United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 156 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JANUARY 26, 2010 No. 10

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 26, 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.

U.S. AND WORLD RESPONDS TO HAITI'S EARTHQUAKE

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it has now been 2 weeks since a 7.0 earthquake struck Haiti on the afternoon of January 12. Over these past 14 days, we have seen pictures of the devastation of Port-au-Prince and the surrounding communities. Estimates of the number of dead continue to rise. And the injured in the capital alone is already in the tens of thousands, many needing sophisticated medical care. People live in the streets and open spaces, fearful of the daily aftershocks. The very basics of life, water, food, and shelter are absent or in short supply.

We watch in anguish as we learn about the potential number of newly orphaned children in a country that already had around 400,000 orphans. The Washington Post ran a story on Saturday about how 75 percent of the schools have been destroyed and the deaths of so many teachers and students. Nearly every Haitian family in the affected areas suffered the loss of at least one loved one, and nearly every UN, international agency, and NGO operating in the area suffered devastating losses among their Haitian and international staff.

And while our own U.S. Embassy staff and aid agencies worked around the clock to respond to the crisis, each and every one of them are also dealing with their own shock and grief over lost family members and Haitian and U.S. colleagues.

In my congressional district, Mr. Speaker, Britney Gengel, the daughter of Len and Cherylann Gengel from Rutland, Massachusetts, remains missing. She is among the approximately 200 Haitian and foreign nationals who were in the Hotel Montana when the earthquake struck. She was part of a student team from Florida's Lynn University in Haiti working with Food for the Poor. In the few days that she was in Haiti, she had already emailed her parents to tell them that she felt that she had found her life's calling.

Hundreds of search and rescue workers have been active day and night at the Hotel Montana, including U.S. teams from Fairfax, Virginia; Miami-Dade; and Los Angeles counties. One rescue worker, talking with Britney's father, spoke movingly about how this was one of the worst sites he had ever worked on, and if his daughter were trapped here, he wouldn't give up on finding her either. The compassion and empathy of the rescue workers and every member of our U.S. Embassy team are palpable, and their commitment to all victims' families is total.

We see on our television and read in the papers and online of the generosity and resilience of the human spirit: people helping people, comforting one another, sacrificing for the well-being of one another. We often forget how much the Haitian people are helping one another as we struggle to provide and get aid to them.

Governments, international agencies, NGOs, corporations, and individuals have responded and mobilized as never before. On Friday evening, I was in my hometown of Worcester, Massachusetts, at an event entitled Worcester Cares for Haiti, to mobilize donations from our local community. And I am sure that many Members of this House have been at similar events in their own districts.

Aid is pouring into Haiti to reach the more than 3 million people directly affected by the earthquake. It is flying in to Santo Domingo and Barahona airports in the Dominican Republic and being trucked overland in vast convoys. It is landing at the Port-au-Prince airport, which now receives over 100 flights day and night. And thanks to our Navy and Coast Guard, the destroyed Port-au-Prince docks are now 30 percent operational.

I want to thank all the nations of the world that have responded so generously. I especially want to thank our hemispheric neighbors, many of whom annually suffer from natural disasters and still struggle to overcome centuries of poverty. They have been particularly generous, from Argentina, Brazil, and Chile to Colombia, Cuba, Mexico, and so many others. And a very special thank you to the Government and people of the Dominican Republic.

To my own government, Secretary Clinton, Secretary Gates, Administrator Raj Shah, Secretary Napolitano,

Printed on recycled paper.

and all of the agencies, officers, and staff here in Washington and on the ground in Haiti, who, when faced with a Herculean task, have more than risen to the occasion. And I want to say how grateful I am for all that you have done, are doing, and will be doing in the days, weeks, and months to come. I have seen firsthand your commitment, compassion, expertise, and professionalism. I am sure that mistakes have been made, but no one wants the aid to arrive more quickly and get to those who need it more than the U.S. personnel on the ground in Haiti.

For myself, I have never been more proud of my government or more grateful for the people who serve in it.

Mr. Speaker, I will insert into the RECORD a story that appeared in The Washington Post entitled, ''Death toll growing at Port-au-Prince's Hotel Montana, once a symbol of stability.''

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 24, 2010]

DEATH TOLL GROWING AT PORT-AU-PRINCE'S HOTEL MONTANA, ONCE A SYMBOL OF STABILITY

(By William Booth)

Before the earthquake, the Hotel Montana was the place to be in Haiti. During coups and crises, it provided air-conditioned shelter from the political storms for the diplomats, spies and aid workers—and a few heavy-duty criminals—who gathered nightly at the News Bar under a towering mahogany tree to sip rum sours concocted by Monsieur Lauren, known as the best barman in the country.

To many foreigners, as well as the Haitian elite, the Montana stood for security and stability in a country that often lacked both. Now the Port-au-Prince landmark lies in ruins, as families of missing American, Canadian and French citizens press their embassies for any news of life at the scene of the most concentrated international search-and-rescue effort mounted since the Jan. 12 quake.

It does not look good. As body identification teams proceed with their grim assignment, the list of the dead is growing—posted on a tree in the hotel's circular drive because the reception desk is buried under rubble. Most reporters are being kept away as workers in white biohazard suits pull bodies out and then stumble off to vomit in the bushes.

''Except for miracles, hope is unfortunately fading,'' Elisabeth Byrs, a spokeswoman for the United Nations' Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, said Saturday.

Some rescue workers have said privately that too many resources have been deployed at the Montana, at the expense of searches elsewhere, and that the U.S. and other governments have focused more attention on those missing at the hotel than on Haitian survivors.

A Facebook page, Haiti Earthquake Hotel Montana, had more than 13,000 members as of Saturday evening and is filled with news, prayers, frustration—and photos of those probably lost in the quake. The posts are poignant: ''Diane Cave, Room 220, may have been on way to gym'' or ''David Apperson last seen in lobby.''

Some people post messages of support not only for the families but also for the missing. It is not as strange as it might seem. Cellphone service, disrupted at first, has improved. Someone in the rubble could have received e-mail.

The affiliations of the missing tell part of the story. Many guests at the Montana were working for organizations such as Food for the Poor, Compassion International and the United Methodist Committee on Relief.

A dozen students from Lynn University in Boca Raton, Fla., were here volunteering with Food for the Poor. Four of them, all women, are missing, along with two faculty members who accompanied them.

Angel Aloma, executive director of Food for the Poor, stood in the driveway in the gathering darkness, hugging Gerthe Cardoso, one of the hotel's owners. The two were going through names of staff members, with Aloma asking whether they were alive and Cardoso answering—yes, no, yes.

''These were not employees, they were family,'' Cardoso said. ''Our accountant. Our waiters. Some had been with us for 15 or 20 years. They came to weddings, birthdays, funerals.''

Aloma asked after the famous bartender. ''He is gone,'' Cardoso said, her eyes filling with tears. ''Oh, Lauren!''

''Our staff member LeAnn Chong, they saved her after 17 hours of digging,'' Aloma said. ''They had to cut off her hair to get her out.''

Many survivors lost far more. Rescue teams describe the work at the Montana as ''highly technical'' and ''medically extreme.'' Some rescues took 24 hours. Buried survivors subsisted on a trickle of their own urine until rescuers could get an intravenous needle into dehydrated veins. One survivor spent four days in a painful crouch. Some heard other people's last words, their last breaths.

The Rev. Clinton Rabb, in Haiti for a meeting with Methodist aid workers, was freed Jan. 15 after a French surgeon sawed through one leg at the knee and the other at the ankle. Still conscious, Rabb emerged from a tunnel dug into the rubble, like a miner being pulled from a collapsed shaft, and was whisked away in a Navy helicopter. He died last Sunday in a Florida hospital.

HELP FROM AN IPHONE APP

For nine days, an intense rescue effort took place at the Montana, with teams from Fairfax County, France, Chile, Brazil, Colombia and elsewhere working sections. Throughout Haiti, more than 50 teams had rescued 132 people by Saturday. U.S. teams took part in 47 rescues. Some of the most dramatic were at the Montana.

Dan Woolley was in Haiti with Compassion International making a video about poor children. He had just returned to the hotel that Tuesday afternoon when the 7.0-magnitude quake brought the 145-room hotel crashing down. Woolley was trapped in a space by an elevator shaft. It was pitch black, but he used his iPhone first-aid app to treat his leg fracture. He lost his glasses but used his digital single-lens reflex camera to focus and both devices to create a weak glow.

''He used the little light he had to write letters to his wife and his kids,'' said Raul Perla of the Fairfax team that helped French rescuers pull him out 60 hours later. ''Can you imagine?''

Other people, just a few feet away, have not been rescued. A colleague of Woolley's, David Hames, was last seen 20 feet from the elevator shaft where Woolley was found. ''David is an amazing family man, the host and creator of the kids' show 'Cranium's Ark,' much loved by hundreds, maybe thousands,'' a friend, Melanie Dobson, said by e-mail.

The family-owned Montana, built in 1946 in the hills of Port-au-Prince with just 12 rooms, had grown into a sprawling compound with shops, a swimming pool and conference facilities.

Now rescue workers store oxygen tanks in the half-empty pool. On the lawn is a makeshift shower. Piles of rotting meal rations sit by the fabled News Bar. Beside the conference room stairs, a man in a light-blue shirt, pressed flat by the roof, lies like a flower between the pages of a book.

The place reeks.

'IT'S A LITTLE MIRACLE'

The president of Lynn University, Kevin M. Ross, pressed this week for the return of remains, including those of the four Lynn students missing in the Montana. ''This is needed for every grieving father, son, mother, daughter, friend and neighbor who is aching at this very moment for a phone call,'' Ross said. ''A missing family member, whether alive or dead, must be returned to his or her loved ones.''

Last week, rumors spread in Port-au-Prince that a popular Montana co-owner, Nadine Cardoso-Riedl, had been killed in her office. Then, just as suddenly, word spread that she was alive.

''We had a little dog, a beagle, that was up on the roof by the terrace, and he alerted, he picked up a scent, but when we brought other dogs to confirm, they couldn't smell her,'' said Camilo Monroy of the Colombian Civil Defense rescue squad. ''We went back the next day, and the same beagle smelled her, and we called, and someone answered. We brought over her son, and he said, 'I think that is my mother down there.' ''

The Colombians and other teams dug one tunnel, then a second. Cardoso-Riedl responded, saying two other people were near her. One was perhaps a boy. Sometimes she was lucid, sometimes she appeared to lose consciousness and could not assist the rescuers when they asked: ''Are we close? Can you hear us?''

More than 100 hours after her hotel fell down on her, she was pulled out. ''It's a little miracle,'' her husband, Reinhard Riedl, told reporters. ''She's one tough cookie. She is indestructible.''

Her sister, Gerthe, said Nadine had been kidnapped in Haiti a few years ago and held captive for 15 days. ''You have no idea what it takes to survive here,'' she said.

AN APPEAL TO THE COMMON SENSE OF THE SENATE

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

Mr. STEARNS. I rise today in the hopes of appealing to the common sense of my colleagues in the United States Senate. In a few days, they will vote on whether or not Ben Bernanke will serve a second term as Federal Reserve Chairman. For the good of American taxpayers and the greater economy, his nomination should be rejected.

As Chairman of the Federal Reserve, Mr. Bernanke has intervened in the financial marketplace in an unprecedented way. He has instituted un-American policies that have distorted our free market economy, such as picking winners and losers, and the creation of ''too big to fail.'' Both Republicans and Democrats alike have argued that the Fed itself was a significant factor in creating the worst economic and financial crisis our Nation has faced in a generation.

Where is the justification in reconfirming Ben Bernanke? Under him, interest rates were kept too low for too

long, as the Fed simultaneously increased the money supply and economic bubbles were created. In 2006, financial experts throughout the Nation pointed out that the housing bubble was collapsing, yet the Fed took no action until it was too late, and tens of thousands of families found themselves in foreclosure.

Another major factor in the economic meltdown was the questionable financial transactions by the holding companies of the largest banks and Wall Street firms, which are regulated by the Federal Reserve. It is clear now that the Fed abdicated its role as a regulator of these entities. Just last month, Mr. Bernanke admitted in front of the Senate Banking Committee that, ''In the area where we had responsibility, the bank holding companies, we should have done more.''

The irony of his comments are that the Fed has plenty of power and authority to deal with the kinds of abuses we have seen in the financial industry and within the housing market, but they refused to act. Under the leadership of Mr. Bernanke, the Fed chose to ignore the abuses going on in the mortgage industry, particularly with subprime loans.

The Fed also chose to ignore Wall Street's risky off-balance-sheet transactions that created a domino effect that rippled through our economy. Bloomberg reported that the Fed itself entered into trillions in off-balance-sheet transactions last year, but the Fed's own Inspector General has not even attempted to audit or to investigate these transactions. Astoundingly, Mr. Bernanke is now advocating that Congress grant the Fed even greater regulatory power. We need to audit the Federal Reserve now.

In discussing Mr. Bernanke's failings as Fed Chairman, it is important to point out that he served on the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve from 2002 to 2005 before becoming Chairman. He is no novice, yet he ignored distress calls about our imminent financial meltdown.

And Mr. Bernanke has not been forthcoming in explaining to Congress and the American people who in the private sector the Fed has chosen to subsidize with American taxpayers' dollars and for what reason and for what amounts. Mr. Bernanke has also been unable to fully explain and account for the $500 billion the Fed has lent to central banks in Europe. Instead, he continues to hide behind the longstanding premise that monetary policy should be free from political pressure, coupled with the convenience of the Fed not being a public agency and, thus, not being obligated to publicly account for its actions.

Mr. Speaker, it is not his money. It belongs to the American taxpayers. Under Mr. Bernanke's leadership, the Fed even strove to keep the details of AIG's overpayments to its counterparties secret, as recently revealed by a newly disclosed e-mail from a New York Fed official. The e-mail clearly demonstrates the kind of culture that Bernanke oversaw at the Fed, one of secrecy and willingness to stifle important public disclosure pertaining to the financial crisis. But again, it is not his money.

After the difficult financial year we have had, common sense dictates a change in leadership at the Federal Reserve. Reconfirming Mr. Bernanke to a second term is like putting a stamp of approval on the health of our unstable economy while guaranteeing more of the same failed policies. More of the same is not the solution to our economic downturn and crisis in the financial markets. We need a complete departure from the failed policies of the past.

Mr. Bernanke steered our financial system directly onto the rocks. Should we really put him at the helm again? No.

BANK BAILOUTS

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

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express outrage, outrage at the information that has recently come to light about the AIG bailout. Though it may not be clear yet who should be held accountable, one thing is clear: The American people will not tolerate the use of taxpayer dollars for use in backdoor bailouts where the details are treated as classified, using methods typically reserved for matters of national security.

Though some financial matters may require protection as a matter of national security, it does not appear that the AIG bailout rises to that standard. At a time when our Nation is actively engaged in wars on two fronts, and terrorists and traffickers are always looking for means to breach our defenses, such treatment should be reserved for documents pertaining to actual security threats.

I opposed the Troubled Asset Relief Program from the very beginning because it focused too much on Wall Street and its executives and not enough on the problems that face working Arizona families. It does too little to hold accountable the banks and corporations that have benefited from billions in taxpayer dollars. The House Oversight Committee and the GAO are now investigating the entire AIG bailout. They should complete their work as quickly as possible so the results can be released to the American taxpayers.

□ 1245

BREAKING THE UNEMPLOYMENT BARRIER

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask how we can break the national 10 percent unemployment barrier which has now hit my home State of Florida hard with a totally unacceptable 11.8 percent unemployment rate.

The congressional leadership has created a cloud of uncertainty over the economy, with support for more oppressive regulations, skyrocketing deficits, tax increases, and trade barriers. The administration's spending policies, including the nearly $1 trillion stimulus bill, have drastically increased the national debt by 23 percent, while unemployment has increased by more than 3 million. And today the CBO announced that the U.S. deficit for the current fiscal year will come in at $1.3 trillion, which means that in the 1 year in which the party controlling the White House and Congress has been entrenched, the annual deficit has increased by over 300 percent.

We need to do everything we can to encourage entrepreneurs and small businesses to once again create jobs through sensible regulation, through reduced government spending, lower taxes and greater investment in education.

I am looking forward to the President's State of the Union message to see what course he has set for this year and will look forward to working with Members in a bipartisan manner to help bring our economy to full employment as soon as possible.

NATIONAL SCHOOL COUNSELING WEEK

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Later on, Mr. Speaker, we will be discussing an important resolution which designates the week of February 1 as National School Counseling Week on behalf of each and every child that these counselors have helped. As a mother, as a grandmother, and as a former Florida certified teacher, I recognize just how important it is to fully support our children at every turn. School counselors across the Nation share the same commendable goal to meet the needs of every child. They work each and every day to offer our children their expert guidance and compassionate care. Whether at home or in school, every child will face new and sometimes difficult situations as they develop into young adults. Through a strong family, many children are able to navigate potentially difficult situations, emotions and decisions from a positive base. But even with the most cohesive and supportive of families, there are times when a growing child needs outside counsel.

Our school counselors can offer children this vital resource: trusted and impartial guides in times of uncertainty as well as thoughtful friends for uncomfortable questions. And they willingly work with all children, regardless of their background or history, and are often the last lifeline for our troubled children.

We all recognize that children go through tremendous social, personal

and emotional development, all while being tasked with achieving academic success. Ensuring that our children are prepared to be tomorrow's adults requires that each of these components come together seamlessly. Our children are being forced to grow up faster than any generation before them. Today's children live in an interconnected world that is vastly different from the one that our parents, or even we, knew. In this sea of rapid and radical change, it is reassuring to know that our school counselors will be there to support those children that need it most. They offer each child an indispensable link between the classroom and the real world. School counselors are without a doubt a vital link in our children's emotional and academic educations.

Always willing to lend their sympathetic ear and advice, school counselors are never far at hand when a child needs to express his or her fears, hopes and aspirations. School counselors are helping our children to develop into wonderful young adults each and every day. We should all welcome the opportunity to say congratulations to these unsung protectors of our children.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues later on today as we take up this bill to honor school counselors across the United States to vote in favor of this resolution, for it is a fine tribute to people whose life's mission is to turn today's children into tomorrow's leaders.

Thank you very much for the time, Mr. Speaker.

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 51 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 (Ms. RICHARDSON) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

Monsignor Stephen J. Rossetti, of The Catholic University of America, offered the following prayer:

Good and gracious God, in these times of difficulty and confusion, our hearts remind us to turn back to You. You are the light; You are the truth. We trust that You will guide our paths during these troubled times; You keep us safe from all evil; and one day, You will lead us safely home. May we open our eyes, now, to see You in our lives; may we open our ears, this day, to hear Your voice. And thus may we follow You with steadfastness and courage. We ask this in the power of Your Spirit and in Your Word present and among us. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. DINGELL 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2949. An act to amend section 1113 of the Social Security Act to provide authority for increased fiscal year 2010 payments for temporary assistance to United States citizens returned from foreign countries, to provide necessary funding to avoid shortfalls in the Medicare cost-sharing program for low-income qualifying individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 2950. An act to extend the pilot program for volunteer groups to obtain criminal history background checks.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 110–315, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, announces the appointment of the following individuals to be members of the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity:

Bruce Cole of Indiana, Anne Neal of Wisconsin, and Michael Pokiakoff of Colorado.

INTRODUCING THE FINANCIAL SERVICES INDUSTRY STABILITY ACT OF 2010

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

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, it is not long since a bunch of avaricious, grasping New York bankers caused a replay of 1929 and a major collapse of the American economy. They were too big to fail, and as a result, this Nation has spent hundreds of billions of dollars bailing them out for their wrongdoing. This is intolerable. If we cannot regulate these people, the least we can do is see that they are properly sized.

I urge my colleagues to join me in sponsoring the Financial Services Industry Stability Act of 2010, which I am introducing today. As Paul Volcker, former chairman of the Federal Reserve, said, the institutions too big to fail would be that they would ''be sheltered by access to a Federal safety net in time of crisis.'' Another former Fed Chair, my dear friend Alan Greenspan, said, ''If they're too big to fail, they're too big.'' Similarly, Mervyn King, governor of the Bank of England, opines, ''If some banks are thought to be too big to fail, then, in the words of a distinguished economist, they are too big.'' I urge my colleagues to help me cut down these avaricious scoundrels to proper size.

THREE OUT OF FOUR AMERICANS THINK STIMULUS MONEY HAS BEEN WASTED

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, where are the jobs? This is the question I continue to ask the liberal majority, since they persist pushing legislation killing jobs. Families are hurting, particularly in South Carolina, where the unemployment rate recently jumped to a gruesome 12.6 percent. The stimulus bill isn't living up to its name, and Americans realize it. According to a CNN poll released yesterday, nearly three out of four Americans think that at least half of the money spent in the Federal stimulus plan has been wasted. Moreover, 63 percent believe projects in the plan were included for political reasons and will have no economic benefit.

I have introduced the National Commission on American Recovery and Reinvestment Act so taxpayers receive adequate answers as to the whereabouts of stimulus funds. I urge Speaker PELOSI to consider this legislation to ensure full accountability of every stimulus dollar spent.

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

TRIBUTE TO OUR REMARKABLE TROOPS

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

Mr. SKELTON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to our remarkable troops. Our men and women in uniform represent the best of America. Never is that more apparent than when our forces are mobilized to help people in need, most recently in the wake of the devastating earthquake in Haiti. As of last week, approximately 13,000 military personnel are part of the Haiti relief effort, about 10,000 aboard ship, and 3,000 ashore.

The United States' response to the Haiti earthquake is a whole-of-government effort, with the U.S. Agency for International Development in the lead,

but our military personnel are truly indispensable to the humanitarian response. U.S. military professionals have the logistical, medical, and engineering skills that are desperately needed in a disaster zone.

This critical contribution to the Haiti relief effort comes at a time when the men and women of our military are already being stretched by two wars. But crises rarely happen on a planned timetable, and our troops have demonstrated, once again, their capability to respond admirably whenever disaster strikes.

As any American who has been helped by the National Guard or other U.S. forces during a flood, hurricane, fire, tornado, or other emergency, there is no limit to the compassion, commitment, and dedication of those wearing the American service uniform.

U.S. military servicemembers and their families make tremendous sacrifices, both for our Nation and in working to help people in times of need all over the world. I am so proud of the contribution our heroes in uniform are making to help the people of Haiti, in cooperation with all of the other people in government and non-governmental organizations, and international organizations who are working as partners in the Haiti relief effort.

NATIONAL HEALTH CARE AND THE CONSTITUTION

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, the United States Constitution is a document to limit the Federal Government. Thomas Jefferson said, ''Free government is founded in jealousy, and not in confidence, which (requires) limited constitutions to bind down those whom we are obliged to trust with power.''

As the all-seeing eye of the government tries to take care of us, and since it believes we are subjects incapable of taking care of our own health, nowhere in the Constitution is the Federal Government given the enumerated privilege to make a power grab and control the Nation's health. The Constitution sets limits on what dictates of pain the Federal Government is allowed to inflict on the rest of us. George Washington didn't fight the Redcoats so people would be the subjects of a new oppressive, untrustworthy Federal bureaucracy, and the Colonists didn't die in the War of Independence so a health care czar could have the rule over us. It is an unconstitutional abuse of power to nationalize American health care and trust the government with our health.

And that's just the way it is.

PUT AMERICANS BACK TO WORK

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

Mr. FLEMING. Madam Speaker, the American people are hurting, and Washington is not listening. Over the past year, the policies of more taxes, runaway spending and record debt have had a chilling effect on job creation across this country. The stock market is languishing, home sales have declined, and unemployment is in double-digits, reaching its highest level in decades.

Last year, President Obama and congressional Democrats promised that the trillion-dollar stimulus plan would create jobs immediately, and unemployment would not rise above 8 percent. Sadly, the only thing the wasteful stimulus bill created was bigger government, with nearly 2.7 million American jobs lost since that promise was made.

