that are corrupted or doing it? And how is it that the President of the United States can hold a right hostage to an ultimatum?

□ 2230

We have a right to a legitimate government; we have a right to government oversight. If there's waste, fraud, abuse, and corruption in Medicare, we shouldn't have to be held hostage to pass socialized medicine to find out where it is so the government can go fix it. That should happen every day, automatically, every time, by due-diligent public servants. A half a trillion dollar cut. By the way, wiping out Medicare Advantage. Oh, except for Florida. That's the carve-out on there.

The American people are full up to here of those kind of shenanigans. They're tired of special arrangements. They really don't like the idea that everybody's Cadillac health insurance plan is going to be taxed at 40 percent, except the unions. They're not going to be taxed quite so much. Give those an exemption because, after all, they helped the President get elected.

So this is like a huge, right-out-in-the-open, shine-the-spotlight-on-it, political payoff. This is America. And this is what the people in Massachusetts revolted against today. A peaceful revolution. People that came up and said, I'm going to exercise my right at the ballot box. And if they exercise their good judgment and their right at the ballot box, then you don't have to go to the other form of changing government, which gets a little bloody. The French had it kind of rough after our Revolution. We don't want that in this country. We're grateful for people that go to the polls and provide that kind of revolution with good judgment and good energy and good organization and a great and wonderful spirit.

For me, I get to pack 3 days of good memories about Massachusetts into my mind, and I can carry that with me forever. That's something that will never change now. I look forward to going back up there. Massachusetts, that deep, deep blue State turned a little purple today, Mr. Speaker.

So I appreciate your indulgence and you listening and I appreciate the opportunity to address you here before the House of Representatives on this glorious day. I look forward to every day we have from here on out to the end of this session as we shape this policy and we start to move back to sanity in America. I look forward to the elections in November of this year, 2010.

I look forward to the new faces that will come, the freshman class. It will be a large freshman class—a class of vigor, people that are full of energy, that really do come to change this country. I intend to team up with them, bring us a balanced budget, bring us back more liberty, strengthen our families, strengthen our foreign policy and, by the way, while that's going on, we need to shape a President for 2010.

Thank, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. TIAHRT (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of attending a funeral.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and the balance of the week on account of attending his brother's funeral in Alaska.

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 Mr. QUIGLEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BLUMENAUER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. QUIGLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GRAYSON, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, January 20 and 21.

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, January 21, 22, and 26.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, January 21, 22, and 26.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, January 21 and 22.

Mr. INGLIS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, January 20, 21, 22, and 26.

Mrs. SCHMIDT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 20, 2010, 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:

5545. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; ICW, Ft. Walton Beach, FL [COTP Mobile-06-027] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5546. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Noble Jim Thompson, Pascagoula, MS to the Gulf of Mexico [COTP Moblie-06-028] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5547. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Pascagoula Channel, Pacagoula, MS [COTP Mobile-06-029] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5548. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf of Mexico off of Panama City Beach, FL [COTP Mobile-06-030] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5549. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; M/V Zhen Hua, Mobile River, McDuffie Berth #1 [COTP Mobile-06-031] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5550. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Secretary of DHS and Commandant Visit to Pascagoula, MS [COTP Mobile-06-032] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5551. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Tacoma Freedom Fair Air Show, Commencement Bay, Tacoma, Washington [CGD13-06-033] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5552. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone: Camp Rilea Offshore Small Arms Firing Range; Warrenton, Oregon [CGD 13-06-035] (RIN: 1625-AA11) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5553. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulation (SLR) and Safety Zone Regulations: Seattle Seafair Unlimited Hydroplane Race and Blue Angles Air Show Performance 2006, Lake Washington, WA [CGD13-06-036] (RIN: 1625-AA08 and 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5554. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone Regulation, Quicksilver Unlimited Light Hydroplane Race, Dyes Inlet, WA [CGD13-06-39] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5555. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; West Cote Blanche Bay, 1 mile radius from a point North 29 degrees, 37 minutes, 8 seconds by West 91 degrees, 47 minutes, 12 seconds [COTP Morgan City-06-007] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5556. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway from MM65.0 to MM67.0, bank to bank [COTP Morgan City-06-006] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5557. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway from MM170.5 to MM171.5 bank to bank [COTP Morgan City-06-001] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5558. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Chandeleur Sound, Gulf of Mexico, Gulfport, MS [COTP Mobile-06-023] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5559. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Miami, FL [COTP Miami, Florida 07-016] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5560. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; USS Girdley Port of Miami Visit, Miami, Florida [COTP Miami 07-002] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5561. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone Regulations; Bomb Threat, East Waterway Duwamish River, WA [CGD13-06-040] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5562. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; 200 feet east to 200 feet west of the Lewis Street Swing Bridge at MM52.5 Bayou Teche, New Iberia, Louisiana, bank to bank [COTP Morgan City-08-003] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5563. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Mobile Ship Channel, Mobile, AL [COPT Mobile-06-014] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5564. 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-07-016] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5565. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Theodore Industrial Canal, Mobile, AL [COTP Mobile-06-016] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5566. 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 January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5567. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Panama City Marina, Panama City, FL [COTP Mobile-06-017] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5568. 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 Bridge at MM52.5 Bayou Teche, New Iberia, Louisiana, bank to bank [COTP Morgan City-07-007] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5569. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Ft. Lauderdale Fleet Week, Port Everglades, Florida [COTP MIAMI 07-096] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5570. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Atlantic Ocean, CSI: Miami Filming [COTP Miami 07-088] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5571. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Sunfest 2007 Fireworks Display, West Palm Beach, Florida [COTP Miami 07-080] (RIN: 1625-AA0) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5572. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Sunken Catamaran ANZHELA EXPLORER, Golden Beach, Florida [COPT MIAMI 07-071] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5573. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Pompano Beach Power Squadron Safe Boating Parade, Intracoastal Waterway, from Pompano Beach, FL to Fort Lauderdale, FL [COPT MIAMI 07-064] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5574. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; GICW MM295 to GICW MM377, Panama City, FL to East of the Fenholloway River, FL [COTP Mobile-06-018] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5575. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone, Live Fire Exercise, Atlantic Ocean, Fort Lauderdale, Florida [COPT Miami, Florida 07-049] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5576. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Live-Fire Gun Exercise, Atlantic Ocean, Fort Pierce, Florida [COTP Miami, Florida 07-042] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5577. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Tombigbee River, Demopolis, AL [COTP Mobile-06-020] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5578. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Biscayne Bay Yacht Racing Association Cruising Races, Biscayne Bay, Miami, FL [COTP MIAMI 07-033] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5579. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Live-Fire Gun Exercise, Atlantic Ocean, Fort Lauderdale, Florida [COTP Miami, Florida 07-025] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5580. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Pensacola Bay, Pensacola, FL [COTP Mobile-06-021] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5581. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf of Mexico, Orange Beach, AL [COTP Mobile-06-022] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5582. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Miami, FL [COTP Miami, Florida 07-018] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5583. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Live-Fire Gun Exercise, Atlantic Ocean, Fort Lauderdale, Florida [COPT Miami, Florida 07-135] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5584. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Chandeleur Sound, Gulf of Mexico, Gulfport, MS [COTP Mobile-06-023] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5585. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Biscayne Bay Yacht Racing Association Cruising Races, Biscayne Bay, Miami, FL [COTP MIAMI 07-124] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5586. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf of Mexico, Destin, FL [COTP Mobile-06-024] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5587. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; HWY 90 Bridge, Bay St. Louis, MS [COTP Mobile-06-025] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5588. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone: Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism Conference, Inter-Continental Hotel, Miami, FL [COTP Miami 07-119] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5589. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Live-Fire Gun Exercise, Atlantic Ocean, Fort Pierce, Florida [COTP Miami, Florida 07-118] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5590. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Fourth of July Fireworks Displays in the Captain of the Port Miami Zone [COTP Miami 07-113] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5591. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Live-Fire Gun Exercise, Atlantic Ocean, Miami, Florida [COTP Miami, Florida 07-106] (RIN: 125-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5592. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Live-Fire Gun Exercise, Atlantic Ocean, Fort Lauderdale, Florida [COTP Miami, Florida 07-105] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5593. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Live-Fire Gun Exercise, Atlantic, Ocean, Fort Pierce, Florida [COTP Miami, Florida 07-176] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5594. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Miami to Key Largo Race, Biscayne Bay and the Intracoastal Waterway, Florida [COTP MIAMI 07-101] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5595. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Israel Independence Day Boat Parade, Intracoastal Waterway, Miami, FL [COTP MIAMI 07-099] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5596. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Live-Fire Gun Exercise, Atlantic Ocean, Fort Pierce, Florida [COTP Miami, Florida 07-097] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5597. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulation; Pompano Beach Boat Parade, Intracoastal Waterway, Broward County, FL [COTP Miami 06-202] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5598. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Mobile Ship Channel, Mobile, AL [COTP Mobile-05-051] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5599. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf of Mexico, Destin, FL [COTP Mobile-06-001] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5600. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf of Mexico off of Panama City Beach, FL [COTP Mobile-06-003] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5601. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Pensacola Caucus Channel and Gulf of Mexico, Pensacola, FL [COTP Mobile-06-004] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5602. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Pensacola Caucus Channel and Pensacola Bay Channel, Pensacola, FL [COTP Mobile-06-005] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5603. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Boomtown Casino Barge, Pascagoula, MS to Biloxi, MS [COTP Mobile-06-006] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5604. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Three Mile Creek, Mobile, AL [COTP Mobile-06-007] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5605. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Pensacola Caucus Channel and Gulf of Mexico, Pensacola, FL [COTP Mobile-06-008] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010,