The Republican plan provides targeted tax relief for working families and small businesses and will create real jobs, not an illusion of jobs saved, as the administration suggests. It's past time that the President and the Democratic majority get serious about putting Americans back to work.

KEEP TERRORISTS LOCKED UP IN CUBA

(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. Madam Speaker, President Obama says that closing the terrorist detention center in Cuba will help America's image abroad and make America safer. This idea is contrary to common sense, nonsensical, irrational, counterintuitive, and dangerous. Since the President has announced his intention to close the military prison, there have been more attempted terrorist attacks, not fewer. The terrorists sense weakness, not strength.

Keeping terrorists locked up in Cuba, rather than transferring them to the U.S. or other countries, is the only way to protect Americans. If they go to other countries, they can be released. If they go to the U.S., they can get constitutional rights, like citizens, which they certainly don't deserve. The administration should treat terrorists like terrorists and leave them in Cuba.

THREE PENDING TRADE AGREEMENTS THAT WILL CREATE JOBS

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, as we all know, there will be a great deal of excitement around the Capitol tomorrow evening. The President of the United States will be delivering his first State of the Union message. Early indications are that he will be talking about the issue that Democrats and Republicans alike and people around this country are talking about, and that is job creation.

We have got an unemployment rate in excess of 10 percent, much higher in my State of California, and we think—Democrat and Republican alike—that it's a very good idea for the President to be focusing on job creation and economic growth.

Well, Madam Speaker, he has a wonderful opportunity to take what I believe would be the strongest, boldest, most dynamic step towards economic growth, and that is to send to Capitol Hill three pending trade agreements: Panama, Colombia and South Korea. We could create jobs in the manufacturing sector, in the service sector, in the farming sector of our economy if we were to break down the barriers that right now prevent U.S. workers and service providers from being able to have access to that consumer market.

So as we work together in a bipartisan way to create jobs, I encourage the President, Madam Speaker, to send those three trade agreements so that we can create jobs.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 22, 2010.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, U.S. Capitol, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on Friday, January 22, 2010 at 2:53 p.m., and said to contain a message from the President whereby he transmits consistent with Public law 107–108 a report on matters related to support for the interdiction of aircraft engaged in illicit drug trafficking.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk of the House.

UNITED STATES ASSISTANCE FOR THE INTERDICTION OF AIRCRAFT ENGAGED IN ILLICIT DRUG TRAFFICKING—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 111–89)

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

To the Congress of the United States:

Consistent with the authorities related to official immunity in the interdiction of aircraft engaged in illicit drug trafficking (Public Law 107–108, 22 U.S.C. 2291–4), as amended, and in order to keep the Congress fully informed, I am providing a report by my Administration. This report includes matters related to support for the interdiction

of aircraft engaged in illicit drug trafficking.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 22, 2010*.

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.

□ 1415

HONORING LESTER FLATT

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 583) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Lester Flatt has made an invaluable contribution to American art as both a songwriter and a performer, leaving an indelible legacy in bluegrass music, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 583

Whereas Lester Flatt was born on June 19, 1914, and was raised in the region of Sparta, Tennessee;

Whereas Lester Flatt began playing guitar and singing in local churches at a young age;

Whereas Lester Flatt began his career with Charlie Monroe and the Kentucky Pardners in North Carolina in the early 1940s;

Whereas in 1945, Lester Flatt was invited by Bill Monroe to play rhythm guitar and sing with Monroe's band on the Grand Ole Opry;

Whereas Lester Flatt, Earl Scruggs, Chubby Wise, Howard Watts, and Bill Monroe are widely credited with the creation of bluegrass music through their band, Bill Monroe and the Bluegrass Boys;

Whereas Lester Flatt later joined with Earl Scruggs to create the band Flatt and Scruggs and the Foggy Mountain Boys, which remains one of the most influential bands in bluegrass music;

Whereas in 1969, Lester Flatt parted with Scruggs to form the band Nashville Grass, with whom he performed until shortly before his death on May 11, 1979;

Whereas in 1991, Lester Flatt, along with Bill Monroe and Earl Scruggs, became an inaugural member of the International Bluegrass Music Hall of Fame; and

Whereas Lester Flatt is widely regarded as one of the greatest bluegrass musicians and singers of all time, writing dozens of songs that are considered bluegrass classics: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that Lester Flatt has made an invaluable contribution to American art as both a songwriter and a performer, leaving an indelible legacy in bluegrass music.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend and insert extraneous material on H. Res. 583 into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I rise today to support House Resolution 583, which recognizes Lester Flatt's invaluable contributions to American art as both a songwriter and a performer. One of nine children, Lester Flatt was born on June 9, 1914, and raised in Sparta, Tennessee. As a singer and a guitarist, Lester Flatt is widely considered one of the founding fathers of bluegrass music.

He learned to sing and to play the guitar in local churches. As a member of the legendary Flatt and Scruggs and the Foggy Mountain Boys, Flatt not only popularized bluegrass music, he transformed the music genre from regional to national. Bluegrass music itself, Madam Speaker, originated in the early 1600s as an American art form of immigrants as they came to America. Irish, Scottish, English and African American cultures have played a major part in developing bluegrass music.

The music started in rural areas and in small towns describing life in the hills or on the farms. Eventually this sound became popularized and Lester Flatt emerged from Tennessee as our Nation's premiere bluegrass artist.

With Bill Monroe's Bluegrass Boys in the mid-1940s, Lester helped bring national acclaim to bluegrass music with the Original Bluegrass Band. Later in Flatt's career he teamed up with Earl Scruggs to create the Foggy Mountain Boys in 1948. This group went on to achieve longstanding success and prestige unprecedented in the bluegrass music world. Parting with Earl in 1969, Lester continued successfully with his own ''Nashville Grass'' until shortly before his death in 1979.

Though he reached tremendous heights across the Nation, Flatt preferred to perform in small towns. He, along with two others, became inaugural members of the International Bluegrass Music Hall of Fame.

Madam Speaker, I want to once again congratulate Lester Flatt on his artistic accomplishments and honor his extraordinary life. I thank Congressman LINCOLN DAVIS from Tennessee for bringing this resolution forward today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise today in support of House Resolution 583, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Lester Flatt has made an invaluable contribution to the American art as both a songwriter and a performer, and has left an indelible legacy on bluegrass music.

Born in Overton County, Tennessee, in 1914, by age seven he had learned to play the guitar and sang in his church choir. He began entertaining locally and began to pursue a music career when rheumatoid arthritis forced him to quit his job in a local silk mill. As has been stated, he started in 1945 with the Blue Grass Boys, then later with the Foggy Mountain Boys and then finally with the Nashville Grass.

He passed away, but his voice and unique bluegrass style will always be remembered. Lester Flatt and the Bluegrass Boys are credited with the introduction of bluegrass music to this Nation. Bluegrass music is a unique form of American roots music and is considered a sub-genre of the country music scene.

Bluegrass was especially popular in the rural areas of this country, and it's often referred to as the Kentucky bluegrass after Bill Monroe, who was from Kentucky and a member of the Bluegrass Boys. Bluegrass music is a uniquely American art form and Lester Flatt helped to introduce this music to the Nation. Lester Flatt left an indelible legacy in bluegrass music and in the American art, and I ask my colleagues to support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I'm pleased to recognize the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DAVIS), the sponsor of this legislation, for as much time as he may consume.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I thank the gentlelady for yielding time, and I will make some very brief comments.

As we look across America, we look at our rivers, our streams, our oceans and our lakes, the scenic mountains of Tennessee, the scenic mountains, obviously the Rocky Mountains and the Appalachians. Our artists that will paint portraits and paintings on canvas, our literature, through great authors of our time, our character, as a Nation, our heritage, our family traditions, our family values, and, yes, our music are part of this great American heritage.

Our music, music of those like Flatt and Scruggs that, when I was a child growing up, listening to a radio operated by a battery on a Saturday night was one of the special times when the family got together. But certainly for this particular occasion, for that hour-long session, the ''Grand Ole Opry,'' we would hear such performers as Bashful Oswald and Stringbean and, yes, Flatt and Scruggs, that became an entity in the mid-forties.

Lester Flatt was born in Sparta, Tennessee, in a district that I now represent in White County. And from that, he basically learned his art in church by singing with the choir. He learned his art by self-teaching and by instructions from others in the community of how to play different instruments. And

he became someone that those of us who loved mountain music, who loved the mountain music, loved to hear him. The songs that he sang, the songs that he composed—most he sang himself, and some were sung by others. But he gave us, all of us who live in America and all of those of us who love bluegrass music on a Saturday night, or Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday and gospel music on Sunday night that's bluegrass style, kind of have a great deal of respect and reverence for Lester Flatt.

It is my honor as a Member of Congress and it is my honor as the Congressman who represents the area where he was born and later moved to North Carolina and Kentucky to perform to audiences that were blessed with his voice, which was unique and his music, which was unique and the three-finger roll that was brought by the banjo to make that music even better. So it's my honor today to recognize this giant who was one of the first three that became a member of the Hall of Fame in 1991, and it's fitting that he did. So it's fitting that we here today honor this giant of bluegrass music.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. After hearing the eloquence of the gentleman from Tennessee, I'm embarrassed to admit that the only thing I think of, when I hear Lester Flatt's name, I have to think of ''The Beverly Hillbillies.''

But with that, I'd like to yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE).

Mr. COBLE. I thank the gentleman from Utah for yielding. I appreciate that. And you're on the money: ''The Beverly Hillbillies,'' indeed, were a very significant role that they played: Lester Flatt, Earl Scruggs and the Foggy Mountain Boys brought to you by Martha White. Those introductory words were disseminated, Madam Speaker, across the airwaves throughout Tennessee, southeastern United States and beyond, introducing what, in my opinion, was the world's premiere bluegrass aggregation during that era, specifically the fifties and the sixties.

I realize that the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee can claim, and rightly so, that Lester Flatt was his constituent, but I would be remiss if I didn't remind him again that Earl Scruggs, the world's premiere 5-string banjoist is a native Carolinian, although not a resident in the district I represent.

In addition to Lester and Earl, Paul, Josh and Jake completed the starting five. But when Lester Flatt, Earl Scruggs and the Foggy Mountain Boys performed, whether on radio, television or in live concert, Americana was on parade because bluegrass music, after all, is America's music. These men, all superb musicians, were celebrities in their own right, but they did not conduct themselves as celebrities. They were not unlike our next-door neighbor or the guy down the street.

Finally, I think it's fitting and appropriate that this House of Representatives recognizes today that Lester Flatt has made an invaluable contribution to American art as both a songwriter and a performer, leaving an indelible legacy in bluegrass music.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. We have no more speakers, so I urge my colleagues to vote favorably on this particular resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, I fully support recognizing legendary bluegrass singer and songwriter Lester Flatt for his many contributions to American music.

Music is a tradition that most of us in West Virginia have enjoyed our entire lives. Lester Flatt is a great example of the amazing collection of musical talent in Appalachia. This resolution supports the history and traditions of our region and brings awareness to the talents of Bluegrass Musicians.

Lester Flatt was an acclaimed guitarist, lead singer and a leader in making Blue Grass music what it is today. Most famous for his long career with Bill Monroe, Earl Scruggs and the Blue Grass Boys; Lester Flatt and his legendary sounds and strong rhythm and guitar playing helped to create the unique and memorable sound of modern Bluegrass.

A southern West Virginia Bluegrass legend Everett Lilly, originally from Clear Creek near Beckley, had the opportunity to tour with Lester Flatt in the early 1950s, and participated in classic duet recordings with Lester Flatt.

In southern West Virginia we celebrate not only famous Bluegrass Musicians like Lester Flatt and Everett Lilly, but all of our talented musicians through efforts led by the West Virginia Humanities Council and the Music Hall of Fame exhibit at Tamarack. The permanent exhibit at Tamarack in Beckley, WV houses memorabilia and recorded works of Mountain State musicians of the last 50 years and is accompanied by a concert series and a variety of educational programs.

Another exciting initiative is The WV Music Hall of Fame's Traveling Museum which is a collaborated effort between the Humanities Council and the WV Department of Education. The exhibits showcase the variety of music that has come from the Mountain State, from opera and jazz to gospel, traditional, country, bluegrass, blues and rock 'n' roll. While visiting the Traveling Museum, you can view an interactive county by county map of West Virginia's musical history, listen to a variety of music and even make your own CD.

I fully encouraged this partnership and commend The Hall of Fame on a remarkable job in its first few years.

Music was the missing link to West Virginia's premiere arts venue, Tamarack. The Hall of Fame and Tamarack are natural partners. I encourage my fellow West Virginians to support our State and our regions' great musicians and organizations—all working to keep our arts and humanities heritage alive and well in our communities, schools, and lives.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 583, which recognizes Lester Flatt's invaluable contributions to American art as both a songwriter and a performer, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 583, 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.

NATIONAL MENTORING MONTH

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 990) expressing support for designation of January 2010 as ''National Mentoring Month''.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 990

Whereas mentoring is a longstanding tradition in which a dependable, caring adult provides guidance, support, and encouragement to facilitate a young person's social, emotional, and cognitive development;

Whereas continued research on mentoring shows that formal, high-quality mentoring focused on developing the competence and character of the mentee promotes positive outcomes, such as improved academic achievement, self-esteem, social skills, and career development;

Whereas further research on mentoring provides strong evidence that mentoring successfully reduces substance use and abuse, academic failure, and delinquency;

Whereas mentoring, in addition to preparing young people for school, work, and life, is extremely rewarding for those serving as mentors;

Whereas more than 4,700 mentoring programs in communities of all sizes across the United States focus on building strong, effective relationships between mentors and mentees;

Whereas approximately 3,000,000 young people in the United States are in solid mentoring relationships due to the remarkable vigor, creativity, and resourcefulness of the thousands of mentoring programs in communities throughout the Nation;

Whereas in spite of the progress made to increase mentoring, the United States has a serious ''mentoring gap'', with nearly 15,000,000 young people in need of mentors;

Whereas mentoring partnerships between the public and private sectors bring State and local leaders together to support mentoring programs by preventing duplication of efforts, offering training in industry best practices, and making the most of limited resources to benefit young people in the United States;

Whereas the designation of January 2010 as ''National Mentoring Month'' will help call attention to the critical role mentors play in helping young people realize their potential;

Whereas a month-long celebration of mentoring will encourage more individuals and organizations, including schools, businesses, nonprofit organizations, faith institutions, and foundations, to become engaged in mentoring across the United States; and

Whereas National Mentoring Month will, most significantly, build awareness of mentoring and encourage more people to become mentors and help close the mentoring gap in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the designation of ''National Mentoring Month'';

(2) recognizes with gratitude the contributions of the millions of caring adults and students who are already volunteering as mentors and encourages more adults and students to volunteer as mentors; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to observe National Mentoring Month with appropriate ceremonies and activities that promote awareness of, and volunteer involvement with, youth mentoring.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend and insert extraneous material on H. Res. 990 into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 990, which recognizes January as National Mentoring Month. Today we acknowledge and thank the millions of caring adults and students who volunteer as mentors, and we commend their efforts. National Mentoring Month serves as a great opportunity to encourage others to get involved mentoring and volunteering their time. Mentors directly improve the lives of those who are in need of guidance by providing support, care, and encouragement to facilitate a younger person's development in life.

Research consistently proves, Madam Speaker, that mentors bolster academic achievement, self-esteem, social skills, and career development. In addition to these positive outcomes, mentoring reduces delinquency, substance abuse, and academic failure. Mentoring, whether it is for school work or life in general, helps young people realize that a better life is attainable, and it helps them to obtain the tools they need to succeed.

Today, there are over 4,700 mentoring programs in communities all across the United States serving approximately 3 million young people. This country, however, is in need of more mentors to help fill the gap and reach the nearly 15 million young people who would benefit from a positive, solid mentoring relationship. As a Nation, we must continue to encourage volunteers to invest their human capital in our youth. Through nonprofit government and private sector partnerships, we can expand mentoring.

□ 1430

The National Mentoring Month is a reminder to reinvest our energy towards mentoring relationships. By building awareness on this issue, we can encourage more people to serve as mentors.

Madam Speaker, once again, I express my support, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise today in support of House Resolution 990, expressing support for the designation of January 2010 as National Mentoring Month, and I am glad we are doing it before it's over.

National Mentoring Month celebrates mentors who are positively impacting the lives of people and highlights the need for additional mentors to make themselves available for America's youth.

Mentoring is a structured and trusting relationship that brings young people together with caring individuals who offer guidance, support, and encouragement, all aimed at developing the confidence and character of the mentee.

A mentor is an adult who, along with parents, provides a young person with support, counsel, friendship, and positive reinforcement.

By all estimates, almost 18 million young people—nearly half of the population of young people between the ages of 10 and 18—live in situations that put them at risk of not living up to their potential. Without immediate intervention by caring adults, they can make choices that not only undermine their futures but, ultimately, the economic and social well-being of our Nation.

Research shows that formal, high-quality mentoring focused on developing the competence and character of the mentee promotes positive outcomes such as improved academic achievement, self-esteem, career development, and social skills. By honoring mentors and mentoring programs, we recognize the importance of mentoring programs implemented in our local schools and communities. We also draw attention to the components of a quality program, including appropriate screening of potential mentors and careful matching of youth with adults who have a genuine interest in providing guidance and being exemplary role models.

Today, thanks to the commitment and dedication of mentoring advocates, 3 million young people are now enjoying mentoring's many benefits through school-based, faith-based, and community organizations. It's a six-fold increase in formal mentoring relationships since the early 1990s.

Today we recognize the contribution mentors make to the lives of the Nation's youth. The time adults take to serve as a mentor provides children and young adults with a positive adult example and support system. Adult mentors should be recognized for their contributions and efforts, and, therefore, I urge Members to support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to recognize the sponsor of this legislation, the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Congresswoman MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, as co-chair of the Congressional Mentoring Caucus, I rise today in strong support for designating January 2010 as National Mentoring Month. Thank you to Chairman MILLER and Chairwoman WOOLSEY for bringing this legislation to the floor. I would also like to thank the other chairs in the Mentoring Caucus, Mrs. DAVIS of California and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, who are original cosponsors of this legislation.

We all have an important role to play in the lives of young people around us. Our entire community needs to be part of the process in shaping young lives to become responsible citizens. When caring adults make connections and provide guidance to our youth, it makes a positive impact on their lives.

A local newspaper in Minnesota recently ran an article about the enormous difference mentoring makes in someone's life. All of us have experienced that personally. For far too many young people and children, they just might not have a strong adult presence in their lives. Mentors encourage the development of strong characters and healthy identities. That's a fact. We have the data to back that up.

Studies show that young adults who have mentors are less likely to experiment with drugs, skip school, or become involved in criminal activity; and at the same time, students are more likely to be confident, make good grades and graduate from high school and improve their self-esteem when they have a mentor. When these students grow up, they are more likely to be better parents, better neighbors, in general, better citizens.

Nationally, there is an estimated mentoring gap of 15 million at-risk young people who need and who would benefit greatly from a mentor. In Minnesota alone, there are more than 250,000 students who fall into this gap.

I sponsored this resolution to help raise awareness of this gap and of the many benefits of mentoring for both the mentee and the mentor and to encourage more people to volunteer their time and to invest in a child's well-being and their future.

Mentorship does not end with childhood. Whether you're asking a neighbor to assist you after you've had your first child or you're seeking a person at work or your place of worship to guide you through these tough decisions, mentoring benefits people of all ages.

My life has personally been filled with many mentors from my childhood right up until today. Congressman Bruce Vento—whose seat I now hold—mentored me from my early days in politics until I decided to run for Congress. And you never know where you might find a mentor. Many in this Chamber might have been surprised that one of my closest mentors was Congressman Henry Hyde from Illinois. He helped me understand the history

and the greatness of this institution, and he taught me by example that elected officials should always, always respect one another in debate and always respect one another especially when we disagree.

I encourage all of my colleagues to look for opportunities to mentor our youth, and they can start by doing that today by voting ''yes'' on this resolution.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 990, ''Expressing support for designation of January 2010 as ''National Mentoring Month'' and for other purposes, introduced by my distinguished colleague from Minnesota, Representative MCCOLLUM. ''National Mentoring Month,'' since January 2002, has been a national initiative and an annual campaign focusing attention on the need of mentors to mentees, and to promote youth mentoring with the message that, ''If we—individuals, businesses, government agencies, schools, faith communities, and nonprofits—can work together to increase the number of mentors, we assure brighter futures for our young people.'' This annual initiative and campaign is spearheaded by the Harvard School of Public Health, MENTOR, and the Corporation for National and Community Service.

President Barack Obama, former Secretary of State General Colin Powell, former Presidents Bill Clinton and George W. Bush, Arizona Senator JOHN MCCAIN, music producer Quincy Jones, poet Maya Angelou, music recording artist Usher, and actor Clint Eastwood, have all endorsed the campaigns for National Mentoring Month. A highlight of the campaign is the ''Thank You Mentor Day,'' in which mentees thank and honor their mentors for their mentorship. Mentees are encouraged to reach out to their mentors to express their appreciation. Mentees also have the options of posting a tribute to their mentor or mentors on WhoMentoredYou.org, to become a mentor in their local communities, and/or make a financial contribution to a mentoring program.

Dr. Jay A. Winsten, as associate dean at the Harvard School of Public Health stated that, ''Youth mentoring is a highly effective public health intervention. Research has shown that programs that rely on volunteer mentors can play a powerful role in reducing drug abuse and youth violence, while greatly enhancing a young person's prospects for leading a healthy and productive life.'' Mentoring is a long-standing tradition where mentors provide guidance, support, encouragement and aid in promoting positive outcomes, in the areas of career and social development in helping young people realize and reach their full potential.

I agree with Ms. Nicola Goren, the Director of the Corporation, in the regard that, ''Our nation's success depends on helping every child succeed and reach their full potential in life and that mentoring strengthens our nation's economic and social well-being by influencing the life choices of young people with a caring adult.''

More than 4,700 mentoring programs in communities of all sizes across the United States focus on building strong relationships and 3,000,000 young people are in mentoring programs throughout the United States. In making January a month-long celebration of mentoring, it will call action to the important role and responsibility that all mentors play in the shaping of the young people of America, and will encourage more individuals and organizations to become engaged in this nationwide effort across this great Nation in building awareness of this national initiative and campaign for mentorship for our youth. I would like to personally encourage all the members of Congress to either become a mentor or to encourage a friend or family member today to become a mentor, not only for our youth, but for this country.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I urge adoption of this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 990, which recognizes January as National Mentoring Month.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 990.

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. WOOLSEY. Madam 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 MESSIAH COLLEGE

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1030) congratulating Messiah College men's and women's soccer teams on winning the 2009 NCAA Division III national championships.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1030

Whereas Messiah College men's and women's soccer teams won the 2009 NCAA Division III championships on December 5, 2009, against Calvin College and Washington University-St. Louis;

Whereas the 2009 championship was the seventh national championship for Messiah College men's soccer team since 2000 and the third national championship for the women's team since 2000;

Whereas Messiah College is the only college in the NCAA to win both the men's and women's soccer national championship in the same year;

Whereas Messiah College is a Christian liberal arts college that was founded in 1909 and is located in Grantham, Pennsylvania;

Whereas Messiah College has 22 intercollegiate athletic teams that have won 11 NCAA national championships; and

Whereas Messiah College encourages athletes to develop their athletic excellence and to develop character: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) congratulates Messiah College men's and women's soccer teams on winning the 2009 NCAA Division III national championships; and

(2) recognizes Messiah College for excellence in academics, athletics, and character.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend and insert extraneous material on House Resolution 1030 into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Messiah College men's and women's soccer teams on winning the 2009 NCAA Division III national championship against Calvin College and Washington State University-St. Louis, respectively.

Messiah is the only NCAA institution to claim men's and women's soccer national championships in the same season. Messiah College men's team won their national championship game 2–0 and provided the men's team with its seventh national title in the last 10 seasons—an NCAA Division III all-time best, to say the least.

Messiah College women's team collected its third national championship and second championship in a row capping a 3-year run in which the Falcons' only loss was to Wheaton College in the 2007 title match. After outscoring their opponents by a 20–1 margin in last year's NCAA tournament, the Messiah College women posted just seven goals in their final five games this year winning four contests 1–0, one in double overtime.

Congratulations are in order for head coaches Brad McCarty and Scott Frey. McCarty was recently named head coach of the Messiah men's soccer program and became the seventh head coach in the program's storied 42-year history. Before becoming head coach, McCarty helped Messiah to five of its six national championships as an assistant coach.

As for the women's coach, Scott Frey has compiled a record of 156 wins, 12 losses, and 8 ties in his 8 seasons with the women's soccer program. Winning over 90 percent of his games, he was placed on the Winningest Active Coaches list.

The success of both the men's and women's soccer teams is a testament to Messiah College's commitment to excellence. They have won 10 national soccer championships combined in the past 10 years.

Not only does Messiah College excel athletically, but they are also a premier academic institution. The school

is a nationally ranked private Christian college with a socially, denominationally, and politically diverse student body of 2,800 undergraduate students. Located in Grantham, Pennsylvania, Messiah College awards bachelor of arts and bachelor of science degrees in more than 55 majors.

Madam Speaker, once again, I congratulate the Messiah College soccer program for their success, and I thank Representative PLATTS for bringing this bill forward.

I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 1030, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 1030 congratulating Messiah College men's and women's soccer teams on winning the 2009 NCAA Division III national championships.

Messiah College is a private Christian college that was founded in 1909 and is located in Grantham, Pennsylvania. Messiah's mission is ''to educate men and women toward maturity of intellect, character, and Christian faith in preparation for lives of service, leadership, and reconciliation in church and society.'' The college's mission reflects its dedication to developing students' character, as well as their intellect.

Messiah College offers 60 majors in five different schools and has been ranked as one of the top 10 best colleges for comprehensive bachelor's degrees in the north by U.S. News and World Report. Messiah College obviously boasts an excellent athletic program. Of the 22 intercollegiate athletic teams at Messiah, the men's and women's soccer teams are the college's two most winning teams. The Messiah College Falcons, both their men's and women's soccer teams, won the 2009 NCAA Division III national championship on December 5. This victory was the seventh national championship since 2000 for the men and the third since 2000 for the women. Messiah claimed the third and only men's and women's dual national championships in NCAA history.

In the championship games, head coaches Brad McCarty and Scott Frey led the men's and women's soccer teams to a 2–0 victory against Calvin College and a 1–0 victory against Washington University of St. Louis. Jared Clugston was voted the most valuable defense player, and Geoff Pezon won the most valuable offensive title at the tournament.

So I congratulate Messiah College, the men's and women's teams, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 1030 congratulating Messiah College men's and women's soccer teams on winning the 2009 NCAA Division III national championships, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1030.

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.

□ 1445

NATIONAL SCHOOL COUNSELING WEEK

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1029) expressing support for designation of the week of February 1 through February 5, 2010, as ''National School Counseling Week''.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1029

Whereas the American School Counselor Association has declared the week of February 1 through February 5, 2010, as ''National School Counseling Week'';

Whereas the House of Representatives has recognized the importance of school counseling through the inclusion of elementary and secondary school counseling programs in the last reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965;

Whereas school counselors have long advocated that the education system of the United States must provide equitable opportunities for all students;

Whereas school counselors have long emphasized the importance of personal and social development in academic achievement;

Whereas school counselors help develop well-rounded students by guiding them through their academic, personal, social, and career development;

Whereas school counselors play a vital role in ensuring that students are aware of financial aid and college opportunities;

Whereas school counselors may encourage students to pursue challenging academic courses to prepare them for college majors and careers in the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics fields;

Whereas school counselors provide support for students whose family members have been deployed to conflicts overseas;

Whereas school counselors help students cope with serious and common challenges of growing up, including peer pressure, mental health issues, school violence, disciplinary problems, and problems in the home;

Whereas school counselors are also instrumental in helping students, teachers, and parents deal with personal trauma and community and national tragedies;

Whereas school counselors are among the few professionals in a school building that are trained in both education and mental health;

Whereas, despite the important contributions of school counselors to student success, counseling positions are not always protected when local budgets are cut, especially in tough economic times;

Whereas the average student-to-counselor ratio in America's public schools, 475-to-1, is almost double the 250-to-1 ratio recommended by the American School Counselor Association, the American Counseling Association, and other organizations;

Whereas the celebration of ''National School Counseling Week'' would increase awareness of the important and necessary role school counselors play in the lives of students in the United States; and

Whereas the week of February 1 through February 5, 2010, would be an appropriate week to designate as ''National School Counseling Week'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States House of Representatives—

(1) honors and recognizes the contributions of school counselors to the success of students in our Nation's elementary and secondary schools; and

(2) encourages the people of the United States to observe ''National School Counseling Week'' with appropriate ceremonies and activities that promote awareness of the crucial role school counselors play in preparing students for fulfilling lives as contributing members of society.

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

The gentlewoman from California is recognized.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H. Res. 1029 into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 1029, which recognizes the impact that school counselors have in students' lives throughout the country. It encourages the observance of February 1 through 5 as National School Counseling Week.

School counselors play an essential role in students', teachers', and families' lives. National data show that school counselors improve teacher quality, bolster student achievement, and lower dropout rates. Additionally, research demonstrates that students who receive social and emotional support and other services carried out by school counselors achieve higher academic results.

Our education system employs school counselors at all levels, in elementary, middle, and high school, as well as in district supervisory positions. The educational backgrounds of school counselors qualify them to work with students to address their academic, personal, social, and career development needs. Through the implementation of a school counseling program, counselors offer a range of services to students. They also offer these services to parents, guardians, other school staff, and the community at large. School counselors assist with curriculum design and implementation, offer individual guidance and counseling, and other intervention activities that meet immediate student needs. Examples include education on mental health

issues, school violence prevention, social and career skills training, college guidance and preparation, as well as conflict resolution.

Day in and day out, Madam Speaker, school counselors work tirelessly to provide academic, college preparatory, career, and emotional support to our children. Through their leadership and advocacy, school counselors strive to foster healthy school environments that promote equity and access to quality educational experiences for every student.

I thank the American School Counselor Association and the National Education Association for supporting this important resolution and the work of counselors in our schools. National School Counseling Week reminds us that the crucial role counselors play is absolutely important in every student's life.

Madam Speaker, again, I support this resolution and thank Congresswoman LINDA SÁNCHEZ for bringing this resolution forward. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 1029 that expresses support for the designation of the week of February 1 through February 5 2010 as National School Counseling Week, even though that is only 5 days. But I guess that is a school week.

School counselors serve as a valuable resource to students across the Nation. School counselors assist students with the transition from secondary education to higher education or the workforce. They help students cope with trauma and difficult family issues, assist students and teachers in dealing with behavioral problems, and they serve as a resource for students dealing with the challenges of becoming adults.

School counselors also serve as a resource for parents and educators. They assist parents in communicating with their kids, and provide parents with important information to help their kids transition to higher education or the workforce. They work with teachers and parents to help students explore their potential and set realistic education and career goals. They often serve as a third party to mediate between parent-teacher or student-teacher or parent-student relationships.

National School Counseling Week highlights the importance of school counselors and the valuable assistance that they provide students, parents, and teachers. This year's theme is ''Celebrate School Counseling.'' The theme aims to focus public attention on the unique contributions of professional school counselors.

I spent far many too years of my life teaching in the public school system. I have known many counselors, and I have appreciated their efforts and have respected their efforts and their goals even as I have harassed them on their particular jobs.

With that, I express my sincere gratitude to all school counselors. I recognize their contribution to our Nation's youth. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to recognize the gentlewoman from California (Congresswoman LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ), the sponsor of the legislation, for as much time as she may consume.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. I want to thank my colleague from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Resolution 1029 and support the goals of National School Counseling Week. I want to thank Chairman GEORGE MILLER and Ranking Member JOHN KLINE, as well as Representative VERN EHLERS, for their support of this resolution.

I introduced this resolution to recognize the tireless efforts of a group of professionals who have dedicated themselves to children and to their education: school counselors.

I wish to take this opportunity to recognize a few of the diligent and hardworking school counselors from California's 39th District. Angela Castellanos of Santa Fe High School in Whittier, California, and Alex Paredes of Southeast High School in South Gate, California, are just two examples of counselors who do exceptional work every single day to help our students reach their highest potential. It is because of their unending dedication and the dedication of counselors like Angela and Alex that children across our country succeed in becoming engineers, doctors and, yes, even Members of Congress.

School counselors play a vital role in the development of our students, not just on academic, but on social and personal levels as well. Unfortunately, there simply aren't enough of them. Counselors often find themselves the casualty of budget cuts. In California, for example, the student-to-counselor ratio is a dismal 945 students to one counselor. That's 945 students to one counselor, almost four times the recommended ratio.

Our secondary school counselors work vigorously to increase graduation rates, identify problems in our schools, and improve morale by inspiring students to challenge themselves and explore new opportunities.

Primary counselors often help identify students with health problems or disabilities that interfere with learning. They also help youngsters to cope with traumatic events, from moving to a new school to the death of a parent.

Our counselors do amazing and often unrecognized work. Our communities are strengthened by the students who are championed by their school counselors. I urge my colleagues to support this effort to recognize the outstanding work that counselors do to ensure that our children's future is full of promise. I thank again my colleague.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I have no other speakers. Is the gentlelady from California ready to yield back?

Ms. WOOLSEY. I am ready to yield back.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Then with that, I urge adoption of this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 1029, which recognizes the impact that school counselors have in students' lives and encourages the observation of February 1 through February 5 as National School Counseling Week.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, today I rise in support of House Resolution 1029. This resolution designates the week of February 1 through February 5 as "National School Counseling Week." It is extremely vital that we recognize those very people who mentor and motivate our youth to do their very best. Our Nation's school counselors work everyday to ensure every child has opportunities for personal and educational growth. With very little resources, they help some kids stay in school and help others cope with personal tragedies. They help our children dream big and prepare for careers from manufacturing to medicine to becoming tomorrow's future leaders. Thus it is vital we support and honor those who play key roles in our children's success and life.

The national "drop out" rate has increased to 6.2 million students in the United States ranging in age from 16 and 24. This pressing issue is of utter importance and should be addressed with urgency as it pertains to our youth. These statistics are hard to believe. Only half of the high school students in the Nation's 50 largest cities are graduating in four years. Marguerite Kondracke, president and CEO of America's Promise, says that each year dropouts represent $320 billion in lost lifetime earning potential. The difference in lifetime salary for a dropout and a high school graduate is about $300,000. This is why it is really important for students to have counselors who are instrumental in encouraging students to stay in school and motivate them to succeed.

This subject is near and dear to my heart. In Houston, we have one of the highest drop out rates in the country. Houston Independent School District's, HISD's, dropout rate is at least 18 percent. It is one of the biggest challenges we are having. Many students need the extra push to truly value education and to stay in school. In the current global economy, having at least a high school diploma is a critical step for avoiding poverty, and a college degree is a prerequisite for a well-paying job. The costs of dropping out of high school today are substantial and have risen over time, especially for young men, who find it almost impossible to earn an adequate income to take care of themselves and their families.

By contrast, adults with high school diplomas contribute major fiscal benefits to the country over their lifetime. The combined lifetime fiscal benefits—including the payment of payroll, Federal, and State income taxes—could amount to more than $250,000 per graduated student. Such a public fiscal benefit more than outweighs the estimated cost of enrolling a student who has dropped out.

The average counselor-to-student ratio in America's public schools is a mere one 1 to

475, a ratio that means school counselors must work extremely hard to meet the individual educational needs of students. Yet, despite their limited supply, counselors are always there in a pinch: counselors are instrumental in helping children and their families cope with trauma, whether a natural disaster or a family death.

As many of you know, professional secondary school counselors are also an integral part of the effort to increase graduation rates. School counselors identify potential problems early in a student's academic career and make sure that they are addressed before students become overwhelmed and drop out. School counselors also inspire children to achieve better futures for themselves and their communities through education.

Once again, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution in honoring our school counselors who do so much and rarely get recognition for their hard work.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1029.

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.

CERVICAL HEALTH AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1011) recognizing the importance of cervical health and of detecting cervical cancer during its earliest stages and supporting the goals and ideals of Cervical Health Awareness Month.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1011

Whereas approximately 11,270 women were diagnosed with, and approximately 4,070 women died from cervical cancer in the United States in 2009;

Whereas cervical cancer occurs most often in Hispanic women, at a rate that is more than twice what is seen in non-Hispanic White women;

Whereas African-American women develop cervical cancer about 50 percent more often than non-Hispanic White women;

Whereas half of the women diagnosed with the disease are between 35 and 55 years of age, and approximately 20 percent of diagnoses are made in women older than 65;

Whereas cervical cancer is usually a slow-growing cancer that may not have symptoms, and is primarily caused by the human papillomavirus (HPV), but can be detected by Papanicolaou tests (Pap tests) or other early detection tests;

Whereas the earlier cervical cancer is detected the better chance a woman has of surviving cervical cancer;

Whereas cervical cancer patients and survivors have shown tremendous courage and determination in the face of adversity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of Cervical Health Awareness Month;

(2) recognizes the importance of good cervical health and of detecting cervical cancer during its earliest stages;

(3) urges healthcare advocates to continue to raise public awareness about cervical cancer and the importance of early detection;

(4) urges the people of the United States to learn about cervical cancer and its causes, most notably human papillomavirus (HPV), and the importance of early detection; and

(5) recognizes the patients and survivors of cervical cancer and their families for their tremendous courage and determination.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rules, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PALLONE. Madam 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 in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield to myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H. Res. 1011, supporting the goals and ideals of Cervical Health Awareness Month.

According to the American Cancer Society, over 11,000 American women will receive the news that they have cervical cancer this year, and over 4,000 women will die due to this disease.

The earlier cervical cancer is detected, the better chance a woman has of surviving. Cellular changes that precede cervical cancer can be detected by Pap tests or other early detection methods. With early detection, women can get treatment that prevents the disease from progressing to a later stage.

As a result of the increase in prevention, we are beginning to see a decrease in the number of women who get and die from cervical cancer. But we still have more work to do, especially in the minority populations. African American women and Hispanic women, for example, are 50 percent more likely to develop cervical cancer than non-Hispanic white women and are also more likely to die from the disease.

And that is why this resolution, Madam Speaker, before us today is so important. We must increase awareness of cervical cancer and promote testing to ensure early detection so that we can further reduce the numbers of women who succumb to cervical cancer every year.

The resolution before us today supports the goals and ideals of Cervical Health Awareness Month. It acknowledges the importance of early detection as a crucial tool in treating and surviving the disease, and supports heightened awareness about prevention of cervical cancer.

I want to thank my colleague, the sponsor of the legislation, Representative DEBBIE HALVORSON from Illinois, for her work in raising this important issue. I urge my colleagues to pass this resolution, Madam Speaker.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I wish to thank the chairman of the Subcommittee on Health of the Energy and Commerce Committee for bringing this important piece of legislation to the floor. And I am a cosponsor of H. Res. 1011, sponsored by Representative DEBORAH HALVORSON from the State of Illinois.

This month, January, is national Cervical Health Awareness Month, and it is important, it is fitting that we highlight the educational efforts that have been made to increase early detection of cervical cancer. Almost half of the women that are diagnosed with this life-threatening disease are between the ages of 35 and 55. They actually fall into two populations. In one population, the disease is relatively slow to evolve. Obviously, in this group, the detection of precancerous and pre-invasive changes allows for treatment of this disease to be relatively straightforward. But there is a second population, fortunately a much smaller population, where the disease behaves with sometimes frightening speed. The disease can be so aggressive as to go from a normal test to an actual invasive cancer within a year's time, and it is this group of individuals where these tests may, in fact, be life-saving.

That is why it is so important that we highlight the awareness of cervical health. The month of January is more than half over. But the need for cervical cancer awareness and education should continue throughout the entire year.

Awareness is the leading cause in the annual decline in deaths from cervical disease. The survival rate of individuals who have cervical cancer is 96 to 99 percent when detected in the early stages versus only a 15 to 20 percent survival rate when cervical cancer is diagnosed after it has spread beyond the confines of the cervix. It is because of successful programs that encourage early diagnosis, such as national Cervical Health Awareness Month, that Americans can lead full and active lives.

By supporting the observance of national Cervical Health Awareness Month, we have the opportunity to encourage women to educate themselves about this disease and about the screening methods that are available to them.

Madam Speaker, I urge all Members to support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1500

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to

the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. HALVORSON), who is the sponsor of the legislation.

Mrs. HALVORSON. I want to thank Congressman PALLONE. I would also like to thank my colleagues for recognizing me on behalf of this very important and timely resolution.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1011, commemorating the goals and ideals of Cervical Health Awareness Month, and I urge my colleagues to support its passage. January has long been recognized as Cervical Health Awareness Month, particularly throughout the public health, women's health, and cervical health advocacy communities.

Today we commemorate the hard work and sacrifice that has been made by these patients, their families, and those who have been confronted by this disease. We also honor the health care providers and advocates that tirelessly work to treat this disease and work to educate the general public on its causes and treatments.

Madam Speaker, cervical cancer is usually a very slow-growing cancer that may not present any symptoms. And it is primarily caused by the human papillomavirus, HPV, but can be detected by early detection tests. It is estimated that 4,000 women in the United States die of cervical cancer every year, and approximately 11,000 new cases will be detected just this year. Half of those women diagnosed with the disease are, as has been said, between 35 and 55 years of age. And approximately 20 percent of all those diagnoses are made in women who are older than 55 years of age. In the vast majority of cases, these deaths could be prevented with early detection, and by being educated and aware of causes, screenings, and medical treatments.

According to data from the Centers for Disease Control, cervical cancer is the easiest female cancer to prevent, and yet it was the number one cause of death from cancer in women. But for the first time in history, we have the potential for significantly reducing, if not eliminating, the number of victims of this cancer through advancements in treatments and procedures that aid in prevention.

So in keeping with the goals and the ideals of Cervical Health Awareness Month, I encourage the people of the United States to learn about cervical cancer, its causes and its treatments, and I encourage health care advocates to continue to raise public awareness about cervical cancer and the importance of early detection, because the earlier cervical cancer is detected, the better the chance a woman has in surviving cervical cancer.

Once again, I would like to thank you all for allowing H. Res. 1011 to come to the floor today, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of its passage.

Mr. BURGESS. As a fellow in the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists before I came to Congress, I recognize the importance of Cervical Health Awareness Month. And yes, while we are focusing on testing today, the gentlelady is quite correct in that newer tests, newer methods, newer abilities to prevent this disease from happening are occurring even as we speak.

Certainly to the health care community out there that has done such a great job at providing information to their patients, providing early detection and treatment to their patients, we owe a debt of gratitude. The work is not yet done, and I again encourage passage of this legislation.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 1011, to recognize the importance of cervical health and of detecting cervical cancer during its earliest stages and supporting the goals and ideals of Cervical Health Awareness Month, introduced by my distinguish colleague Representative DEBORAH L. HALVORSON, from Illinois. This legislation will solidify that we, the United States Congress: (1) support all the initiatives of Cervical Health Awareness Month; (2) Recognize the importance of earlier detection; and (3) advocate and encourage education on the subject.

Madam Speaker, the origin of Cervical Health Awareness Month was established to enhance awareness of the prevention of cervical cancer, particularly the importance of screening for this malignancy. It is my hope that Congress continues to support these current and future efforts to make our constituents more knowledgeable.

According to the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, in 2009, an estimated 11,270 new cases of cervical cancer were diagnosed in the U.S., and the disease caused over 4,000 deaths. The Pap test is a highly effective tool in detecting cervical cancer at its earliest and most treatable stages. In fact, regular cervical screening tests can actually find precancerous changes before they become dangerous and turn into cancer.

I support any enterprise which cultivates organized successful health promotion events and campaigns. Getting new ideas, information and resources on Cervical Cancer and the prevention of it, is something that this Congress must emphasize.

By passing this resolution, we are making a monumental statement that we care. We care about the patients and survivors of this cancer; we care about the families of the ones who were taken by this disease; and most of all we care about the life and life more abundantly. By passing this legislation, we are also reaffirming that Congress is not an ambiguous body of unsympathetic individuals with no grasp of the world outside these walls. We have families; we have mothers, daughters and sisters, that can be affected by this cancer and we will not stand for lives perishing because of a lack of knowledge and available prevention and treatment!

Mr. BURGESS. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1011.

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. PALLONE. Madam 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.

NATIONAL INFLUENZA VACCINATION WEEK

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1003) expressing support for the designation of January 10, 2010, through January 16, 2010, as National Influenza Vaccination Week, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1003

Whereas National Influenza Vaccination Week may provide an important opportunity to encourage seasonal flu and H1N1 vaccination at a time when demand for flu vaccines usually drops significantly but the risk for infection remains;

Whereas each year 5 to 20 percent of the population in the United States gets the flu, an average of more than 200,000 people are hospitalized from flu-related complications, and about 36,000 people die from flu-related causes;

Whereas between April and mid-November, the United States saw approximately 47,000,000 cases of the 2009 H1N1 flu, more than 200,000 hospitalizations, and nearly 10,000 deaths;

Whereas the United States is fortunate that the flu activity has declined in recent weeks, but flu experts warn that the public is still at risk of infection and we should also prepare for a possible third wave of H1N1 flu;

Whereas people in the United States have a window of opportunity to get the H1N1 vaccine and lessen the impact of, or even prevent, another wave of illness;

Whereas getting vaccinated is a shared responsibility to protect families and communities that is safe and effective, and it is the best defense against all types of flu;

Whereas seasonal flu vaccines have been safely used for more than 60 years and data compiled for H1N1 vaccines indicate a similarly excellent safety profile;

Whereas information on seasonal flu vaccine distribution and availability is available at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's (CDC) www.Flu.gov Web site;

Whereas over 135,000,000 doses of the H1N1 vaccine are now available, with more coming every day;

Whereas Congress recognizes the hard work of public health officials in responding to the 2009 H1N1 flu;

Whereas one of the goals, in addition to fostering continuing influenza vaccination, of National Influenza Vaccination Week is to engage H1N1 at-risk audiences who are not yet vaccinated;

Whereas when the vaccine was first made available, the CDC's Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP) recommended that vaccination efforts should

focus first on people in five target groups who are at higher risk for the 2009 H1N1 influenza or related complications;

Whereas the five target groups for H1N1 are pregnant women, people who live with or provide care for infants younger than 6 months, health care and emergency medical services personnel, people 6 months through 24 years of age, and people 25 years through 64 years of age who have certain medical conditions that put them at higher risk for influenza-related complications;

Whereas Monica Rodriguez, a pregnant mother from El Monte, California, could likely have prevented her death if she was able to get vaccinated;

Whereas January 13 is Families Flu Vaccination Day and will highlight the importance of the 2009 H1N1 vaccination for pregnant women, children, and caregivers of children less than 6 months of age;

Whereas H1N1 flu shots are widely available and everyone, even those not in the high-risk groups are urged to get vaccinated;

Whereas the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services as well as State and local public health departments and other partners, such as Families Fighting Flu, are planning National Influenza Vaccination Week events around the country and have additional information available at www.cdc.gov/flu/NIVW/;

Whereas the American Public Health Association, the Association of State and Territorial Health Officials, Families Fighting Flu, the Infectious Diseases Society of America, the American Medical Association, the American Nurses Association, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, the National Environmental Health Association, the National Association of Nurse Practitioners in Women's Health, the American Association of Colleges of Nursing, the Society for Healthcare Epidemiology of America, the American Osteopathic Association, the National Association of Community Health Centers, the National Association of Pediatric Nurse Practitioners, the American Red Cross, the American Academy of Physician Assistants, the National Hispanic Medical Association, the American College of Emergency Physicians, the American College of Preventive Medicine, the National Alliance for Hispanic Health, the International Association of Firefighters, the American Academy of Family Physicians, the Association for Profession in Infection Control and Epidemiology, the American Pharmacists Association, the American College Health Association, the American College of Physicians, the National Family Planning and Reproductive Health Association, the National Association of School Nurses, the Association of Maternal and Child Health Programs, the National Association of Children's Hospitals and Related Institutions, the National Community Pharmacists Association, the American Hospital Association, the Federation of American Hospitals, Epocrates, the American Academy of Neurology, the National Association of County and City Health Officials, and the Association of Occupational Health Professionals in Healthcare support the H1N1 flu vaccine; and

Whereas people can find seasonal and H1N1 vaccine distribution information by checking the www.Flu.gov Web site that identifies clinics that have influenza vaccine available: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the designation of National Influenza Vaccination Week, including raising public awareness that vaccination is the best defense against the flu; and

(2) encourages people in the United States to get vaccinated, especially those with underlying health conditions, pregnant women, children, young adults, caretakers of infants, and healthcare workers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PALLONE. Madam 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 in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield to myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H. Res. 1003, expressing support for the designation of January 10 through January 16, 2010, as National Influenza Vaccination Week. In the 6 months between April and mid-November, there were approximately 47 million cases of the 2009 H1N1 flu in the United States. More than 200,000 individuals were hospitalized, and tragically, nearly 10,000 people lost their lives to this illness. One of those individuals was Monica Rodriguez, who died in October 2009, before the H1N1 vaccine was available.