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. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3538. A bill to authorize the continued use of certain water diversions located on National Forest System land in the Frank Church-River of No Return Wilderness and the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 111–398). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MCGOVERN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1017. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3254) to approve the Taos Pueblo Indian Water Rights Settlement Agreement, and for other purposes; for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3342) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Commissioner of Reclamation, to develop water infrastructure in the Rio Grande Basin, and to approve the settlement of the water rights claims of the Pueblos of Nambe, Pojaoque, San Ildefonso, and Tesuque; and for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1065) to resolve water rights claims of the White Mountain Apache Tribe in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes (Rept. 111–399).

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. RANGEL (for himself, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. STARK, Mr. HERGER, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. NUNES, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KIND, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. BACA, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CHANDLER, Ms. CHU, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. DRIEHAUS, Mr. EHLERS, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FILNER, Ms. FOXX, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HALL of New York, Mrs. HALVORSON, Mr. HARE, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KAGEN, Ms. KILROY, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona, Mr. KISSELL, Ms. KOSMAS, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MACK, Mr. MASSA, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Ms. NORTON, Mr. NYE, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PERRIELLO, Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. POLIS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. REYES, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHAUER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SESTAK, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SIRES, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. WALZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WEINER, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. WU):

H.R. 4462. A bill to accelerate the income tax benefits for charitable cash contributions for the relief of victims of the earthquake in Haiti; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUCHANAN (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. HARPER, and Mr. KLINE of Minnesota):

H.R. 4463. A bill to require that all foreign terrorists with links to terrorist networks who attack the United States or its Government be considered enemy combatants to be tried by military tribunals instead of civilian courts; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. GINGREY of Georgia (for himself, Mr. LINDER, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. OLSON, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. COBLE):

H.R. 4464. A bill to prohibit the release or transfer of an individual detained at Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, into or to the custody of any country or region that is recognized by the Department of State or the Department of Defense as a haven for terrorist activity or that has been classified as a state sponsor of terrorism; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KISSELL (for himself, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. MASSA, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. POE of Texas):

H.R. 4465. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to take into account each child a veteran has when determining the veteran's financial status when receiving hospital care or medical services; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. OLSON, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. MURTHA):