Ms. Rodriguez, a constituent of Representative JUDY CHU's, was the mother of three children, and was 5 months pregnant at the time she died. As a pregnant woman, Monica was considered a high risk, and would have been on the priority list to get the vaccine as soon as it was ready. Vaccines save lives. And had the vaccine been available, it could have saved her life.

Though flu activity has declined in recent weeks, experts warn that the risk for contracting the flu is still great. We must prepare for a possible third wave of H1N1 flu, and Americans must remain vigilant about preventing infection of the H1N1 virus and the seasonal flu. In both instances, the vaccines can help protect against these illnesses.

Now the resolution before us today shows our support for National Influenza Vaccination Week, which is sponsored by the Centers for Disease Control. By supporting this resolution, Congress will help urge all Americans to take advantage of the supply of vaccine available to prevent further needless deaths from the H1N1 virus or seasonal flu.

I want to thank my colleague, Representative CHU, for her work on this important issue. I urge my colleagues to pass this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise today in support of H. Res. 1003, supporting the designation of January 10 through January 16 as National Influenza Vaccination Week. I would like to thank the numerous associations and health professionals for their work in this regard. The National Influenza Vaccination Week is an important opportunity to encourage those vulnerable to seasonal flu and those vulnerable to H1N1 to avail themselves of a vaccination.

Although there has been a major decrease in the number of cases of H1N1, those who have not been vaccinated should consider how important it is to protect not only themselves, but the health of their family, their community, and of course their own well-being.

Currently, there are well over 130,000 doses of the H1N1 vaccine available, and we are told that there is more coming every day. For those wondering where they can get more information about the seasonal flu vaccines and the H1N1, they can visit the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's www.flu.gov Web site.

Again, I want to thank all of the health professionals for their efforts to lower the impact of the illness this flu season. I stand in support of this legislation, and urge my colleagues to join me.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I would like to recognize now the sponsor of the legislation, the gentlewoman from California, Representative CHU, for as much time as she may consume.

Ms. CHU. Thank you, Chairman PALLONE and Chairman WAXMAN, for your assistance in getting this resolution presented to the House floor.

It is January 26, and several months of flu season are still before us. Many people are still at risk of contracting H1N1 but have not gotten the vaccination that would save their lives. Months before cold and flu season began, the media and health professionals warned us about the potential complications from this new strain of flu, H1N1. And indeed, this virus killed over 10,000 people last year.

The purpose of this resolution is to remind people that the threat is not over, and that it is imperative that they get their H1N1 vaccination. Such a vaccination would have helped one of my constituents, Monica Rodriguez. Monica was a wife, mother of three children, and 5 months pregnant. After experiencing severe flu symptoms, including fever, congestion, and cough, Monica went twice in 24 hours to a hospital in El Monte, but she was turned away with only cough syrup to numb the pain, which did little to help the underlying illness.

Days later, after only getting worse, Monica returned to the hospital, where she was immediately admitted into intensive care, but it was too late. On October 25, 2009, Monica and her unborn child passed away from complications of the H1N1 virus. Monica's husband, Jorge Gonzalez, wants others to know his wife's story so that they can receive proper care. Many may believe

that the risk of death from H1N1 no longer exists, but flu experts warn that we should prepare for a possible third wave of H1N1.

Americans definitely have a window of opportunity of getting this vaccine and lessening the impact, or even preventing, another wave of illness. And Monica's husband Jorge would tell you that he wished a vaccine was available to save his wife's life.

The threat of H1N1 is clearly not over. Getting vaccinated is the most important step to preventing the spread of influenza. That is why I have authored this resolution, which recognizes National Influenza Vaccination Week. In contrast to last year, the H1N1 vaccine is now widely available. The risk of contracting flu is still high, and we have several months of flu season before us. Today with this resolution we have another opportunity to get the word out and to remind the public that it is the time to protect yourself.

Many public health departments, hospitals, doctors and nurses are doing a good job of preventing and treating the 22 million cases of H1N1 across the country. However, we must not be complacent and let patients like Monica slip through the cracks. In fact, we must remind everyone to get the H1N1 vaccine.

Today you can easily find the shot, such as online at flu.gov. And of course, we must not forget those who are still at greatest risk, pregnant women like Monica, people who care for infants, health care and emergency medical services personnel, those under the age of 24, and people with medical conditions that put them at higher risk for influenza-related complications.

Please join me and the 22 health organizations that have endorsed this resolution in showing support for National Influenza Vaccination Week and spreading the message that getting vaccinated is the first step towards preventing the flu. Its passage will not only avert another wave of H1N1 but will honor Monica Rodriguez and all those who have suffered or died from the virus.

List of Healthcare Organizations that Support H. Res. 1003: American Academy of Neurology, American Academy of Pediatrics, American Academy of Physician Assistants, American Association of Colleges of Nursing, American College Health Association, American College of Preventative Medicine, American Nurses Association, American Pharmacists Association, American Public Health Association, American Society of Health-System Pharmacists, Association for Professionals in Infection Control and Epidemiology, Inc., Association of State and Territorial Health Officials, Families Fighting Flu, National Association of Children's Hospitals and Related Institutions, National Association of County and City Health Officials, National Association of Nurse Practitioners in Women's Health, National Community Pharmacists Association, National Environmental Health Association, National Family Planning and Reproductive Health Association, National Foundation for Infectious Diseases, The Society for Healthcare Epidemiology of America, Trust for America's Health.

Mr. BURGESS. You know, it is just about 10 months ago that we first began to hear about this novel strain of flu that was coming across the border from Mexico. My home State of Texas was affected severely early on. And it is amazing that within such a short period of time the virus was identified, isolated, the genetic sequence was known, and then a vaccination was developed, tested, found to be safe, and delivered into the hands of Americans shortly after the commencement of the school year this year.

We did lose many individuals to this illness, and for that we are sorry. But I would also stress that because of the efforts of the men and women who worked at the CDC, the National Institutes of Health, all the practitioners across this country who provided information and timely vaccination, the effect of this epidemic was significantly blunted over what it might have been. Those early telephone calls, those early conference calls in March and April of last year were nothing short of startling and alarming.

□ 1515

I do urge people to avail themselves of this vaccine before this flu season is over.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 1003; a resolution entitled "Expressing support for the designation of January 10, 2010, through January 16, 2010, as National Influenza Vaccination Week," and which also expresses the sentiments of the House of Representatives that preventing the spread of influenza and other infectious diseases should be a priority of all American citizens.

It is important that we recognize the important role that immunizations have in protecting Americans from influenza outbreaks. Seasonal influenza causes more than 200,000 hospitalizations and 36,000 deaths in the U.S. every year, and is the seventh leading cause of death in the U.S.

It is important that we mitigate this great threat to our citizens and equip all Americans with the necessary preventative measures to effectively combat both the seasonal flu as well as the H1N1 Influenza strain.

The flu can be very disruptive to business and trade as well. The economic and financial costs of seasonal influenza in the United States can be devastating due to employee absence from work, the high cost associated with medical care and the draw down in the financial activity of persons infected with the flu. In addition, lost earnings due to illness and loss of life amounted to over $15 billion annually and the total economic burden of annual influenza epidemics amounts to over $80 billion.

Again, it is important for us to alleviate this growing stress on our nation's economic and financial systems by equipping our citizens with the necessary tools to fight the flu.

Furthermore, both the seasonal flu and the H1N1 Influenza strain can be disruptive to important American pastimes such as cultural events as well as sporting events. In the event of a highly contagious infectious outbreak it would be likely that large gatherings of people could be cancelled in order to prevent the unnecessary spread of disease.

By informing American citizens of the benefits of influenza vaccines however, we can attempt to prohibit the influenza bug from spreading.

In addition it is important that American citizens remain vigilant in the fight against the H1N1 Influenza strain. There are currently over 135 million doses of the H1N1 vaccine available to Americans. It is important that citizens weigh the costs and benefits of such a shot before receiving it, but it is important for citizens to remain informed. For the very young and the elderly it can be very helpful in preventing disease but may also prevent unnecessary death.

That is why it is important for Americans to understand both the necessity and benefit that seasonal flu shots provide for its citizens.

This is also the reason I ask for your support of this resolution. The increased awareness that would come from designating the week of January 10, 2010 through January 16, 2010 as "National Influenza Vaccination Week" would serve to provide American citizens with the important information needed to prevent a larger-than-normal influenza outbreak as well as provide the necessary preventative measures to those who are at a higher risk for influenza-related complications.

I would also like to take this opportunity to encourage all Americans as well as those from my home town of Houston, Texas to get vaccinated against both the seasonal flu as well as the H1N1 Influenza strain. I would especially encourage people with underlying health conditions, pregnant women, children, young adults, caretakers of infants, and healthcare workers to get vaccinated in preparation for a possible third wave of H1N1 flu.

Officially establishing the week of January 10, 2010, through January 16, 2010 as "National Influenza Vaccination Week," would seek to improve the lives of our citizens as well as increase our citizen's awareness of the importance of both seasonal as well as H1N1 Influenza vaccinations.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution. I also ask my colleagues for their continued support in the fight against infectious and contagious diseases.

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, I oppose H. Res. 1003, designating January 10, 2010 through January 16, 2010 as National Influenza Vaccination Week. While I believe the American people should be made aware of infectious diseases and common sense preventative measures, I am concerned that this resolution continues the hysterical reaction from government officials to the swine flu outbreak.

As a physician, I have yet to see any evidence that justifies the current level of alarm. Influenza typically kills around 36,000 people every year in this country and hospitalizes a couple hundred thousand. In the almost a year since swine flu made its first appearance in the U.S., there have been only a handful of confirmed deaths attributable to this strain, and most of those sickened have or will fully recover. Every death is tragic, but I see no reason to deal with this flu outbreak any differently than we typically deal with any other flu season. Instead, the federal government has responded with invasive screening at airports, closing down schools and sporting events, and causing general panic.

There have also been discussions of mandating that certain populations be forced to receive the swine flu vaccine. I would remind my

colleagues that during the 1976 outbreak of swine flu only 1 America died from the flu, but mandatory vaccinations killed at least 25 before the program was abandoned.

Madam Speaker, the panicked reaction to swine flu outbreak demonstrates why the Federal Government should not become involved in health care. Instead, decisions as to how best to deal with infectious disease should be left to local communities, health care providers, and, most importantly of all, individual citizens. Patients should always have the right to make their own decision about whether or not to receive a vaccine after getting full information on both the risks and the benefits of vaccines from their health care provider.

Mr. BURGESS. I have no other speakers on my side, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I have no additional speakers. I urge passage of this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1003, 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. PALLONE. Madam 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.

EMERGENCY AID TO AMERICAN SURVIVORS OF THE HAITI EARTHQUAKE ACT

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2949) to amend section 1113 of the Social Security Act to provide authority for increased fiscal year 2010 payments for temporary assistance to United States citizens returned from foreign countries, to provide necessary funding to avoid shortfalls in the Medicare cost-sharing program for low-income qualifying individuals, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2949

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 ''Emergency Aid to American Survivors of the Haiti Earthquake Act''.

SEC. 2. INCREASE IN AGGREGATE PAYMENTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010 FOR TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE TO UNITED STATES CITIZENS RETURNED FROM FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

Section 1113(d) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1313(d)) is amended by striking ''September, 30, 2003'' and all that follows and inserting ''September 30, 2009, except that, in the case of fiscal year 2010, the total amount of such assistance provided during that fiscal year shall not exceed $25,000,000.''.

SEC. 3. QI PROGRAM FUNDING.

Section 1933(g)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396u–3(g)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (M), by striking ''$412,500,000'' and inserting ''$462,500,000''; and

(2) in subparagraph (N), by striking ''$150,000,000'' and inserting ''$165,000,000''.

SEC. 4. APPLICATION OF MEDICAID IMPROVEMENT FUND.

Section 1941(b)(1)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396w–1(b)(1)(A)) is amended by striking ''$100,000,000'' and inserting ''$10,000,000''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) be allowed to control 10 minutes of the time for debate on this bill.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S. 2949.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, 2 weeks ago, the largest earthquake ever recorded in Haiti wreaked havoc throughout the country.

Some of those affected by the devastation in Haiti are U.S. citizens who are now being evacuated back to the United States. We need to act today to continue a program that helps these Americans get back home.

The Repatriation Program provides assistance to U.S. citizens evacuating foreign countries due to a crisis by helping them secure and pay for connecting flights, temporary lodging, food, and medical assistance. Recipients of this assistance are expected to reimburse the government for such aid, unless repayment poses a significant hardship.

This program has an annual funding cap of only $1 million, which is far short of the funding needed to help all the U.S. citizens returning home. There were roughly 45,000 Americans living in Haiti when the earthquake hit, and over 14,000 have already been evacuated.

The bill before us increases the program's funding cap to $25 million for this year so that it can continue to serve U.S. citizens returning from Haiti.

It is worth noting that we have raised this program's annual funding cap in response to past international crises. Most recently, in 2006, Congress responded to a request from the Bush administration to increase the program's funding to help Americans evacuating Lebanon.

As sent over by the Senate, this bill also continues funding for another group of needy Americans, low-income senior citizens. A program known as QI that now helps Medicare beneficiaries with their part B premiums if their income is only slightly above the poverty line requires additional funding in order to continue to provide assistance to every State throughout the rest of the year. This legislation provides the necessary funding to address this shortfall and to ensure the program continues to operate.

The Congressional Budget Office reports that the cost of both of these provisions is fully offset by a reduction in the Medicaid Improvement Fund, which provides additional funding to HHS for program management.

In short, this bill helps people in great need of assistance without raising the deficit.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this effort to help Americans evacuating from Haiti and to continue assistance to Medicare beneficiaries.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of this Senate bill, S. 2949. As Representative MCDERMOTT described, it will provide assistance to thousands of Americans returning from Haiti following the devastating January 12 earthquake there.

Let me reiterate that we are helping American citizens with this legislation.

The bill, entitled Emergency Aid to American Survivors of the Haiti Earthquake Act, will ensure that State and local governments and charitable agencies on the ground in Florida, for example, and elsewhere have the resources to do exactly that.

Funding for those local efforts is provided through the Repatriation Program administered by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Each year, that program provides temporary assistance in the form of loans to U.S. citizens and their dependents arriving in the U.S. following an emergency. By law, currently the program is capped at $1 million per year.

This bill, which passed the Senate last night, temporarily increases that cap for 2010. As the legislation makes clear, and the Congressional Budget Office score confirms, this increase is entirely paid for by reducing spending in other areas. It does not raise the national debt.

This is similar to how Congress responded when demand for repatriation assistance swelled following the American evacuation of Lebanon in 2006. Congress stepped in to provide for the additional funds that were needed and paid for that additional funding through savings. That is the right approach. And, frankly, my constituents

would like to see this balanced budget approach applied across the board, not just to the smallest items.

For my part, I wish we were cutting funds in the bloated State Department budget to pay for this emergency. As I am sure my colleagues would agree, Congress should be looking for ways to save taxpayer dollars all the time, not just when new spending emergency needs come up. Unfortunately, since we are acting on a Senate bill, these concerns will have to wait for another day.

Before I yield, I would like to note the special importance this bill has for the State of Florida. Since so many of our returning citizens are arriving through my home State, I truly appreciate my colleagues supporting this bill and making sure that State and local agencies have the resources that they need to respond to this emergency.

The State Department suggests that there were approximately 45,000 U.S. citizens in Haiti and that they were there when the earthquake hit. As of yesterday, some 14,000 had already returned to the United States. I commend all the workers in Florida and across the country, whether with State or local government agencies, the Red Cross, our Armed Forces, or other agencies who are helping fellow citizens as they travel to their final destinations in the United States.

The House and Senate are to be commended for acting very quickly on this legislation. Passing the Emergency Aid to American Survivors of the Haiti Earthquake Act today is important to thousands of Americans who have been displaced and who need a helping hand to return home. I encourage support for this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in strong support of the Emergency Aid to American Survivors of the Haiti Earthquake Act, or S. 2949, which passed the Senate last night with bipartisan support.

As my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee have explained, this bill provides $25 million to enable the Secretary of HHS to reimburse States for the costs of providing temporary assistance to U.S. citizens who have returned from the catastrophe in Haiti without available resources.

I want to focus on the portion of the bill that provides temporary assistance for low-income Medicare beneficiaries under what is known as the Medicaid QI program.

Currently, Medicaid pays the Medicare part B premiums for low-income Medicare beneficiaries with incomes between 120 percent and 135 percent of the Federal poverty level. That translates to an income of between $13,000 and $14,600 per year.

Now, the monthly part B premium is $96.40 per month, or $1,157 per year. And this is 8 percent to 9 percent of the income of these low-income, elderly, and disabled Medicare beneficiaries. Obviously, having Medicaid pay this premium makes Medicare much more affordable for these people and eases their financial struggles.

This Medicaid payment comes from a fixed amount of funding for the QIs that is allocated among the States. According to the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, that fund is about $65 million short for this calendar year 2010. When the fund runs out, States have the option of continuing to pay the part B premiums for this population with their own funds or simply stopping new enrollment.

One State, Arizona, has already announced that it is capping its QI program this week in response to an estimated $2.8 million shortfall in its allotment. The State is going to give public notice and then deny all new Arizona applications. This will affect approximately 175 Medicare beneficiaries in Arizona each month.

While no other State has yet to stop enrollment, there are 21 States in addition to Arizona that have projected shortfalls in their QI funding. That includes Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Mississippi, Nevada, New York, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, and Vermont.

By filling this $65 million national QI funding shortfall for this calendar year, this bill will allow Arizona to uncap its QI program and help the other 21 States avoid capping theirs. Tens of thousands of low-income Medicare beneficiaries all over the country will be able to receive assistance with their part B premiums.

Madam Speaker, let me stress that this bill is fully paid for. It withdraws $90 million from the Medicaid Improvement Fund to offset both the cost of the temporary assistance for U.S. citizens returning from Haiti and the cost of funding the QI program shortfall. In fact, CBO estimates that the legislation will actually reduce the deficit by $14 million. So I think overall this is very good legislation, very helpful to the States, and certainly significant for those who are returning from Haiti. And I would urge my colleagues to suspend the rules and pass S. 2949.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. This legislation will ensure that American citizens returning from the devastation in Haiti in the days ahead will receive the same help and support as those who have already arrived and gotten their way home. It also will ensure that the many individuals hard at work assisting their fellow citizens will get the resources they need to continue these important efforts. I would ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

Mr. RANGEL. I want to thank my colleagues, and especially Dr. MCDERMOTT, for bringing this piece of legislation to the floor to give some assistance to American citizens who found themselves in Haiti during this tragedy. This comes under the Social Security system, and I'm glad that Dr. MCDERMOTT was able to bring it to the floor.

I have never been more proud of the Congress, my country, and, indeed, citizens throughout the world for rallying to the cause of these young people.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of S. 2949: The "Emergency Aid to American Survivors of the Haiti Earthquake Act." This bill would provide up to $25 million in Fiscal Year 2010 for a Department of Health and Human Services program which repatriates U.S. citizens from foreign countries. This assistance is vital to Americans who were living in Haiti when the earthquake struck as well as the families of those displaced who are now faced with the unexpected responsibility of supporting their repatriating relatives.

This repatriation assistance provides temporary assistance to citizens and their dependents who are identified by the Department of State as needing to return from a foreign country to the U.S. but who do not have the resources to do so.

As you know, on Tuesday, January 12th, a massive, 7.0 magnitude earthquake struck Haiti near the capital of Port-au-Prince. There is still no official estimate of death or destruction but the damage to buildings is extensive and the number of injured or dead is estimated to be in the hundreds of thousands.

The full dimensions of the disaster are still unfolding, but Haiti's Prime Minister Jean-Max Bellerive told CNN that he believes there are well over 100,000 dead, and leading senator Youri Latortue estimated the number at possibly as high as 500,000, according the Associated Press.

America is responding, and will continue to respond with immediate humanitarian assistance to help the people of this struggling island nation rebuild their livelihoods. I send my condolences to the people and government of Haiti as they grieve once again in the aftermath of a natural disaster. As Haiti's neighbor, I believe it is the United States' responsibility to help Haiti recover, and build the capacity to mitigate against future disasters.

America and her allies have already initiated a comprehensive, interagency response to the earthquake. The State Department, Department of Defense, Department of Homeland Security, Coast Guard, USAID—all worked overnight to ensure critical resources were positioned to support the response and recovery effort, including efforts to find and assist American citizens in Haiti.

Within days of last week's devastating earthquake, U.S. Southern Command deployed a team of 30 people to Haiti to support U.S. relief efforts in the aftermath of one of the largest natural disasters in the western hemisphere. The team included U.S. military engineers, operational planners, and a command and control group and communication specialists arriving on two C–130 Hercules aircraft. Since, there has been a tremendous interagency response with support and partnering with U.S. Embassy personnel as well as Haitian, United Nations and international officials

to assess the situation and facilitate follow-on U.S. military support.

Our friends in the international community must also be commended for their efforts. The United Nations is releasing $10 million from its emergency funds. The European Commission has approved €3 million ($4.37 million) with more funds likely. Countless other nations, from Germany to China to Israel to Mexico have also pledged support. I commend each of these nations for coming to our neighboring nation in dire need of assistance.

Many of my constituents have asked what they can do to help, or how they can find their loved ones. Those who are interested in helping immediately can text 'HAITI' to '90999' and a donation of $10 will be made automatically to the Red Cross for relief efforts. The donation will be charged to your cell phone bill.

The outpouring of support and funding from the American people was both instant and sustained. According to the Washington Post, the text messaging effort raised $5 million in its first day, breaking the previous one-day record of about $450,000. Text-message donations continue to play a larger-than-expected role in the push for earthquake relief in Haiti. As of late Sunday, the American Red Cross said that it had collected pledges of about $103 million, including $22 million through the text donation program. Each donor should be proud of their contribution to help their brothers and sisters in Haiti.

Financially, 2009 was not an easy year for many Americans. Although thousands of jobs were created and we are back on the road to economic recovery, Americans lived on tighter budgets than usual. This legislation passed today will allow those Americans who have generously donated money to Haiti to receive their tax break this year instead of next year.

In January of 2005, Congress enacted this type of relief for individuals that made charitable contributions to victims of the Indian Ocean tsunami that occurred in late December of 2004. That bill (H.R. 241 in the 109th Congress) passed the House of Representatives without objection and subsequently passed the Senate by unanimous consent. I hope that this legislation, like our response to the 2004 tsunami, will encourage Americans to contribute more money to Haiti. As Haiti starts on its long recovery, every dollar is critically important. Americans have responded in great numbers, and I am proud to represent such a compassionate and generous nation.

Americans are not only giving their money, they are also giving their time and expertise as well. This weekend, I arranged for a team of seven doctors, six nurses, two techs, and two search and rescue volunteers to fly to Haiti and provide immediate humanitarian support. This team led by Dr. Richard Toussaint from Forest Park Medical Center in Dallas Texas arrived in Haiti just after noon on Saturday. From there, the doctors made their way to Hospital Sacre-Couer where, in roughly two days, they performed about 70 amputations, surgically treated about 150 patients, and saw about 600 patients total. I commend this team of medical personnel for their selfless actions and willingness to spend their own time and money to come to the aid of people they had never met.

Additionally, I hosted a Houston-based Haiti relief effort called "Texans helping Haitians" with city leadership and the Haitian community in the aftermath of this horrible disaster. Groups included in the effort to provide supplies and medical assistance to Haiti were: Texas Medical Center, Texas Dental Association, Search and Rescue Organizations, the Haitian Multicultural Association, Haitian Caribbean Organization of Texas, Caribbean Impact Foundation, and Haiti Counts.

We also helped coordinate the safe return of six Houston Rotarians that were stranded in the mountains and we are now working with Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance on the transport of orphans to awaiting families here in the U.S. Our paramount duty is to protect Americans, and this bill will do exactly that.

In addition to providing temporary assistance directly to repatriates, the program also provides funds to States and other vendors to cover the administrative costs of providing temporary assistance to these individuals. This financial assistance is repayable to the U.S. government, unless waived by the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

Additionally, this legislation provides an additional $60 million in funding for the Qualifying Individual (QI) program, which allows States to fund the Medicare Part B premiums of near-poor seniors not eligible for Medicaid.

The bill's Haiti funding and the increased QI funds are paid for through transfers from the Medicaid Improvement Fund. The Medicaid Improvement Fund is a program intended to improve the management of the Medicaid program. The legislation cuts $90 million from that fund.

Medicare is a lifeline for Houston's seniors and this bill takes crucial steps toward strengthening it and providing the highest quality of care and benefits for our elderly.

In my home state of Texas, the need for a more efficient healthcare is more prevalent now than ever. One in four Texans, about 5.7 million people, or 24.5 percent of the state's population, has no health insurance coverage. An estimated 1,339,550 Texas children—20.2 percent of Texas children—are uninsured. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, Texas has the nation's highest percentage of uninsured residents. This poses consequences for every person, business and local government in the state who bear extra costs to pay for uncompensated care. If Medicare funding is allowed to be cut or capped, the number of uninsured will grow dramatically.

Once again, I am devastated by the immeasurable tragedy that occurred in Haiti. Along with my colleagues, I hope to visit Haiti in the near future to meet with their leaders and see what the United States can do to rebuild the shattered livelihoods. This bill will help two categories of Americans with no cost to the taxpayers. I strongly support this bill and urge my colleagues to join me in voting in favor of it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, it is difficult to comprehend the depth of tragedy and sorrow that has visited the poor island of Haiti. It is difficult to convey the depth of our sympathy and shock at the catastrophe that has befallen the Haitian people.

Madam Speaker, the extent of the misery, destruction and death is nearly beyond imagination. It surely puts our own national trials and tribulations into perspective.

Our national unity in pursuing efforts to relieve the suffering of the Haitian people has been tremendously encouraging, particularly as this unity has sprung up amid the division and vitriol that have plagued our national politics in recent months and years.

And while our efforts to bring aid to the Haitians must continue, and will continue, our first priority, our first obligation, our first solemn duty as Americans and members of the United States Congress is to rescue and provide immediate relief to the American citizens in Haiti who are victims of this tragic natural disaster.

I applaud Chairman RANGEL in the House and Chairman BAUCUS in the Senate for their swift and focused action. On short notice and in an environment of uncertainty they have crafted a bill that will ensure the U.S. government has the resources and authority it needs to provide emergency aid to American survivors of this earthquake.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 2949.

Two weeks ago today, Haiti was devastated by its largest earthquake in over two centuries.

The United States has been unparalleled in its efforts to assist Haiti in the wake of this catastrophe and it only makes sense that we would show the same compassion and generosity to the many Americans who were victims of this tragic disaster.

As my colleagues have shared, this bill will provide important temporary assistance to help U.S. citizens on a need basis as they return from Haiti and re-establish themselves here in the U.S.

When the earthquake struck, there were an estimated 45,000 Americans living in Haiti.

Since then, nearly 12,000 Americans have been evacuated.

This bill will help to cover the costs related to these repatriations.

Again, I rise in support of this important measure and if I may, would also like to take a moment to acknowledge the many Americans whose lives were lost as well in the earthquake.

My most sincere thoughts and prayers go out to all of the family and friends who lost loved ones that day.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I have no additional speakers. I urge passage of the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. I urge the passage of S. 2949, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 2949.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1530

POVERTY IN AMERICA AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1024) expressing

support for designation of January as Poverty in America Awareness Month.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1024

Whereas, in 2008, the Census Bureau found that the number of people living in poverty has jumped by nearly 2,600,000 to 39,800,000, the highest number since 1960;

Whereas that same report found that the percentage of people living in poverty, 13.2 percent, rose to the highest level since 1997;

Whereas, in 2008, the number of children who lived in poverty increased by 744,000 to 14,000,000;

Whereas the share of people in the United States who have incomes that fall below half of the Federal poverty line reached 5.7 percent, or 17,100,000 people, its highest level since 1994;

Whereas the next Census report on poverty will likely illustrate higher levels of poverty as the report will reflect data from 2009, a year in which the economy experienced substantial job loss and historic levels of long-term unemployment, leading some experts to project that the overall poverty rate may increase by 1.5 percentage points and the percentage of children living in poverty may increase by 6 percentage points in the next report;

Whereas, between 1989 and 2000, the overall poverty rate declined by 1.5 percentage points and child poverty decreased by 3.4 percentage points, those achievements have been nearly reversed as the overall poverty rate increased by 1.9 percentage points and child poverty increased by 2.8 percentage points from 2000 to 2008;

Whereas there is broad consensus among researchers and policy experts that the Federal poverty measure is outdated and inadequate in determining the depth and extent of poverty in the United States;

Whereas rising levels of poverty and economic hardship have a severe impact on the overall well-being of children in the Nation;

Whereas the U.S. Census Bureau and other organizations have highlighted the unmet needs that existed for some of the most vulnerable families prior to the recession;

Whereas while the Federal Government has provided critical assistance to needy individuals and families in their time of need, more can and should be done to strengthen the Nation's safety-net programs, and other programs investing in communities and families to ensure that all needy people in the United States have access to the support services for which they are eligible;

Whereas, during the present economic downturn, Congress should do more to help individuals and families rise out of poverty and maintain economic stability through the use of a variety of programs promoting education and training, childcare assistance, housing security, and related services; and

Whereas it would be appropriate to designate the month of January 2010 as Poverty in America Awareness Month: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) the House of Representatives—

(A) supports the designation of Poverty in America Awareness Month; and

(B) recognizes the important contributions of those individuals and organizations that have made a commitment to providing critical support and services to needy individuals and families; and

(2) it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(A) eradicating poverty in the United States should be the goal for all people in the United States, including all levels of government;

(B) the severe economic downturn has highlighted the need to ensure that the Nation's most vulnerable individuals and families are able to meet their most fundamental needs during a time of financial crisis; and

(C) Congress should recommit itself to helping individuals and families facing economic hardship receive the assistance they need and deserve in moving towards greater economic security through programs under Title IV of the Social Security Act and other related programs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Madam 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 H. Res. 1024.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of recognizing the designation of January as ''Poverty in America Awareness Month.''

In 2008, there were nearly 40 million Americans living in poverty, including one in every five children. There were also more than 49 million Americans living in households that the USDA calls ''food insecure,'' which is really just a technical way to say that those 49 million Americans—nearly one out of every four children—had experienced hunger. While poverty affects every segment of our population, these figures are drastically higher for children in single-parent families and in black and Latino households.

At the same time, a recent report showed that the top 1 percent of the richest Americans now hold the greatest proportion of our Nation's wealth since 1928. For the wealthiest Nation in the world, this is completely unacceptable, and we must readjust our priorities. In fact, the way we measure poverty is badly outdated.

The current poverty threshold is calculated by taking the cost of a minimal diet in 1955 and multiplying that number by 3 and then adjusting this amount for inflation. That method may have made some sense when the measure was created in the 1960s because the cost of food actually made up about one-third of a family's average expenditure, but today, families only spend about one-seventh of their income on food, and our current measure fails to capture the costs of basic necessities such as clothing, utilities, and shelter.

What we define as poverty no longer reflects at all what it really means to be poor in this country. Using our current method of measuring poverty, we don't even consider a family of four making just $23,000 poor. There's something wrong with our formula, and a majority of Americans agree with a higher threshold.

Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan famously said, ''You can't solve a problem until you first learn how to measure it.'' We are making great progress in moving toward the publication of a new measure of poverty that reflects the economic and social realities in this country. An accurate measurement is essential in determining how to best tackle this problem. If the moral cause of helping the poor doesn't serve as motivation to help struggling Americans rise out of poverty, maybe the economic argument will.

Economists estimate that persistent child poverty alone costs our society an estimated $500 million a year in lost productivity and increased spending on health care and the criminal justice system. More and more Americans are slipping through the mesh of our badly tattered safety net, and we are at risk of losing an entire generation.

As Congress discusses PAYGO and the deficit reduction agenda, I often hear the rhetoric that we can't drive up the deficit on the backs of our children. But we cannot abandon the needs of vulnerable groups with little political voice and certainly few lobbyists on K Street. Because the voices of the least among us are too often drowned out, we must take opportunities like this to draw attention to the realities facing poor Americans. Awareness is a critical step in finding solutions to improve the well-being of those living in poverty, so let us affirm the recognition of January as Poverty in America Awareness Month.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of House Resolution 1024, which expresses support for designating January as Poverty in America Awareness Month.

As I'm sure my colleagues would agree, awareness of poverty is something that Congress should never lose sight of, not for one single day. But it also should be noted that poverty can only be eliminated in this country when there are jobs available for every able-bodied man and woman. I know this firsthand because I grew up in poverty. I know that the only way that my mother helped get my brother and me out of poverty was by having a great work ethic and working her way out of poverty.

The government does not create jobs; small businesses do. The American people know this even if the majority in Congress does not. That is why CNN is reporting that 75 percent of Americans polled believe that at least half of the stimulus has been wasted, and a third of those believe that it actually has made the economy worse.

In a perfect world, the President could hold a jobs summit and everyone would breathe a sigh of relief as they went off to new jobs created. But in the real world, sitting around and talking about jobs does not magically make them appear. In a perfect world, the money to pay for the stimulus and the endless unemployment extensions would come from a magic tree growing on the South Lawn of the White House. But we know that unemployment benefits are no real substitute for a paycheck. We know that the stimulus didn't work. And we know that the closest thing the government has to a money tree is the money that it takes out of taxpayers' pockets.

The bottom line is, if they are serious about reducing poverty, the President and my Democrat colleagues need to stop talking about jobs and start working with Republicans to support and facilitate an economy that will create them. Specifically, the Democrats, who control the progress of legislation in this town, should do three things:

First, they need to end their obsession with the trillion-dollar takeover of health care, because this single-minded approach is coming at the expense of everything else that matters to the American public.

Second, the tax code should be reformed to protect workers' wages, to encourage investment and entrepreneurship, to reward saving, and to provide the American people with the confidence and certainty about their financial future.

And third, my Democrat colleagues need to take a long, hard look at their failed trillion-dollar stimulus plan and fix it. Don't just borrow another hundred billion dollars here and there and hope that it works better this time.

Raising awareness about poverty is important, and I support this legislation. But before we spend too much time patting ourselves on the back for this feel-good resolution, let us get down to business in a bipartisan manner and really do the hard work of making this economy great again.

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. In the wealthiest country in the world, far too many of our citizens live in poverty, and the number is growing. Mr. MCDERMOTT and Chairman RANGEL, thank you for bringing this important resolution to the floor.

Families in Minnesota and across our country are hurting. The economy may be improving on Wall Street, but on Main Street people are hurting and they're afraid. Unemployed workers are worried about where and how they will find a job and whether they can survive after their unemployment insurance runs out. Our neighbors with jobs are facing hours being cut, facing pay cuts, and they're in fear of also losing their jobs.

The housing crisis has driven families from their homes, and the homeless shelters are filled. Families are sleeping in their cars. Access to basic health care and putting food on the table are now a struggle for far too many Americans. More families are falling below the poverty line and they need our help.

In 2008, one in eight residents of Minnesota's Fourth Congressional District, which I represent, was living in poverty—over 68,000 men, women, children, and seniors. The number is certainly growing with the economic recession, and that means children are going hungry, parents lack day care and reliable transportation to get a job, seniors struggle to pay rent. And yes, many illnesses are left unattended.

Yesterday, I visited a Head Start site in St. Paul, and the staff members there are worried about food insecurity for the children in their classrooms. It is unacceptable that children would go hungry.

The role of the Federal Government is to keep our country safe and to provide an opportunity for people to improve their lives. We have much work to do. But because of the Democrats in Congress passing the Recovery Act, an estimated 60.1 million Americans did not fall below the poverty line, including 66,000 Minnesotans.

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentlewoman.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, because if we're going to defeat poverty and create jobs and economic opportunity for all Americans, we need to reach out to get to know those Americans who need our help the most, those in poverty.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Madam Speaker, in closing, I want to reiterate that there still is much work to be done—and undone—to breathe new life into this economy. The Democrats told Americans that if their stimulus passed, unemployment would stay below 8 percent and millions of Americans would continue receiving paychecks. Instead, the stimulus passed and a record 12 million Americans are now collecting unemployment checks. As predicted, that is triggering massive State tax hikes that will continue for years to come.

Frankly, Madam Speaker, that is why the stimulus isn't working. Every dollar spent by government is a dollar that first must be taken out of the economy. That dollar of government spending is a dollar that a business owner can use to hire a new worker and it's a dollar that a mother can use to feed her child.

My colleagues will say that this is what the stimulus was supposed to do, but what they won't tell you is that the government wastes 50 cents collecting that dollar and fumbling around trying to put it back into the economy. As part of our awareness of poverty, let us also be aware of that.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, today I rise in support of House Resolution 1024 "Expressing support for designation of January as poverty in America awareness month." This resolution seeks to designate the month of January as an official "Poverty in America Awareness Month," and also expresses the sentiments of the House of Representatives that eradicating poverty in the United States should be the goal of all American citizens—especially those in government positions.

Over the last several decades the numbers of people living in poverty in the United States has steadily increased to a high point in 2008 of over 39 million Americans living below the Federal poverty line.

This is a particularly important issue for the people living in my home district in Houston, Texas where the number of residents with income below the poverty level in 2007 was 20.7 percent, which is several percentage points higher than the Texas State average of 16.3 percent.

These problems have been further exacerbated by the recent economic downturn which has pushed many American families to a financial breaking point. Over the past 10 years much of the progress that was made during the 1990s was reversed as the overall poverty rate increased by 1.9 percent.

As the Chairwoman of the Congressional Children's Caucus I also understand the severe impact that poverty can have on children in the United States. In fact, 14 million of the 39 million Americans currently living below the poverty line are children. For children, growing up in poverty can have numerous negative effects on development ranging from malnutrition to poor education.

As Americans we can not allow underprivileged children in our Nation to be overlooked and ignored. We must ensure that all children of all income levels in this country are provided with quality education, proper nutrition and access to support services.

Furthermore, we can not allow hard-working American citizens to continue to fall below the Federal poverty line. That is why it is important that we support this resolution as it would bring further attention to this important matter and provide an opportunity to reverse the growing trend of poverty in the United States.

Officially establishing the month of January as "Poverty in America Awareness Month," would seek to improve the lives of our citizens as well as increase advocacy for some of the most vulnerable families in our Nation.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution. I also ask my colleagues for their continued support for the 39 million Americans currently living in poverty.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to applaud the actions of the House of Representatives in addressing poverty in America and designating January as Poverty in America Awareness Month. I strongly support H. Res. 1024 and urge my colleagues to support this piece of legislation.

The Census Bureau's poverty statistics are alarming. In 2008, 13.2 percent of people were living in poverty. This statistic was even worse for children under 18 years old. In 2008, 19 percent of children under 18 years old were living in poverty. In my state, Georgia, 14.3 percent of people were living below the poverty level in 2007.

Poverty has many adverse effects on society. Poor Americans are less likely to eat healthy, which leads to poor health. Poor health can make study and work difficult. Poor education and the inability to work can adversely affect individual income, and the American economy as a whole.

This resolution expresses the sense of the House that eradicating poverty in the United States should be the goal for all people in the United States. Further, this resolution recognizes that the severe economic downturn, and double-digit unemployment rate, increases the need for Congress to commit itself to helping individuals and families facing economic hardship.

I join the chairman in urging my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I urge the adoption of the resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1024.

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. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

□ 1833

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COSTA) at 6 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3726, CASTLE NUGENT NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE ESTABLISHMENT ACT OF 2010; AND FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4474, IDAHO WILDERNESS WATER FACILITIES ACT

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111–401) on the resolution (H. Res. 1038) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3726) to establish the Castle Nugent National Historic Site at St. Croix, United States Virgin Islands, and for other purposes; and for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4474) 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, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H. Res. 990, by the yeas and nays;

H. Res. 1011, by the yeas and nays;

H. Res. 1003, by the yeas and nays.

Proceedings on H. Res. 1024 will resume later this week.

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

NATIONAL MENTORING MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 990, 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 California (Ms. WOOLSEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 990.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 398, nays 0, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 17]

YEAS—398

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Guthrie
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
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
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujáyn
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Wasserman Schultz
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)

Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—35

Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Bishop (GA)
Boccieri
Conyers
Crenshaw
Davis (AL)
Deal (GA)
Delahunt
Ellison
Frank (MA)
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hoekstra
Johnson, E. B.
Kind
King (IA)
Miller (FL)
Moran (VA)
Ortiz
Paulsen
Putnam
Rehberg
Ryan (OH)
Speier
Towns
Turner
Walz
Wamp
Waters
Yarmuth

□ 1859

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.

CERVICAL HEALTH AWARENESS MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TEAGUE). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1011, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1011.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 400, nays 0, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 18]

YEAS—400

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
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
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Garrett (NJ)
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Guthrie
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
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
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Wasserman Schultz
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—33

Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Barton (TX)
Bishop (GA)
Boccieri
Crenshaw
Davis (AL)
Deal (GA)
Delahunt
Ellison
Frank (MA)
Gerlach
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hoekstra
Johnson, E.B.
Kind
King (IA)
LaTourette
Miller (FL)
Moran (VA)
Ortiz
Paulsen
Putnam
Rehberg
Ryan (OH)
Speier
Turner
Walz
Wamp
Waters

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.

NATIONAL INFLUENZA VACCINATION WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1003, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1003, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 398, nays 2, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 19]

YEAS—398

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
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
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel

Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Garrett (NJ)
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Guthrie
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
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
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Wasserman Schultz
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—2

Paul
Polis (CO)

NOT VOTING—33

Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Bishop (GA)
Boccieri
Boehner
Crenshaw
Davis (AL)
Deal (GA)
Delahunt
Ellison
Frank (MA)
Gerlach
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hoekstra
Johnson, E.B.
Kennedy
Kind
King (IA)
Miller (FL)
Moran (VA)
Ortiz
Paulsen
Putnam
Rehberg
Ryan (OH)
Speier
Turner
Walz
Wamp
Waters

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes left in the 5-minute vote.

□ 1915

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WALZ. Madam Speaker, Due to unforeseen circumstances, I was not able to make it to the floor for votes. Had I been in attendance, I would have voted as following:

On passage of H. Res. 990 under suspension of the rules. "yea"; on passage of H. Res. 1011 under suspension of the rules, "yea"; on passage of H. Res. 1003 under suspension of the rules, "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from the Chamber this evening. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall votes, 17, 18 and 19.

HOLOCAUST REMEMBRANCE DAY

(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. This year marks the 65th anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz, the largest of the Nazi extermination camps. Over 1 million people were systematically murdered at Auschwitz in gas chambers or shot or tortured or starved to death or any cruel combination. Most of those who perished were Jews, but others that Nazis perceived as enemies were also murdered there.

As we honor the victims of the Holocaust and those who helped to defeat the Nazis, we must also reaffirm our commitment to enhancing Holocaust education programs in our schools and urge all countries to bolster their efforts in fighting bigotry, racism and anti-Semitism.

In the words of Elie Wiesel, who is an Auschwitz survivor, ''There may be times when we are powerless to prevent injustice, but there must never be a time when we fail to protest.'' Let our voices be heard loudly and clearly. Never again. Tomorrow is Holocaust Remembrance Day. Let's honor their struggles every day.

HELP FOR AMERICA'S UNINSURED

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of controversy that has arisen over what I think is not only good policy but good for America, and that is real health care reform. Today I listened to the story of a mother who lost her son, whose name was Mike. Because he could not get a colonoscopy to determine whether or not he had colon cancer, he is not living today. He could not get it because he did not have insurance.

We need health care reform that allows Americans to have the dignity of health care and, as well, the respect of treatment. I met a man today who is blind because he could not get the treatment while he was going blind to reverse that terrible disability. It could have occurred with good health care, and we must stop allowing 45,000 Americans to die every year because they do not have good health care.

We can do it by putting the bill together, House and Senate, reconciliation, protecting physician-owned hospitals, preventing individuals from being denied insurance because of preexisting disease, insuring 36 million to 40 million. I ask my colleagues to join for what is best for America.

HONORING COACH DAVE LOOS, AUSTIN PEAY UNIVERSITY

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

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to commend Coach Dave Loos, the head basketball coach at my alma mater, Austin Peay University. He has dedicated the majority of his life to coaching basketball.

The year 2009 marked Coach Loos' 20th season as head coach at Austin Pea, where he is also athletic director. During this time, he welcomed his 400th overall head-coaching victory on December 3, 2009. Austin Peay is a member of the Ohio Valley Conference, and this year, Coach Loos became the winningest coach in OVC history.

It has been a privilege to watch Coach Loos interact with his young athletes, recruiting and encouraging them, both as a mentor and as a coach. As Rick Pitino once said, ''The key to coaching is not what you do, but the way you do it. The intangibles, the motivational parts of the game are the most important facets of it.'' A successful coach not only prepares his team for victory but motivates them along the way. Coach Loos accomplishes this each time he sets a foot on the court and has great concern and

appreciation for each of his players, and that is an invaluable trait as a successful coach.

However, his proudest accomplishment is being a dedicated husband to Phyllis, a father, and grandfather. I encourage my colleagues to join me in commending Coach Loos for his service to Austin Peay University.

HONORING COACH DAVE LOOS, UNIVERSITY OF MEMPHIS

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I just heard my colleague from east Tennessee make those remarks, and I had to add something because it's typical of what happens up here. The people from east Tennessee forget about the fact that Memphis exists in Tennessee, and Dave Loos started his career and played basketball at the University of Memphis, started his coaching career at the University of Memphis, and is a Memphian as well as a graduate of Austin Peay. And while he attended your school, he coached and attended my law school. He is a class act and wonderful gentleman. I wanted to set the record straight.

HONORING FIRE CHIEF HAROLD WATKINS, LITTLE MARSH, PENNSYLVANIA

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a man who has been a dedicated volunteer firefighter since 1980, Harold Watkins of Little Marsh, Pennsylvania. Harold has served the Chatham Township Volunteer Fire Company and his community in many capacities. He has held the positions of president, vice president, second assistant chief, and first assistant chief. For the past 15 years, he has been fire chief, and in 2004, he was named Firefighter of the Year. In other words, Harold has done it all in his 29 years of protecting and saving lives. But he has decided it is time to step down.