H.R. 4466. A bill to amend section 1502 of title 5, United States Code, to permit law enforcement officers to be candidates for sheriff, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MEEK of Florida (for himself, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. RUSH, Ms. WATERS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. MCMAHON, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MACK, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. CAPUANO):

H.R. 4467. A bill to accelerate the income tax benefits for charitable cash contributions for the relief of victims of the January 12, 2010, earthquake in Haiti; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York (for himself and Mr. HIMES):

H.R. 4468. A bill to accelerate the income tax benefits for charitable cash contributions for the relief of victims of the January 12, 2010, earthquake in Haiti; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 4469. A bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to provide for protection of child custody arrangements for parents who are members of the Armed Forces deployed in support of a contingency operation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. WATSON:

H.R. 4470. A bill to ensure that individuals detained by the Department of Homeland Security are treated humanely, provided adequate medical care, and granted certain specified rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

H. Con. Res. 228. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of Congress to receive a message from the President; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. DENT, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. MURTHA, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. GERLACH):

H. Res. 1015. A resolution congratulating the Penn State women's volleyball team on winning the 2009 NCAA Division I National Championship; to the Committee on Education and Labor; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H. Res. 1016. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that a Global Marshall Plan holds the potential to demonstrate the commitment of the United States to peace and prosperity through poverty reduction in the United States and abroad; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. WELCH, Mr. HONDA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. NADLER of New York, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. TONKO, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. COHEN, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, and Mr. FARR):