Firefighting is a family affair for the Watkins family. Harold's wife, Vivian, serves as secretary for the company and helps organize fundraisers. The chief calls Vivian his personal hero for all her hard work. His son, Matthew, was Firefighter of the Year in 2008 and serves as the vice president and was recently elected as second assistant chief, following in his father's footsteps.

I commend Chief Harold Watkins for his years of dedication and service saving lives and property in Chatham Township. And I know the community joins me in wishing him all the best in retirement.

RECOGNIZING RUTH MOYER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN FORT THOMAS, KENTUCKY

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

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the students, faculty, and staff at Ruth Moyer Elementary School in Fort Thomas, Kentucky. Last fall, Ruth Moyer was named a 2009 Blue Ribbon School. The Blue Ribbon Schools program honors schools that are academically superior or demonstrate dramatic gains in student achievement at all levels. These schools are models for others throughout the Nation.

I had the opportunity to meet students and faculty at Ruth Moyer and speak with them about their efforts to improve their school. The students and staff were unable to be here today in Washington to receive our congratulations because they are working hard in the classroom to uphold their high standards. However, the students in Mrs. Greene's class sent a distinguished ambassador to represent them in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in welcoming Flat Stanley from Fort Thomas, Kentucky, to the House of Representatives and extending our congratulations to the community at Ruth Moyer Elementary for their outstanding achievement.

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.

BOOKS, NOT BOMBS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the House's attention to the work of Greg Mortenson, who has built schools in Pakistan and Afghanistan and written two bestsellers about it. Mr. Mortenson has a lot to say about the power of education to dramatically improve the lives of people, especially girls and women, and how education can bring peace to the world.

Mr. Mortenson began his work in Pakistan, where he originally went to climb K2, the world's second-tallest mountain. After the climb, he was very ill, and he was helped by the people of an impoverished village. To thank them, Mr. Mortenson built the town's first school. He wrote a widely acclaimed book about the project called ''Three Cups of Tea: One Man's Mission to Promote Peace . . . One School at a Time.'' Mr. Mortenson then went on to build schools in Afghanistan.

So far, he has built 131 schools, educating 58,000 children with a special emphasis on education for girls. He has written a second book about his remarkable work entitled, ''Stones Into Schools: Promoting Peace With Books, Not Bombs, in Afghanistan and Pakistan.''

□ 1930

Mr. Speaker, in a recent interview with Bill Moyers, Mortenson explains how the education of girls can transform lives and whole countries. He said, and I quote, ''The education of girls has very powerful impacts on society. Number one, infant mortality is reduced. Number two, the population is reduced. And, number three, the quality of health improves.''

Mr. Speaker, he also explained how the education of girls can be a powerful weapon against terrorism. He said, ''Culturally, when someone goes on jihad they should get permission from their mother first. If they don't, it's very shameful. But when women are educated, they are less likely to encourage their sons to get into violence. I've seen that happen over the last decade in rural areas of Afghanistan and Pakistan.''

Mr. Speaker, in fact, Mortenson said that when men leave the Taliban, it's often because their mothers said what you're doing is not a good thing. It's not in the name of Islam. He went on to say, ''I ask widows and women in rural areas in Pakistan and Afghanistan, what do you want? They say, we don't want our babies to die, and we want our children to go to school.'' Mr. Speaker, he said, ''we need to listen to those women. It doesn't mean we just go around the world holding hands and drinking tea and having peace.'' Actually, I would say, as an aside, why not.

But he continued that he really did ''believe that there's a lot of power behind love and compassion and resisting and listening to people.'' Now, some people might call Mr. Mortenson a fuzzy-brained peacenik, but he isn't. Far from it. He opposes the Taliban and he believes that there's a place for American troops in Afghanistan. His books have even influenced our military commanders, including General McChrystal and General Petraeus.

Admiral Mike Mullen, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has made Mr. Mortenson an adviser. So Mr. Mortenson isn't saying let's pick up and leave Afghanistan and sing ''Kumbaya.'' But he does want to change our mission there, as I do. He wants to see much more emphasis on diplomacy, economic development, better policing, a better legal system to protect women's rights and of course, more schools.

These are some of the cornerstones of SMART security, which I've been advocating because, Mr. Speaker, President Obama is sending 30,000 more troops to Afghanistan. It will cost $1 million per year to support each of those soldiers. Greg Mortenson says that we could build 30 to 40 schools with $1 million and educate up to 30,000 young people

for the cost of one soldier. I think that's a far better way to win the hearts and minds of the Afghan people and defeat violent terrorism.

Mr. Mortenson is really on to something. I think we should all listen to what he has to say. There has to be a smarter way.

THE AMERICANS WHO DRIVE TRUCKS

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. Mr. Speaker, freedom and liberty have always been the American ideal. Core American values have not changed over the centuries. Take a look at the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights, and America's values are written down for us. The Declaration acknowledges that our rights come from God, not from government. Life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness are manifested in the Constitution, not granted by the Constitution.

The government doesn't give us our rights, and they can't take them away. Government has no rights. People have rights. Government has power. Government gets power when we give up our rights to government. The American people have made it plain they don't want the government taking over health care. That's not compatible with liberty. America does believe in freedom, that includes freedom of religion and the freedom to exercise our religion. They believe in freedom of the press and the right to peaceably assemble and speak their minds to a government that is not allowed to stop them, especially if the government doesn't like what the people are saying. Americans believe in the God-given right to defend themselves, their families, their homes and their property. We have a right to be free from illegal search and seizure. And the American people believe in fair trials, fair courts and fair play. These are all core American values. They are in the Constitution. Most Americans believe these rights don't change with time. And most of the Americans I represent in Texas believe all these values are fairly well set in stone.

Now, some of these Americans drive trucks, or pickups as we call them. Recently, there have been some derogatory, disrespectful statements made by those who arrogantly dismiss truck owners. However, there are a lot of vocal truck owners in America. The Ford F–150 pickup is the most popular vehicle sold in the United States for the last 28 years; 25 percent of all vehicles sold in America are pickups. And if you add SUVs to the mix, 40 percent of all truck sales, including pickups, are sold to women. Over 40 percent consider their truck more important than their home. As one truck owner told me, ''You can sleep in your truck, but you can't drive your house.''

Not surprisingly, Texas is America's biggest pickup market, and you don't see too many Volvo station wagons where I come from. These Americans who drive trucks, in my opinion, are fiercely independent, outspoken and will tell you they don't belong to a party but they vote for the person. These drivers are of every race and age, and 64 percent say their truck is a manifestation of their character, their personality and their politics.

Truck owners are one voice in America that government would do well to listen to. Contrary to current Washington wisdom, the Americans I know and represent, like truck drivers and others, do not look forward to a day when government, in the name of progressive politics, makes all our decisions for us. This is not a country of weak, timid souls who think government is the answer to every problem and has a better solution than the individuals it rules over. This is not a people of sheep who are afraid to control their own lives and believe government knows best. This is a country of high-spirited individuals that want to be left alone.

Many people I represent believe government is a wolf seeking what liberties it can devour from the people. Americans don't believe our health should be turned over to the Federal Government and made a budget item. We don't want some government bureaucrat deciding we can't have the pacemaker surgery, just take pain killers. That will not work for America. After all, we're not some nanny state, European-style.

Truck owners and other Americans believe in transparent government, not smoky back-room deals that have an odor of corruption, payoffs, and paybacks. The Americans I know believe in hard work and a private economy that rewards hard work with jobs open to every citizen. They believe in enjoying the fruits of their own labor, and they know how better to spend their money than Big Government. Americans believe in giving people a helping hand when they need it, but don't believe in creating a dependent class of people.

Truck owners don't believe in an elite ruling class of D.C. insiders making decisions for the rest of us. Mr. Speaker, I think most Americans believe in the American Dream which is simply this: freedom. This Nation was founded on freedom, and we don't want the government micromanaging our lives. The Americans I know, especially those that drive trucks, want government to remember the beginning of the Constitution, which says, ''We, the people.'' After all, it doesn't say, we the subjects. And as one bumper sticker on a pickup stated, ''I love America. It's government I continue to worry about.''

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.)

UNDERSTANDING THE ECONOMY

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

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, the Joint Economic Committee, which I chair, has just released a report entitled ''Understanding the Economy, State by State.'' The report provides quick and easy access to the major economic indicators for all 50 States in the areas of jobs, unemployment, personal earnings, and housing. It paints a by-the-numbers picture of the current economic reality in each of our 50 States. Every picture tells a story that is at once both informative and sobering.

The report captures the enormity of the economic damage caused by the Great Recession that began in December of 2007, while making clear that the United States economy has improved and begun to grow since the Bush administration left office. And this shows that the last month the Bush administration was in office this country lost over 750,000 jobs. Nationally, there has been a substantial decrease in the rate of job losses. The economy started losing jobs in January of 2008, increasing at a rapid rate throughout the year. The average quarterly job loss has now declined from a staggering 691,000 jobs lost per month in the first quarter of 2009 to 69,000 jobs in the most recent quarter, yet even that number is unacceptable.

And as you delve into the report, it provides a more localized and precise picture for each State. A chart like this is available for all 50 States. This chart, for example, is for my home State of New York. It shows at a glance the monthly change in private payrolls from January of 2008 to December of 2009. You can see that the unemployment rate in New York was 9 percent in December of 2009. That's up 4.4 percentage points from December of 2007. It has been a bumpy road, but you can see clearly that the trend is now in the right direction.

A scatter chart is also included in the report, and for New York State it reveals at a glance that the unemployment rate is below the national rate, and that total job losses have been smaller than U.S. averages. The economies of the States vary enormously. New York's economy depends heavily on information technology and financial services. Some States that are more dependent on construction and manufacturing have been hit much harder by job losses.

An economic overview and outlook accompanies each State chart. The one for New York provides an estimate from the President's Council of Economic Advisers that employment in

New York was boosted by a total of 141,000 jobs through the fourth quarter of 2009 by the investments we made through the Recovery Act. It also shows that real per capita personal income in New York was 43,000 in the third quarter of 2009, down from 45,000 in the third quarter of 2007.

There is also useful information on housing for each State, and it too varies enormously. For instance, the median price for single family homes in New York was $290,000 in 2008, compared to $250,000 nationwide. And in New York in November, housing starts increased by 52 percent over October to a total of 18,000 units at a seasonally adjusted annual rate.

You can review the report online at www.jec.senate.gov. The majority staff will continue to update the data throughout the year in order to track the progress our economy will be making month by month. But from this first edition, it is abundantly clear why this Congress is so focused on job growth. Americans are demanding, and rightly so, that we must do all we can to grow the economy and help create new private sector jobs. The hard facts and real-life consequences of the economic policies of the prior administration don't make for a very pretty picture right now.

Mr. Speaker, stay tuned. The American spirit of innovation is on the way and individual resilience are ready and raring to go.

□ 1945

DON'T LET DEBT DEFEAT A GREAT NATION

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. Mr. Speaker, soon the Congress will be asked to raise the debt limit of this Nation. This actually happened under the previous administration, and now it's happening under the new administration.

I have not voted, from the time I have been in Congress, to raise this debt ceiling because all this really does is permit our government to borrow more money from foreign governments. I think we all know that we are what is called a debtor nation. We don't pay our bills anymore. We have to go to the Japanese, the Chinese, the UAE, and to many other countries to buy our debt so we can spend more. That is the reason I wanted to come to the floor tonight.

Before we broke for Christmas, FRANK WOLF had sent out to each Member of the House a little pamphlet that says, ''Don't Let Debt Defeat a Great Nation.'' He and JIM COOPER, in a bipartisan way—FRANK WOLF being a Republican; JIM COOPER a Democrat—have introduced H.R. 1557, the SAFE Commission Act, and I want to talk about that in the little bit of time I have.

And I am reading from his publication, Mr. WOLF's publication. ''We have amassed massive unfunded 'promises' to guarantee future entitlement benefits that when added with liabilities like the debt, total nearly $57 trillion. That means every man, woman and child in America owes $184,000.''

I have used this back in my district, and I like to say it this way, Mr. Speaker. When that beautiful baby is born, the first cry out of his or her mouth is a cry of, ''Do I owe $184,000?'' Yes, baby, you do owe $184,000. Every American does.

This could, according to the information from FRANK WOLF, skyrocket to $21 trillion by the year 2020. How do FRANK WOLF and JIM COOPER, in a bipartisan effort, try to deal with this out-of-control spending? They have introduced, again, H.R. 1557, the SAFE Commission Act. And the actual title on it is the Securing America's Future Economy—SAFE Act.

How does this function? This would create a SAFE Commission. This would be made up of 16 bipartisan appointed people to be on this SAFE Commission Act, and it would be their responsibility to go through how government spends its money, from the entitlements to the spending on education, transportation, health care, national defense, tax policy, and other items. This commission would come back to Congress, if this should become the law, and then Congress would be required to vote up or down on the panels's proposal.

Now, how this panel would come up with this proposal is they would go around this country and they would hold hearings and listen to the American people—something we have not been doing, either party, quite frankly. We are not listening to the American people. Yes, we are now, and after what happened in Massachusetts a couple weeks ago, the American people are being heard and they've been heard by many of us when we go back home and do our own town meetings. But this commission would have the authority, should this become the law, to say to the Congress, You can't duck these votes. You're going to have to vote up or down. I think this is critical.

I would love to hear the President tomorrow night—I hope somebody has made him aware of this bipartisan effort known as the SAFE Commission, and I hope he would say tomorrow night that he would endorse this legislation and encourage the Democratic leadership in the House and the Republican leadership in the House to get behind this bill.

At this present time, Mr. Speaker, we have 109 Members of Congress who have cosponsored this legislation. I hope my other colleagues will look seriously at what Mr. COOPER and Mr. WOLF have done to try to bring to the American people hope that we can meet our obligations based on the Constitution and deal with this out-of-control spending here in Washington, D.C. that both parties are responsible for.

With that, Mr. Speaker, before I leave, as I do every night on the floor, I ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform, to please bless their families, and I ask God to hold in his arms the families who've given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq.

And, Mr. Speaker, three times, I ask God to please, please God, please God, please God, continue to bless America.

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

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

CONGRESSIONAL JOBS NOW CAUCUS

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the single most important concern for Americans throughout our Nation is the vast and growing rate of joblessness. This is not difficult to understand. Bob Herbert asked in a recent New York Times column, ''How loud do alarm bells have to ring?''

More than 15 million Americans—more than 1 in 10 people—are out of work. Another 15 million people are underemployed or have quit looking. That means that over 30 million Americans want to work but cannot find the job they want. More people join their ranks every single day. Worse, 4 in 10 unemployed workers have been jobless for 27 weeks or longer.

Yes, we have a jobs crisis in our country, and it's everybody's number one issue. That's why I joined with colleagues on both sides of the aisle to form the Congressional Jobs Now Caucus, to keep the focus where it needs to be. That's why I sponsored bills to create jobs in America to stem our rising trade deficits and to bring justice to Wall Street, which has shut down normal lending across this country, contributing to the jobs crisis.

Job creation is not a Republican issue or a Democratic issue. We are all in this together. Last month, Toledo, a city I represent, lost an additional 1,200 jobs. Added to the yearly tally, more than 38,600 individuals, or 11.8 percent of the city's population, are without work.

The unemployment rate in the adjoining rural Ottawa County, also in our district, is now over 17 percent. Again, these are official numbers which did not include those who have part-time jobs and need more hours or those who have simply given up because there are no jobs to be had.

Job creation is not just an urban issue. The damage has spread to the suburbs of our country, and no one is safe from the jobs hemorrhage. In fact,

a recent study by the Brookings Institute, as examined by Mr. Herbert in his article, found that the largest and fastest-growing population of poor people in the United States are in the suburbs.

The number of poor people in our country grew by 5.2 million when President Bush was President between 2002 and 2008, and more than 90 million Americans—90 million; that's a third of our country—are living on less than $21,834 for a family of four. The alarm bells are roaring.

At the same time, the basic goodness and generosity of the American people remains one of our greatest strengths. Through it all, the American people remain compassionate and caring. Last weekend, a local television station in our region organized a telethon for relief to Haiti. Even with double-digit unemployment and great economic uncertainty, the people of our community opened their hearts to the people they've never seen in a country most of them have never visited and donated tens of thousands of dollars to that end.

For our community and our country, the first alarm bells started ringing with the empty promises and rapid failure of NAFTA as it outsourced jobs everywhere, certainly to Mexico. The next alarm bell rang every time another trade deal came down the pike that took more of our jobs that used to exist in this country and doled them out to every undemocratic place in the world.

You can't make televisions in our country anymore—not a single one is made here—or clothing, or cars, or electrical parts, or even toys. More and more, even our food is being imported. You mean we are falling behind in even that?

There was plenty of warning, but big business and big money insisted on the right to seek out the lowest common denominator in the most undemocratic places, and they found it in China, in Mexico, in Bangladesh, in Pakistan, in Guatemala and every poor, undemocratic place where penny-wage workers are treated like the expendable pieces of equipment that they work with.

In our country, now we need those jobs because people without jobs can't pay mortgages. They can't pay their health insurance. They can't buy cars. They can't plan for their children's future or even get enough food and clothing to meet their families' needs.

Unemployment also means our Federal deficits rise as people can't pay their way forward. Unemployment and COBRA benefits are running out. State funds are depleted. Our private charities are overwhelmed. The American people need work and they need good jobs. It's really that simple. We simply can't rest until we get our economy back on track and create jobs for everyone who wants to work. I hope it is to this subject—the economy and job creation—that President Obama will direct his address tomorrow night.

We know that under President Bush we were hemorrhaging 734,000 jobs when he left at the end of his term, and though we haven't been losing as many jobs, now is the time during this fiscal year where we need to do more for our people to put them back to work, to use that productive energy to help pull our country forward rather than allow her to continue to fall behind, and that begins with work for every single American who needs a job.

PRESIDENT OBAMA'S BUDGET FREEZE

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. Mr. Speaker, I listened to my colleagues, and I think we are all of one accord when we say we want to see jobs created in this country and we want to see the unemployment rate go down. But the way you do that is the way Ronald Reagan did it when he was President. And he came in when we had 12 percent unemployment and 14 percent inflation. He came in and he cut taxes across the board. What are we doing instead?

Well, since January when the President took office, we have spent $73.3 billion that we didn't have on one program. We spent $1.6 trillion, including interest, on the stimulus bill; the omnibus spending bill, $410 billion. If you add interest, that's $625 billion. In June, we spent $106 billion, with a lot of pork in it, on the defense supplemental; and then on the consolidated appropriation bill, the mini-omnibus bill we passed in December, it was $3.5 trillion.

And then you include the things that we passed in this House which have not been enacted into law like cap-and-trade. That's $846 billion in new taxes. And the proposed government-run health care program, if it were to pass, it would cost between $1 trillion and $3 trillion.

Now, since the opposition party, under Speaker PELOSI, took control of this body, the Federal deficit has increased from $162 billion the first year she was Speaker in 2007 to $459 billion in 2008. And then it went up by a huge amount to $1.42 trillion in 2009. This is just an unsustainable growth rate.

And over the last 3 years, we have increased the debt ceiling five times since she took office as Speaker. This is something that's unbelievable. It went from $8.97 trillion in January of 2007 to $12.39 trillion today, which is an increase of $3.4 trillion, or 38 percent, in just 3 years. Now you're talking about spending $3 trillion a year—more than half of that borrowed money—and we are talking about how we are going to get control of it.

Tomorrow night the President is going to be speaking from right there just below the Speaker's lectern, and the President is going to try to address our economic problems. And as I understand it from some of the reports that have come out, he is going to talk about freezing spending, or a partial freeze, over the next 3 years that would reduce the budget by less than 1 percent, or $15 billion, in the first year.

Now, don't get me wrong. I am for freezing spending. But when you look at what has happened in the last year or two, especially during the last year, it's unbelievable. We had an 8 percent boost in spending in the omnibus bill the President signed into law in March and a 12 percent boost that he signed in right at the end of last year in December. We're spending money like it's going out of style.

Now, what is the answer? The answer is that we get together and realize the way to create jobs is to stimulate the private sector, and that is by cutting taxes, cutting personal income taxes, cutting corporate taxes, cutting capital gains taxes. That will give business, industry, and individuals more disposable income for investment and to buy products. If the government continues to spend like we're doing right now, we're digging ourselves into a deeper and deeper hole, and it is not going to solve the unemployment problem.

I heard some of my colleagues down there talking about how things are getting better. We just had 10½ percent unemployment. Now it's at least 10 percent unemployment. And when you add in those who are working part-time who want a full-time job, it's probably more like 17 or 18 percent of the people that are either out of work or have given up.

□ 2000

It's just terrible. So what do we do? We ought to do what has been done by John F. Kennedy in the past and what Ronald Reagan did when he was President. And that is to say, let's cut taxes. Let's give a shot in the arm to the private sector. They create jobs. Government cannot and will not create jobs by spending, spending, spending.

Tomorrow night when the President speaks, he will get a lot of applause from probably both sides of the aisle when he says some of the things he is going to say. But the thing that concerns me the most is the ''spending freeze'' he is talking about. It's not really anything but a drop in the bucket. It's not even a drop in the bucket when you talk about a 1 percent spending freeze over the next 3 years, when you're talking about a multitrillion-dollar deficit that goes on and on and on, and you're talking about a spending freeze that is going to save maybe $4 billion or $5 billion. It's just nothing.

So I would admonish the President, or suggest to the President, that he start moving toward cutting taxes, stimulate the private sector and cut the huge deficit spending we are facing.

A PACT WITH THE DEVIL

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

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, now that help to Haiti is on the way and that we are doing the best we can to save lives and to reconstruct lives in that torn country, I think this is a good time to look back and to give some thought to people's reaction to what happened in Haiti, to do sort of a post-mortem of the post-mortem. And particularly I want to revisit one comment that was made after that time, the comment by Pat Robertson. He claimed that the earthquake in Haiti was the result of a pact with the devil that the people of Haiti had made to achieve an end to slavery and independence at the beginning of the 1800s.

I thought that was an interesting comment to make. It turns out that there were two devastating earthquakes in Haiti before their independence, before their so-called pact with the devil, before their end to slavery. And in the 200 years plus since their so-called pact with the devil, Haiti has actually been pretty much earthquake-free.

Now you compare that to the neighboring country, the Dominican Republic. In 1946, the Dominican Republic had a devastating earthquake, actually, it's hard to believe, ten times more powerful than the earthquake that Haiti experienced 2 weeks ago. The Dominican Republic had no pact with the devil, and therefore, if I can use the word ''therefore'' in this context, was laid low. So under Pat Robertson's logic, one would have to conclude that, in fact, Haiti has benefited tremendously by what he would depict as a pact with the devil.

And I wonder, in contrast, how well Pat Robertson's followers have made out with their own pact with the devil. And what I mean is this: Pat Robertson ran for President in 1988. He did something in that year that nobody has done before or since. He brought 3 million volunteers to his campaign. He got millions of people involved in the Republican Party all across the country. In the end, he came in third. But he activated the Christian right. And all those people joined the Republican Party with something in mind, a couple of things in mind. One thing they wanted was an end to gay marriage. And for years, when the Republican Party was in charge of this country, the House, the Senate, the Supreme Court, the Presidency, the Republican Party did nothing to accomplish that for Pat Robertson's followers.

Similarly, these people wanted an end to abortion in America. And I'm not going to say whether that was right or wrong, whether they are right or wrong, but I will point out to you that when the Republicans were in charge, the Senate, the House, the White House and the Supreme Court, once again, they did nothing to help Pat Robertson's followers accomplish what they wanted.

So tonight I ask those people, the Christian right: What about your own pact with the devil? How has that worked out for you?

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

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

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

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

NEW ORLEANS SAINTS

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

Mr. CAO. Mr. Speaker, the New Orleans Saints are going to the Super Bowl for first time in franchise history. As their representative to Congress, I want to congratulate them in an official manner by acknowledging words of encouragement from constituents on the House floor.

Sunday's thrilling and historic win was an inspiration to the residents of Orleans and Jefferson Parishes, who continue to struggle to rebuild their lives 4 years after Hurricane Katrina. I'm proud to be their Congressman, and I look forward to an exciting Super Bowl in which they will defeat the Indianapolis Colts.

Tonight, I will read several statements from my district in their honor. The first statement is from Kay Higginbotham, a teacher at the Academy of the Sacred Heart in New Orleans. Kay writes, Do the Saints have an impact on education? As a school administrator, I believe the impact is immeasurable and far exceeds economics. The value lessons are much greater than an awareness of team colors. Students certainly enjoy spirit days or completing math problems with a Saints bent, but they also spend time discussing the job of a professional athlete, what it means to stay focused, eat healthy food, get plenty of exercise and sleep, follow rules, work as a team, and be a good sport, win or lose.

Teachers help students understand the importance of following parent and teacher directives, and when talking about the Saints, they link it to the attention each player must pay to the coaches' play-calling. They discuss the pride one feels in the hard work of a job well done, the discipline it takes to make a wise choice, both on and off the field, and the consequences that ensue if one doesn't.

Is the job of a student so different from the job of a New Orleans Saint? When interviewed, Saints players speak about having faith in their team and giving back to the community. They talk about developing self-confidence and leadership and overcoming adversity, values important in a game, but even more important in life. And parents report something incredible: Dinner conversations that include the whole family. Brothers are amazed at how much their sisters understand about first-downs and touchdowns. And sisters actually want to hear what their brothers know about Drew Brees and Reggie Bush.

Do the Saints have an impact on education? Yes, indeed. They give us lessons worth teaching and learning.

The second statement is from Cindy Hilbrink of New Orleans. Cindy writes, While city accountants calculate the financial impact of the Saints football team to New Orleans, citizens know, as one writer to the local paper said, that despite failures of Federal, State, and local governments after Katrina, and suggestions that we don't merit help, we are, nevertheless, deserving—deserving of a winning team, of good schools, the best health care, safe roads, bridges and reliable levees.

When the population was only trickling back into New Orleans that summer of 2006 after Hurricane Katrina, when politicians and pundits urged that the city be abandoned, the sign on the dominant building in New Orleans, the Superdome, with its patched roof and iconic status as the symbol of suffering, said, 'Our team, our home.'

Bumper stickers in the Saints' black font read, 'Faith.' Drew Brees, the new quarterback who took a chance on the team and the city, printed T-shirts to benefit children that implored, 'Believe, New Orleans!' A popular Saints song contends 'This is the way we live,' meaning we are enabled to survive by clinging to our faith in this team. Our devotion to the New Orleans Saints, win or lose, keeps our battered spirits alive.

Finally, I want to close tonight with a prayer for the Saints delivered by Archbishop Philip Hannan at the first Saints and Sinners banquet in 1968.

Our heavenly Father, who has instructed us that the Saints by faith conquered kingdoms and overcame lions, grant our Saints an increase of faith and strength so that they will not only overcome the Lions, but also the Bears, the Rams, the Giants and even those awesome people in Green Bay. May they continue to tame the Redskins and fetter the Falcons as well as the Eagles. Give to our owners and coaches the continued ability to be as wise as serpents and simple as doves, so that no good talent will dodge our draft. Grant to our fans perseverance in their devotion and unlimited lung power, tempered with a sense of charity to all, including the referees.

May our beloved Bedlam Bowl be a source of good fellowship, and may ''The Saints Come Marching In'' be a victory march for all, now and in eternity.

THE AGONY OF THE CENTRAL VALLEY

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, for many months, the Republicans on the Water and Power Subcommittee of the Natural Resources Committee have implored the majority Democrats to hold a hearing in the Central Valley of California to see and hear for themselves the damage that the Federal Government has caused by diverting 200 billion gallons of water from Central Valley farms in order to indulge the environmental left's pet cause, the delta smelt.

After our pleas were met with continued stonewalling, we decided to hold a forum under our own auspices and to invite all members of the California congressional delegation, all members of the Natural Resources Committee and representatives of the Obama administration to come to Fresno to see firsthand what these policies have wrought.

Instead, after we had announced the forum, the Water and Power Subcommittee chairwoman decided to meet on the same day in southern California to extol the virtues of water conservation. Congress has thus made clear its intention to sacrifice the people of the San Joaquin Valley upon the altar of environmental extremism.

Despite heavy rains over the past month, the administration continues to blame a relatively mild drought for the fact that Valley farmers will receive only 5 percent of the water that they are entitled to. This does not explain how, in far more severe droughts than this, Valley farmers have received far greater allocations. Nor does it explain how these massive water diversions can be justified to support the delta smelt if indeed supplies were constrained.

Had the Democrats in the subcommittee come to Fresno, they would have heard and seen the anguish of the people of the Central Valley of California. These water diversions have destroyed a half-million acres of the most productive farmland in America, and they have thrown 30,000 Central Valley farm families into unemployment.

They would have heard the stories of food lines in communities that once prided themselves on being the breadbasket of the Western United States. They would have heard about the frustration of seeing produce imported from China being handed out in these food lines to the very same American farmers who once supplied the very same produce to the entire world.

And they would have seen the anger as the absent Interior Secretary's testimony to the Natural Resources Committee last year was played back, in which Mr. SALAZAR admitted that the Obama administration has the authority to turn the pumps back on, but that it chooses not to do so because that would be ''like admitting failure.''

There is some good news. This afternoon, the day after our forum in Fresno, the Interior Secretary relented to the extent of releasing 350,000 to 400,000 acre-feet of already allocated water to the Central Valley. Having demonstrated his authority to release the water that Central Valley farmers already own, he now needs to follow through and release the water that is being held hostage to the delta smelt.

Meanwhile, Mr. NUNES of California has introduced H.R. 3105, the Turn on the Pumps Act, which does exactly the same thing that Congress did under far less severe circumstances several years ago for the farmers of New Mexico. Mr. NUNES has filed a discharge petition to bypass that subcommittee and bring the bill directly to the House for a vote. It needs 218 signatures. So far, it has 105, 104 Republicans and one Democrat.

Madam Speaker, I assure you that it is not only the Central Valley that is suffering. The willful destruction of 500,000 acres of American farmland by these massive water diversions, all for the enjoyment and amusement of the 3-inch long delta smelt, is reflected in the rising prices for produce that families are feeling far beyond the congressionally created dust bowl of California's Central Valley.

Nor is the delta smelt doing any better. Despite these massive water diversions, the delta smelt population fell back to the historic low in 2005 and is now well below the high points recorded in the late 1970s. Given these findings, how can anybody argue that the delta pumping restrictions are benefiting the delta smelt?

Madam Speaker, I promised to carry the plea from the many Americans who poured out their hearts to us in Fresno on Monday for Congress to come to the Central Valley and see what their policies have caused. I place their invitation before you.

REBUILDING THE ECONOMY

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

Mr. PERRIELLO. Madam Speaker, I rise today as one of many freshmen who will be speaking during this hour because a little over a year ago, we came in on a wave of change. Many of us came into politics for the first time, certainly to the Federal Government for the first time, because we believed this country needed a new kind of politics, not just a politics of right or left, but a politics of right and wrong. For too long, both parties had failed to rise to the challenges of our time. Energy independence, redefining our competitive advantage—there were so many challenges to take on. And a year later, we are not satisfied.

Tomorrow night, the President of the United States will come and join us here in this body to speak and give us a report on the state of the Nation. Well, the Nation is in pain. Working and middle class families are in pain, and we haven't done nearly enough to show people the results of standing up for the working and middle class.

□ 2015

There are many things that the change was about, but certainly at the heart of it was a desire for a new era of accountability, accountability for the private sector, accountability for government, and even accountability for consumers and bad decisions that had been made.

But most importantly to this was a need to shift our economic policies from speculation on Wall Street to job creation on Main Street. Changing the name plate on the door from Hank Paulson to Tim Geithner does not represent a change of economic policy. We need to understand what it will take to have actual economic accountability and job growth in this country.

We believe in this House, the people's House, we have taken dramatic steps to put working class and middle class people ahead of the most powerful among us. But the pain continues. In my district over the last 5 years we have seen people's utility rates go up 93 percent by Appalachian Power and others. We get calls every day, 20 percent increases in their health insurance premiums, bank fees, credit card fees, Comcast fees, all going through the roof while the working and middle class pay the price.

We have taken steps here to stand up and say someone is going to stand up for Main Street, demand that accountability and that economic relief that we thought was part of the change. We hope tomorrow night to hear more about your willingness to lead in these areas.

But we also must switch this focus to Main Street because we are in a jobs crisis. We need a wartime-like mentality of how serious this job crisis is. And we took dramatic efforts a year ago that have helped to stop the bleeding, to help turn from some of the most dramatic job losses in American history, certainly modern American history under the last administration, to stopping that bleeding so that we could begin the recovery. But we know much more needs to be done. We are not satisfied.

I hear time and time again the banks are still not lending. If we need to do direct lending, if we need to do more to get the lending going to small and medium-sized businesses, we have to understand that in America's economy today two-thirds of job creation comes from small- and medium-sized business. They may not have the political power and control over both parties in this town, but small- and medium-sized businesses create that job growth. We need to get job creation on Main Street

through direct lending. We also need to see the kind of investment in our infrastructure not only because it puts people to work today, but because it rebuilds America's competitive advantage.

The hardworking, proud people of my district would rather collect a paycheck for building something than an unemployment check for sitting home. People want to work. They don't want those holes in their resume. And we know we are being outcompeted. So this is a jobs crisis. But it also goes to the heart of restoring the capitalistic innovation in this country.

We saw a policy under the last administration of rewarding failure with bailouts. Many of us wanted a change in that policy. We are not satisfied with what we have seen. We cannot have the strength of our private sector when we continue to reward failure instead of innovation. The people's House has taken bold moves to ensure the kind of accountability that will restore the very heart of our capitalism.

We know that the other side put in place many of the policies that created this problem, but it is not enough to point the finger. Let us be judged not by what the other side did to get us here, but by what we did to get us out of this economic mess. Many of us came here, we are working a double shift every day and will not rest until we see the kind of job creation and rewards for innovation that the American people deserve. That is why many of us came here. And we are not satisfied. We want to continue being that change, demanding that kind of shift from speculation on Wall Street to job creation on Main Street.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DRIEHAUS. I would thank, Madam Chair, the gentleman from Virginia for leading this hour on our recovery. We talk so much about the job loss that has been created by this Great Recession. But far too often we don't discuss the causes of that job loss, and we don't discuss the direction we are heading in. And so I think it is important to remind the viewers and remind all Americans just where we are.

I was at a luncheon today in Cincinnati, Ohio, with Johnson Investment Counsel. They refer to this as the Great Recession. And they refer to it as the Great Recession because it is the most significant recession that has taken place since the 1930s in the United States.

This recession has lasted for 18 months, longer than any other recession since the Great Depression. This recession has caused a loss of 3.8 percent of the gross domestic product here in the United States, a greater loss than any recession since the Great Depression. This recession has caused the loss of 7.2 million jobs. 7.2 million jobs. The greatest job loss since the Great Depression.

But I think it is important to understand when this recession started. This recession started in 2007, under the policies of the Bush administration. And I know the other side doesn't like us to go back. They want to believe that the world began, that this recession began, in January of 2009. But the facts just don't bear that out.

So I brought this chart. And I brought this chart to explain the job loss that has occurred during this recession. And you can see that in the last 3 months of the Bush administration, this economy lost nearly 2 million jobs. In the last 3 months of the Bush administration alone. As a matter of fact, it is after President Obama took the oath of office that we started turning things around. We are still losing jobs. And I think we all hope that next quarter we will turn this around and see positive growth. We saw growth last quarter. But we are heading in the right direction. And that is the important thing.

Also at the luncheon today, I was struck by the analysis given. And I will just mention the first few points. First of all, the Great Recession is over. The recovery has begun. And I think this is important. Near-term growth has been bolstered by the stimulus and inventory building. There is no question in the minds of economists around the country that the stimulus is working.

I would point you, Mr. PERRIELLO, to just one comment made in the Cincinnati Enquirer this week. It was by the Realtors of Cincinnati. And the Realtors of Cincinnati were praising the stimulus. The headline reads this: ''Realtors, Builders Laud Tax Credit.'' They are praising the tax credit that we passed as a part of the stimulus. Because oftentimes when we talk about the stimulus, this $800 billion package, we forget that $300 billion of it was tax credits. It was tax credits and tax breaks for moderate-income families. And an important credit was to stimulate first-time homebuyers and to help people get back in the housing market. We have achieved that. Realtors understand that, people around the country understand it, because homes are starting to sell. And it is thanks to the efforts of this Democratic Caucus.

Mr. PERRIELLO. Let me yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you.

Madam Speaker, it is a great honor to be here with the other freshmen. We are new to this system, but we are not new to the problems in our districts or in our Nation. We often go home on weekends to spend time in our districts. And what I have found in the district that I represent and the East Bay of California is a lot of pain, a lot of people that are suffering, but are filled with hope with the possibility that things are indeed turning around.

I met a carpenter 2 weekends ago. He is a member of the carpenters union, and he had been out of work for about 8 months. The housing industry had literally shut down, and he had been thrown aside. And he said to me, ''Why can't those bankers make loans to my company? Why can't they do that? They have been given hundreds of billions of dollars, and yet they cannot make a loan.'' One of the things that we have been working on here is to force those bankers to make loans, to use our tax money not for the great bonuses that they are giving themselves this month, but rather to use that tax money to put people to work with loans to this home construction company that this carpenter was once employed by.

Another person that I met in the City of Antioch about 8 months ago was protesting the fact that the loan modification program that had been put through was stalled once again by the bankers. We all know the statistics. A lot of talk, but very few loan modifications. This person had worked as a painter painting houses, had two jobs to support their family, and yet was unable to continue their mortgage when the Great Recession began.

A third person just this last weekend was a heavy equipment operator at a groundbreaking ceremony for the Caldecott Tunnel in Contra Costa County. The heavy equipment operator said, ''Thank God the stimulus is working for me.'' In that project alone, over a $300 million project, the State of California was unable to pay its share because of the downturn in the California economy. So it was the action of my colleagues here, the freshman class plus the other Democrats in this House that voted to pass the stimulus bill, and $197 million of direct stimulus money went into that project, and 6,000 men and women will be employed, and a major commuting backlog will cease.

It is working. The statistics we saw just a moment ago clearly show that with the new administration coming into place, with the stimulus money that was put in place last January, the first vote, supported unanimously by our caucus and opposed unanimously by the other side, that is working. The statistics are clear. We are seeing job declines slowing down, and we will soon see it turn around.

Tomorrow the President will be here speaking to all of us about what we need to do in the months ahead. We need that Jobs for Main Street bill that passed here in December. Get it out there, get it passed, get people to work. We also need to make sure that Wall Street is properly disciplined. If they are going to get those big fat bonuses using our tax money, then we ought to tax those bonuses and put that money back to work with small businesses.

We can do these things. And much has been done. We have seen the turnaround. We have seen the statistics showing that we are on the right track. We will continue that. And for all of us, we have a choice. We can do nothing, and people will be on welfare, people will get the unemployment checks, people will lose their insurance, and we will try to keep them going with COBRA support. Or we can do the jobs

program, the stimulus programs, the Jobs for Main Street program. And in doing that, we will put people to work. They will not be tax takers, they will become taxpayers.

I yield my time.

Mr. PERRIELLO. Thank you very much.

I think it is important to remember we have got to rebuild jobs in this country that are between $6 an hour and six figures. There still has to be a middle class, a working class in this country. We have to respect those jobs, remember that we have lost jobs in construction, we have lost jobs in places where people want to go back to work.

The jobs bill we passed here was a good start. We need to be bold in our willingness to both put people to work and recreate our competitive advantage. Even before the Great Recession, even before some of the horrible fiscal decisions of the last administration we had been getting outcompeted around the world. We have got to make the investments in our infrastructure, in our small-and medium-sized businesses, and education and workforce development so that we can outcompete any country.

We are more innovative than any country on earth. We will continue to do that. But we cannot do it when we have a corporate capture of this body that means we reward failure instead of rewarding innovation. That must be the key.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. WELCH. I thank my colleagues, and appreciate the opportunity to participate with you in the freshman hour.

I want to speak about two things. One is how do we get lending going for small businesses. And two, what is a practical thing we can do to create 600,000 to 850,000 jobs. You have recited very well how we got here, why we needed the stimulus. But on lending, let's address that. What happened? Wall Street went on strike. After they made record profits and record bonuses by making record bets with taxpayer money, they put a gun to the head of the American economy and lost billions and billions of dollars. And it was so threatening to the American economy.

Henry Paulson, then the Treasury Secretary under a conservative President, George Bush, came to Congress hat in hand, acknowledged that he was embarrassed, and asked for a $750 billion bailout.

□ 2030

Now, I was on that conference call with Mr. PAULson, and many of us were shocked that this former Goldman Sachs head was acknowledging failure but saying, If you don't help us out on the bets we made, we will have an implosion that will have collateral consequences that are absolutely catastrophic for Main Street.

Congress gave him the money, but it was after an assurance on his part that Wall Street had learned its ways and they wouldn't do the same thing. It is 15 months later, and what has happened? Wall Street is back to its old ways. In this past year, Wall Street has made so much money that they have set aside a bonus pool of $140 billion to $160 billion.

Now, how did they make that money? They had the TARP money, the taxpayer bailout money, number one. Number two, they had zero interest rate money from the Federal open window, and they did what they did before to get us there: they went and started trading in currencies, derivatives, and commodities.

Now, with those profits they had three options. One, they could have lent that money out to our small businesses. And they need it. By the way, I have a lot of folks in Vermont, I am sure this is true in California, saying, If they are making so much money, how come they won't give me a loan?

Number two, they could have added it to their bottom line to have a stronger balance sheet in the event of a downturn later. Or, three, they could have put it in their pocket. And that is what they did. Fifteen months after they stuck a gun to the head of the American economy, they went back to their old ways and made a ton of money. They are very good at what they do. But what they do is not good for America, it is not good for building an economy and sustainable jobs, and they are going to rake that in.

So we have legislation, many of us are on it, that would say to Wall Street: look, if you are not going to lend that money out, we are going to tax those bonuses. Anything above $50,000, we are going to tax at 50 percent, and we are going to put it into lending for small businesses.

Second, we can create 600,000 to 850,000 jobs by engaging in energy home retrofit programs. In every single community, we have got carpenters, plumbers, masons, electricians out of work because we have got a stagnant home industry. But we have got homeowners who need to save money and need a little help doing it.

If we put $20 billion into that, we can create 600,000 to 850,000 jobs, all local. We can use materials that have to be made in the United States. Ninety percent of all the retrofit materials are manufactured right here. We can save $3.3 billion for homeowners by lowering their energy bills. And we can take 3 million cars, the equivalent of 3 million cars, off the road. These are the things we can do, get lending going, and get jobs created. Thank you.

Mr. PERRIELLO. One thing I just want to add on that before I move to the gentleman from Colorado is to say anyone who has run a business or a household knows the difference between an expenditure and an investment. Going out to the movies is different than investing in a solar panel or retrofitting your home.

Now is the time where we need to be investing. We can do that through some of the retrofitting of both our commercial and residential stock. We can do that by investing in our workforce development and by getting that lending, again, to small and medium-size business.

There has been a thought among some of the elites in this country that we can continue to prosper without building anything, without growing anything. At some point, we have to be creating value in the system. Our financial sector is extremely important, and it will be strong if there are good rules in place that allow for predictability.

But we also must remember the industrial and agricultural sectors. These are not things of a bygone past, though sometimes in this city and on Wall Street that is forgotten. These remain major drivers of economic growth, major drivers of employment; and we must have an economic development strategy in addition to a financial sector strategy.

Some of the things that continue to change and set us back, I believe the gentleman from Colorado wants to address, are not just in this building but perhaps across the street. With that, I yield.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from Virginia.

Following on the gentleman from Vermont, as well as the gentleman from Ohio, taking us back to where we were before I was in this body, my colleague from Vermont was here, when President Bush, Secretary Paulson said we need a blank check for a whole lot of money, $700 billion.

Well, what are you going to do with it? Well, we are going to buy toxic assets. We are going to take some of the bad debt off the books of banks and we are going to then relieve them of that, and that will improve their balance sheets, and they will be able to loan again. Well, okay.

At that point the Congress said, well, not one dollar of that TARP money has gone to buying bad debt. Instead, the Bush administration started nationalizing companies left and right. They bought up banks. They are now owned by the government. They bought up automobile companies now owned by the government. They bought insurance companies. They went on a shopping spree and nationalized the means of production in this country.

Now we are at a place where you have Big Government in league with Big Business, the worst of both worlds for the people of this country. This is made worse by a recent Supreme Court decision that opened the channels for unregulated use of corporate funds to influence political elections. That is right. Congress, in its wisdom, had previously established regulations around this that they advertised, they could say call so and so to lobby them but not vote for, vote against, not within 30 days of an election. The Supreme Court threw that all out.

What you now have is a very, very dangerous situation where, let's say

that the Bush administration nationalized a big bank, and let's say there was a Member of Congress didn't think they should. Well, now you have that bank can spend an enormous amount of money trying to stop the reelection of people they don't like and trying to elect people they like. You have Big Government and Big Business working together in the Bush socialist economy to the detriment of the American people.

We will be looking at solutions of campaign finance reform in Congress. A lot of it needs to start with that, for Congress to take action and be willing to take on this nexus where Big Business and Big Government operated in unholy alliance. We need to make sure that the system is influenced by the people of the country, rather than the corporations with their dollars, using them to confuse and trick people with their massive and misleading public relations attacks. I am hopeful.

I am a sponsor of the fair elections bill, a campaign finance reform bill; many of my colleagues are as well. We also need to look at disclosure requirements, shareholder approval requirements. We need to make it more difficult, not easier, for corporations to influence the United States Congress.

I yield back to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. PERRIELLO. I thank you for those comments. We can't say enough about how disastrous this decision is, not just for the political system in terms of corruption of the political system, but really a threat to the private sector itself, when the biggest corporations are able to capture government, as we have seen in the years past.

What they do is they try to lock in the status quo that is the very antithesis of capitalism, which is about innovation and competition. When you are able to buy the referees on the field, you no longer have a decent game. We will outcompete and win on that fair battlefield, on that fair sports field, but you cannot do it when they are buying the referees. And anyone who thinks that money has no influence in politics may need to have a little wake-up call.

This is a disastrous decision that goes against decades of precedent. Many out there who decry judicial activism, this is not only overthrowing decades of precedent but a decision just 6 years earlier that had come down the opposite way which looks dangerous in terms of what it means for our Supreme Court. But, again, I think you do a good job of pointing out exactly what it means for the private sector.

I will go to the gentleman from New York and then the gentleman from California.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative PERRIELLO, for bringing us together this evening for conversation and dialogue on what is an important part of the work we are doing right now. There can be no more important issue than jobs, job creation, job retention, and dealing with the Nation's economy.

I am glad that we are talking about a bit of a reality check this evening, too, to review history, what brought us here.

There is no mistaking that this administration and we in Congress this year have inherited, as freshmen, a very difficult task because some irresponsible behavior guided the decision-making; and where we found that we grew a deficit to record proportions, historically largest deficit, handed to this administration. That was just a year ago.

So when we look at some of the stats that the stimulus package was responsible for, minimally, 2 million jobs, looking at a number of projections and assessments that have been done out there, I think it is reassuring to know that we have been able to speak to that gross number of at least, minimally, 2 million jobs that came about through sound stewardship and through investment at a time when our recession was bleeding this economy. And all telltale indicators suggest that that bleeding has stopped. But we have only placed a down payment upon the economy with the stimulus package.