H. Res. 1018. A resolution requesting the Senate to adjust its rules to reflect the intent of the framers of the Constitution by amending the Senate's filibuster rule, Rule 22, to facilitate the consideration of bills and amendments; to the Committee on Rules.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 13: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 25: Mr. BOOZMAN.
H.R. 211: Mr. REYES.
H.R. 333: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 417: Ms. HIRONO and Mr. WEINER.
H.R. 537: Ms. MATSUI and Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 571: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 600: Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 716: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 793: Mr. MANZULLO.
H.R. 930: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 953: Mr. CARTER.
H.R. 997: Mr. MCKEON.
H.R. 1126: Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 1175: Mr. SESTAK.
H.R. 1361: Mr. CASTLE and Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 1551: Ms. WATERS and Ms. CHU.
H.R. 1570: Mr. CAMP.
H.R. 1589: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
H.R. 1645: Mr. REYES.
H.R. 1778: Mr. WALZ, Mr. SESTAK, and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 1873: Mr. TONKO and Mrs. MALONEY.
H.R. 1925: Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 1956: Mr. CHANDLER.
H.R. 2055: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Mr. PIERLUISI.
H.R. 2143: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona.
H.R. 2256: Mr. MAFFEI.
H.R. 2350: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. HODES, and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H.R. 2377: Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 2478: Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. PETERSON, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona, Mr. MOLLOHAN, and Ms. HARMAN.
H.R. 2546: Mr. SESTAK and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H.R. 2567: Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland and Mr. NADLER of New York.
H.R. 2605: Mr. TIAHRT.
H.R. 2624: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, and Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 2788: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 2811: Mr. FARR and Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 2842: Mr. ROYCE.
H.R. 2849: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.
H.R. 2923: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 2941: Mr. WALZ and Ms. SUTTON.
H.R. 3010: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania and Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 3011: Mr. ROONEY.
H.R. 3012: Mr. LUJÁN.
H.R. 3042: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 3043: Mr. OLVER, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Mr. BOSWELL.
H.R. 3054: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 3090: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 3105: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 3125: Mr. TERRY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.
H.R. 3251: Mr. PRICE of Georgia.
H.R. 3264: Ms. CHU, Mr. SESTAK, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 3308: Mrs. BIGGERT.
H.R. 3315: Mrs. MALONEY.
H.R. 3321: Mr. GONZALEZ.
H.R. 3343: Ms. CLARKE.
H.R. 3355: Mrs. HALVORSON.
H.R. 3362: Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, and Mr. JONES.
H.R. 3488: Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 3536: Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 3652: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
H.R. 3664: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 3688: Mr. SHULER.
H.R. 3695: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. CHANDLER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. FARR, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. MASSA, Ms. CHU, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 3721: Mr. HODES.
H.R. 3758: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 3790: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. HILL, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 3838: Mr. TONKO, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. SESTAK.
H.R. 3943: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mrs. HALVORSON, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PERRIELLO, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. GRAVES.
H.R. 3974: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. STARK, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 3990: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 3995: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. MASSA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 4003: Mr. MURPHY of New York.
H.R. 4004: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 4021: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. MCMAHON.
H.R. 4034: Mr. OWENS and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 4037: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 4109: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 4129: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 4138: Mr. SOUDER.
H.R. 4149: Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 4155: Mr. LUJÁN.
H.R. 4247: Mr. HARPER and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 4249: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 4255: Mr. STEARNS, Mr. SOUDER, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. FORBES, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 4256: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 4262: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4264: Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 4278: Mr. CARNAHAN.
H.R. 4291: Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Ms. CHU.
H.R. 4295: Mr. HODES.
H.R. 4298: Mr. NADLER of New York.
H.R. 4324: Mr. COSTELLO and Mr. KISSELL.
H.R. 4325: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 4329: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 4356: Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. WOLF, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 4360: Mr. STARK, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. FARR, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 4374: Mr. HARE.
H.R. 4375: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 4386: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 4392: Mr. TOWNS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 4393: Ms. RICHARDSON.
H.R. 4400: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 4402: Mr. KAGEN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 4403: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 4415: Mr. HARPER and Mr. LINDER.
H.R. 4426: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. SCHAUER, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 4427: Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 4450: Mr. CHAFFETZ.
H.R. 4453: Mr. JONES, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H. Con. Res. 13: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois and Mr. FILNER.
H. Con. Res. 154: Mr. TOWNS.
H. Con. Res. 170: Mr. RAHALL.
H. Con. Res. 175: Mr. SESTAK.
H. Res. 200: Ms. KAPTUR and Mr. COOPER.
H. Res. 236: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H. Res. 252: Ms. CHU.
H. Res. 443: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H. Res. 486: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H. Res. 567: Mr. MCCARTHY of California.
H. Res. 699: Mr. OWENS.
H. Res. 709: Ms. CHU.
H. Res. 762: Mrs. LOWEY and Mrs. MALONEY.
H. Res. 803: Ms. JENKINS.
H. Res. 847: Mr. BONNER and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.
H. Res. 888: Mr. LANCE and Mr. SCHOCK.
H. Res. 902: Mr. COBLE, Mr. HOLT, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, and Mr. HINCHEY.
H. Res. 943: Mr. HUNTER.
H. Res. 954: Mr. BOOZMAN.
H. Res. 959: Mr. SOUDER, Mr. PAUL, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. CONAWAY.
H. Res. 977: Mr. ROONEY, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. LINDER, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. TURNER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. MACK.
H. Res. 988: Ms. GRANGER.
H. Res. 997: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. COSTELLO, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. MASSA.
H. Res. 1003: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. ARCURI, and Mr. STUPAK.
H. Res. 1008: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. TERRY.
H. Res. 1010: Mr. WATT and Ms. CHU.
H. Res. 1011: Mr. SHULER, Mr. POLIS, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. KIRK, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. COSTA, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona.
H. Res. 1013: Mr. WOLF and Mr. CROWLEY.
H. Res. 1014: Ms. FOXX, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

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:

The amendment to be offered by Representative MCCLINTOCK, or a designee, to H.R. 1065, the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2009, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9(d), 9(e), or 9(f) of rule XXI.

The amendment to be offered by Representative MCCLINTOCK, or a designee, to H.R. 3254, the Taos Pueblo Indian Water Rights Settlement Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9(d), 9(e), or 9(f) of rule XXI.

The amendment to be offered by Representative MCCLINTOCK, or a designee, to H.R. 3342, the Aamodt Litigation Settlement Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9(d), 9(e), or 9(f) of rule XXI.