In the pipeline are tremendous investments to come, areas that deal with communications, with broadband, opportunities for our neighborhoods, for our communities dealing with transportation projects that are coming, with the smart grid, investment in smart meters, and all of the delivery system that brings the energy supplies to our doorstep, be it a workplace or a home place.

So these are sound investments, so much so that the news we received just recently last month about the third quarter showed 2.2 percent growth. That came about because of a change in thinking, a change of behavior. As witnessed over the last several months and years, we were dealing with what was a draining situation. In fact, I have to look at the fact that we provided within the stimulus package a middle class tax cut, largest in its nature, in its history. And what benefited our communities was that 95 percent of working families in this country realized the benefit that amounted to some $37 billion in tax relief that came through their paychecks during the calendar year of 2009. That was important work. That was a way to help stretch the budgets for our American households.

Contrast that with the fact that tax cuts under the Bush administration were provided by borrowing from China. Now, isn't it interesting that China was made strong with our kind of irresponsible behavior. We look now at the fact that China's clean energy budget surpasses her defense budget. And we, in this Nation, have an opportunity to enter into that clean energy global race in a sound and practical manner, to prepare ourselves and to invest in the American economy and in the American race in that global measure that will find us a leader, an innovator, one that will become the ultimate go-to nation for energy intellect. And that is the juncture we find ourselves in today.

Representative PERRIELLO, I would suggest that this clean energy economy that we try to create, and Representative WELCH touched upon it just a moment ago, there is an awful lot of opportunity for us to invest.

The banking community has shied away from energy efficiency, from some of the retrofits we can do for businesses and residents. We know that in this economy it is much easier for them to grant a 20-year plan for a coal plant or a 30-year plan for a nuclear plant, but we can't get the investment in energy efficiency seen as our fuel of choice.

It has been stated that we are writing annually about a $900 billion check to our competitors simply because of our energy, our gluttonous energy behavior and the price tag on our energy bills. If we could move forward and provide for ESCOs, energy service companies, to go out into this company and retrofit our residential parcels and allow for us to reduce that demand that is worldwide gluttonous in nature, if we could invest in the infrastructure, the human infrastructure, the workforce, it is said that for every billion dollars of investment in retrofitting our residential parcels, some 8,000 jobs are created. That is how we bring back this economy. And it has been happening.

We have been doing installments. We have been great stewards of that stimulus package. We have made certain they go to vital projects. I can see it happening. I can see the pipeline activities coming in the next few months with high-speed rail, with communications opportunities. I think we are on the right course. We need to invest heavily now in a green energy, clean energy economy. That is our way in one sector of activity that can really produce a multitude of wins, with reducing energy demand, enhancing job creation, and reducing the carbon footprint of this Nation and the globe.

Mr. PERRIELLO. What the gentleman talks about here is so important. We have to have the courage at this moment not just to think about how we survive the next quarter, but how do we thrive in the next quarter of a century, How do we compete again. And spending $1 billion every day on oil that goes overseas to some of the countries that hate us the most is one of the dumbest strategies imaginable, $1 billion every day out of this country.

Let me brag on Southside, Virginia for a moment before I go on, because we are at the cutting edge of the new energy economy. Just last week, we worked with one of the biggest dairy farmers in the State, and we are going to turn cow manure into power. So instead of having all the effluence go off into the Chesapeake Bay and annoy

neighbors with the smell and be a costly thing that makes milk more expensive, we are going to invest in an anaerobic digester that is going to turn that into power, not only fuel the entire farm, but also much of the town around it.

□ 2030

I say to farmers who say, How are my kids going to make it with the utility bills that these monopoly utilities are jacking up on us—a 93 percent increase in my area in the last 5 years—I'd say, I don't want you to have a power bill at all. In 5 years, I hope you're selling power in the same way that you're selling milk today.

We have a truck stop owner in my district who's figured out a way. After 9/11, he said, You know, I'm nothing but a front man for al Qaeda. I'm selling their product. Instead, I want to sell an American product. He's worked with farmers in our area to use canola oil to sell a premium diesel fuel—a premium fuel, not a low-grade fuel—and instead of 3 cents on every dollar staying in the county, which is what happens in a normal truck stop, 93 cents on every dollar is staying in our community supporting farmers, supporting the refining.

One of the poorest communities in Virginia, highest unemployment, we're working in their landfill to capture the methane, turn it into power so we can reduce power bills for low-income residents and make it more attractive to business. This is what other countries are daring to do, and we've always been better at it. We've got to dare to be better at it if we're going to be ahead.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, the gentleman from Virginia couldn't be more correct. I'm a cattle rancher, so you're getting very close to home with the discussion about methane and cow power. It's a reality. It actually is happening in large parts of California. Keep in mind that methane is a greenhouse gas that's over 20 times more powerful that carbon dioxide, so you're getting a twofer here. You're getting an energy source. And methane actually is very similar in chemistry to natural gas, so it is a very, very important thing. It has all of the win-win that you just talked about and it takes care of a small environmental problem when you do this methane production.

So this is another example of the way in which this Congress last year in the American Recovery Act instituted public policies that are a win-win for America. These are long-term investments. More than a hundred, almost $200 million of that stimulus money goes into energy research. We're talking about jobs, researchers in laboratories and the university campuses that are figuring out how to do these things in an efficient and an effective way. In California, we have major research underway in laboratories at the universities that are figuring out how can you use algae to produce fuel. And it's actually happening. Some of that fuel is now being used in jet airplanes, and the Department of Defense is testing the use of that fuel, biofuels of all kinds.

The other thing that's happening here is the notion that energy is a fundamental national security issue. My colleagues, you've already talked about the enormous expense that the energy consumption is bringing to us and the risk that it puts us in when we get the energy from the most dangerous places in the world. Every step we take to conserve and every step we take to use alternate and renewable energy is a step that enhances our national security.

I want us all to keep in mind who was it that voted in the stimulus bill of last year, the American of Recovery Act, for these critical investments. It was our side, the Democratic side, that voted for it. And who voted against it, voted no? It was our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. There is a very clear dichotomy here on philosophy on how to deal with this. Yes, there is a deficit. More than half of that deficit actually occurred during the George W. Bush era in which this Congress was controlled by the other party. I'm being a bit partisan here, but these are the facts.

Now, what was left to us to clean up when President Obama came in? The greatest recession since the Great Depression. The statistics are clear. Look at the job losses, the way they accelerated during the Bush era. And look what happened when Obama and the stimulus package came into place. We saw a reversal of that. We're now building the American economy once again.

One final point, and this was brought up by our colleagues here, and that is the investment in education. This is a long-term investment. Before I took this job, I was a regent at the University of California, and I watched the enormous decline in support to that university. Forty thousand students are not at the State University and the University of California this year. Those are the people that will lead us in the future. They're not there. They will not be available to us. The stimulus package also put a lot of money into the education system and kept the schools open, kept the teachers working.

Thank you so very, very much. I yield my time.

Mr. PERRIELLO. Thank you.

And before I go to the gentleman from Ohio, I think it is important to note how serious fiscal responsibility is and how serious it is for those of us, frankly, who are some of the younger Members of this body who understand that this threat of fiscal irresponsibility is not coming due for our children or our grandchildren. It's not that far off. It's going to be within our lifetime that we see this. And in order to fix a problem, sometimes you have to understand the root cause of that problem.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DRIEHAUS. I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia.

Madam Speaker, I think it's important to look back and to determine where this deficit started. And when you look back, it's back in the Clinton administration when we began to turn around the budget here in the United States, where we began to go from deficits to surpluses and we were actually paying down on the debt.

At the beginning of the Bush administration, they had a choice. They had a choice: Should we continue paying off that debt, should we continue paying down the debt in order to support future generations, or, do we want to gain short-term political gain? I think Republicans in Congress and the Bush administration chose that short-term political gain, because we know what they did. They decided to pursue tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans, we engaged in two different wars that were not paid for, and we engaged in reckless spending. And that led to what? The greatest deficits that we have ever seen in the United States.

When we came in the numbers were off the charts, literally off the charts. Americans had never seen deficits like this. They could have chosen a different course. They could have said it's not the fiscally responsible thing to do right now, to pursue these massive tax cuts for the wealthy. They could have said if we're going to engage in war, we're actually going to pay for it as we go. But they decided not to, and they engaged in reckless spending.

So where has that left us? It required us to make an investment and to continue to spend in order to end this recession, because if we didn't make expenditures in the stimulus, the recession would have gone longer and the recession would have been deeper. I already mentioned that this was the longest recession that we have experienced since the Great Depression. It would have been significantly longer were it not for the stimulus. We know this to be true.

I gave an example earlier of the Realtors. Just this weekend, the Realtors and homebuilders were praising the tax credits in the stimulus for finally getting first-time home buyers back into the market. But we spent a lot of time here tonight talking about new energy technology and how we're going to build this economy in the future, and it is through investment in energy and manufacturing and clean technologies that we're going to move forward.

Just today, Ted Strickland, the Governor of the State of Ohio, gave his State of the State address. In that, the Governor said, I believe in Ohio because Ohio will power the future.

So I want to challenge the gentleman from Virginia, because Ohio is poised. Ohio is poised to lead this Nation in manufacturing, in clean energy technology.

And I'll just give you one more story because it's a good one. Several months

ago, I went out to a business in my district called XTech. Now this was a business that was really reliant upon the steel industry. They make steel rollers for the steel industry. They're made from steel. They sell to the steel industry. I went there thinking, Wow, they're not going to particularly like the investments that we're making in the stimulus in new energy technology. They're not going to like the direction that we're heading in terms of greenhouse gasses. Instead, when I walked in, they said, Thanks. Thanks for your support and thanks for the Congress. Because we get it. You get it. They realized that they were one of the few manufacturers in all of the United States that has the ability to make the steel gears for windmills, windmills that are being built and going up across the country.

Now, we could allow European countries to build these parts. We could allow European countries to sell into the United States. But because of the investments we're making in new energy technology, because of the investments this Congress is making to get us out of this recession, businesses like XTech see a future where there was no future before. That's what the stimulus has meant. Has it required additional spending? Yes. But that additional spending has allowed us to reduce the size of the recession, the duration of the recession, and put Americans back to work.

With that, I yield back.

Mr. PERRIELLO. I will take the challenge from the gentleman from Ohio and remind him of the recent NCAA soccer championship in which I believe the University of Virginia beat a team from your State, a very good team from your State.

Mr. DRIEHAUS. It was a good team.

Mr. PERRIELLO. I do just want you to be warned that that challenge may not work out well for your State. I think what we're talking about here is this issue: We cannot speculate our way to economic recovery.

Sometimes when I'm meeting with the folks in my district—just a couple of days ago I was down in a town that has seen several plants close. The big plants closed back in the nineties after NAFTA. A recent set have closed that had managed to cling on a lot longer. They turned to me and said, Do people up there know we exist, those of us that are making 15, 20, 25 bucks an hour? Do they know we're out there?

And they know that I'm fighting through the Jobs Caucus, through the jobs bill, by being a broken record about jobs, jobs, jobs. But there's a sense that sometimes those on Wall Street and, as Mr. POE mentioned, that Wall Street-Washington collusion, only think about the folks that are already doing really well in the economy and forget about that working middle class, forget about advanced manufacturing, forget about the next generation of farming and ag products and forestry, forget about the fact that two-thirds of job growth in this country comes from small and medium-sized businesses. They may not get the same headlines as the Goldman Sachs, but they employ America. They treat their workers well. They're accountable, and they produce real value in our community. Those are the folks we have to remember. Those are the people that are taking it on the chin from getting nickel-and-dimed by credit card companies and bank fees and utility rate increases and everything across the board. Those working- and middle-class folks need a voice. We need to be that voice.

I've given the President a little grief tonight and certainly his Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Geithner, for not being the change that I expected to see and not doing enough for Main Street, but when the President last came here, he did say something that's so important for us to remember. He was talking about how big the challenges are that we face, whether it's health reform or energy independence or the great recession. And he said, We're going to step up and face this because that's what Americans do. We don't back down. We don't back away from a challenge.

Every generation of Americans are faced with a challenge. Some have to storm the beaches of Normandy, some have had to fight great wars. We are being asked to figure out how to compete again in the 21st century and have a strong middle class. And part of that is being willing to do the tough decisions on energy independence and other areas that are going to be the job creators. When we worry about something like the Supreme Court decision saying that if corporations can spend unlimited money, that means the corporations that are competitive today will be able to lock in their monopolies through the Washington-Wall Street collusion. What we have to have is the innovation, even the creative destruction, to create the jobs and the competitive advantage of the future.

The President asked us to have that courage that every generation of Americans has, to not back down from the challenge. This is our challenge, whether it's how to get the budget balanced, how to shore up the middle class, how to be economically competitive in a global economy, how to create competitiveness in energy and health care and other sectors. This is our time, and we will step up and we will try to be worthy of the American people. We will not forget those working- and middle-class folks.

With that, I yield the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative PERRIELLO. Thank you again for bringing us together this evening.

The gentleman from Ohio charted for us the recession, and to use his phrase, it went off the charts, literally. I think what is important to recognize is that we stopped the bleeding. We stopped that drop off the charts with this stimulus package. And the experts, economists are suggesting that perhaps it would have been another one or two points higher, percentagewise, the unemployment rate.

□ 2100

Well, that translates into millions of people, millions of people who would have lost a job had it not been for this stimulus and stopping the bleeding. So I think this investment is wise. And it also tells us—we've heard here this evening—that we're investing in a way that allows America's business community and the manufacturing base to do it smarter. We give them the tools to do it smarter. I believe that that's how we sharpen the competitive edge for our business community. They compete in the global marketplace. If we give them a smarter outcome, we will be victorious at that global marketplace. We may not even do it cheaper, but we'll do it smarter. And that will be a thumbs up for the American worker.

So this evening, it was a pleasure to join with you to talk about what we can do with the clean energy economy, what we are doing with the stimulus, the investment in the future of this country in a way that uses cutting-edge tools, which is the important strategy here. And I am proud of the opportunities to be able to think outside the barrel when it comes to energy policy so that we can lift this Nation to a new era of accomplishment and competitiveness. It starts with the stimulus, and it will continue with legislation on jobs, job reform, health care reform, and certainly with energy independence. We need to multitask. Every American worker I know multitasks. We, here in this Chamber, need to multitask and get a host of legislative pieces done. These bills are essential to the rise of the American worker.

Mr. DRIEHAUS. I thank the gentleman from New York. Picking up on the point about multitasking and getting a host of things done. We haven't talked much tonight, and I think it's important. I have the honor of serving on the Financial Services Committee, and I think one of the most important things that we have done for the American people since we have been here is to make sure that we don't go back from where we came. And that is, we don't re-create what created this recession in the first place.

Recently we passed regulatory reform here in the House. The Senate now has that bill in front of them, in front of Senator DODD's committee, and I hope they take it up. And I hope they take it up in short order because what we were able to do in the House version of regulatory reform was to say, you know, these mortgage-backed securities, these credit default swaps, these crazy derivative products that no one was paying any attention to, that the Republicans in Congress said we didn't need to regulate but we know led to the great recession, what we did for the first time, we actually addressed it.

And we said, We're not going to allow the systemic risk in the system any longer. We're going to protect the American people because it's the folks in our neighborhoods, it's the folks in our communities that we represent that continue to pay the price.

So while the Wall Street barons are doling out bonuses left and right on Wall Street, the folks back in my neighborhood are still dealing with the foreclosure crisis. We still have hundreds, if not thousands, of homes in Cincinnati that have been foreclosed on. It's the neighborhoods that are paying the price. I haven't seen the investment banks step up and say that they're creating a community fund for communities across the United States to help alleviate some of the damage that was caused. Instead, they're patting themselves on the back. They're doling out bonuses.

Well, the school systems in our urban core, the small businesses in our urban core, the neighborhoods themselves and families still continue to struggle. They continue to struggle because of the unregulated activity of Wall Street. So we stepped up, and we took responsibility. We passed regulatory reform, and we're going to hold them accountable so that this doesn't happen again in the future.

With that, I'll pass it back to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. PERRIELLO. Well, it is interesting that you mention the importance of this because really, again, what we're doing is voting referees back on the field. We shouldn't be choosing sides as a government, but we should make sure the rules are there. Now no one ever leaves the ball game and says, Wow, I really liked the referees in that game. No one ever says, Oh, the referees did a good job. You notice the referees when things go wrong and when a bad call is made. Government certainly makes errors. But what is important is that we have referees on the field.

I talk to friends of mine all the time who are investors and business leaders, and they say, We want predictability and accountability in the market so we can then adjust to that. It's frustrating not just, I think, for many working and middle class folks who have been asked to pay for the mistakes that were made on Wall Street, in part because of mistakes that were made in Washington, to ask hardworking people in my district making $30,000 a year to pay for people that were making millions every year. But it has also been frustrating for some investors to say, Look, I made the smart investment. I didn't go for the crazy, exotic mortgage-backed securities and derivatives. I made smart, reasonable hedged risks, and it was fine. Yet the people who did make those high-risk, high-return investments not only got to see the upsides in the good years but then got bailed out in the bad years. I mean, if you go to Vegas, and you bet 13 on the roulette wheel, it's a sucker's bet. But if you know that every time you lose on 13, someone is going to make you money to make the next bet, and when you win, you're going to get to keep it all, of course you are going to keep betting on 13.

So with this, we must understand that the rules must be clear on the field. That's what this is. It's not about being anti-Wall Street. It's about being pro-accountability and having rules that are there. So let's get down to some brass tacks on Main Street job creation, that moves us from speculation on Wall Street to job creation on Main Street, and these are some good, commonsense ideas that should be able to be pursued on a bipartisan basis. We need to figure out a way to get lending going to small- and medium-sized business. If we need to do it through incentives, we can do it through incentives. If we need to do direct lending because the banks just won't do it, we need to do that.

We need to get creative. That is what I hear in my district. People want to expand. They want to hire. They can't get the lending. Consider a capital gains freeze for 2 years for small business. Infrastructure investment, particularly smart grid technology, water infrastructure, broadband infrastructure that we know creates competitive advantage. We've talked about retrofits that already make win-win sense in the economy. We can do this in the commercial sector, the industrial sector. Not at the scale of 100 homes here and 100 homes there. The market incentives are there to do this more broadly than that and put hundreds and hundreds of thousands of people to work in retrofits.

These are concrete areas that will not only help us in these dramatic downtimes in our economy, but do it in a way that creates value on the upside because we know that the cheapest electricity is the electricity you never have to buy in the first place. These are ways to invest in our competitiveness. And with that, I yield to another member of our class.

Mrs. DAHLKEMPER. Thank you very much. I appreciate the gentleman from Virginia bringing us together tonight. I just wanted to come and join you in the sentiments that you have expressed.

As we look at our country and look where we have been and how we got to where we are not just today but in the 200-plus years, it's our ingenuity, it's our resourcefulness, and it's our strong work ethic that really has always propelled the United States to success. Our prosperity, as we know, is built on the American dream and the belief that we can achieve extraordinary things in the future, regardless of all the challenges of the present. And this is the vision of Main Street Americans. Work hard, set high goals, and be optimistic about the future.

In the face of this economic crisis, it's all too easy I think to choose cynicism, but I think if we abandon the optimism, and the American dream, we'll do nothing but delay our return to prosperity. I have certainly seen small businesses on my Main Streets throughout my district who have really taken these difficult times and really made changes in their business, and we need to be here in Washington supporting those businesses.

I have had people like John Hall, who lost his job in the textile industry, but then that didn't deter him from a new path to success. In fact, he invented a new piece of fishing equipment. With the help of Penn State Behrend and the Northwest Pennsylvania Industrial Resource Center, he has brought his invention to the marketplace. In Butler County, BeamOne, a company which produces electric beam medical sterilization equipment, has announced plans to build a service center in a local industrial park that is going to create at least 20 new jobs.

I find great hope in all of these success stories around my district, and it kind of ties into what everyone's been saying. We cannot listen to the skeptics. The proof is back with the Americans, the Americans on Main Street. They have not lost their optimism. Many of them drive to really define our Nation's character.

It was mentioned earlier on that our decisions need not be about next week, next month or even next year, or even the election this year. The decisions that we make have to be about our future, the future for our children, the future for our grandchildren. We need to invest in that future, and I think we were doing that last year. We are going to continue to do that this year. It's the innovation that's going to take us to the future to make things I think more positive. We've got to be here in Washington, helping them along with that investment. Innovation, innovation, innovation which will lead to jobs, jobs, jobs. So I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DRIEHAUS. I want to thank the gentlelady from Pennsylvania for her comments. And I think tomorrow we're going to hear from the President, and the President is going to challenge us. Because while we know we've seen a 60 percent increase in the stock market over the last year, we also know that we're not to the point yet where we're creating jobs. I think all of us are very worried that while we are entering into a recovery, we're fearful that it's going to be a jobless recovery. We need to focus on creating jobs.

The President is going to challenge us tomorrow night to control spending while at the same time making strategic investments in jobs and job growth across the United States. That's what we're trying to do in infrastructure. That's what we're doing in clean-energy technology. That's what we're doing through our access to education, higher education, in the bills that we've passed earlier in the year. That's the challenge before us.

I think the American people are really sick and tired, quite frankly, of seeing Democrats and Republicans fight against each other because they feel that they are the ones that pay the price for that, and I think they're right. We need to come together. We need to come together, accept the President's challenge, and move forward to create jobs in the United States. So with that, I'll hand it back to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. PERRIELLO. We stand here in the midst of a tremendous economic crisis. What we hear when we go home every weekend is the pain of people who have lost their jobs, the fear of those who think they might be next, the confusion and frustration of having seen one administration seem to wreck the economy and the next not doing enough to fix it.

Well, like many Americans, I am not satisfied. We can sit here tonight and blame the other side for letting the deficit go off the rails or helping to wreck the economy. I am not satisfied being judged by what the other side did. I want us to be judged by whether we get this economy back on track. I want us to be judged by whether we have stepped up to the generational challenges that both parties have failed to address in the decades past.

It's too easy in this town to focus on winning a debate or a legislative fight or a campaign by convincing people that the other side is even worse. That's not a politics worthy of the American people. We've done a lot to stop the bleeding in the economy in the last year, but I'm not satisfied with us merely stopping the bleeding. We must have the healing and the rehabilitation, not just to get us back to where we were, but to an even stronger working and middle class that we've seen in the last few years, a more competitive American economy. A politics that doesn't just reward and lock in the status quo through corporate campaign contributions and ads, but rewards innovation and dares to think of what the next big thing can be, that can unleash again the American competitiveness that is being choked out by so much of the Washington-Wall Street collusion that seems to reward what has been, instead of what needs to be in this country.

It's good to see that Wall Street has recovered and is above 10,000, but I am not satisfied until we see that growth on Main Street, we see the job creation, we see jobs that are somewhere between $6 an hour and six figures for that vibrant middle class that's always been at the heart of this country. I'm a big believer in this President, and I am a big believer in hope, but hope doesn't pay the mortgage. We have to deal with the banking crisis, the housing crisis. We have to look at the construction sector, education, and workforce development. I am not satisfied with solutions that simply stabilize where we are or offer something a little bit better than what came before. We promised something better than that.

I believe tomorrow night the President has an opportunity to give an address to this Nation that gives an honest reading of the state of this Union, both its unbelievable strengths, its unprecedented hunger for innovation, but also the reality of its economic suffering, particularly with our middle class and working class families who continue to suffer under monopolies of electric utilities, of the credit card companies, of the joblessness; that we will see a President who steps up and continues to say, We are not going to shirk away from the challenges of our time because that's not what Americans do. We step up. We figure out a way to innovate, to out-compete, and to give the American people a kind of politics that they deserve.

That's what brought many of us into politics for the first time, like many of the freshmen who have been speaking tonight. And we are not satisfied yet with the change, but we still believe it is possible. We are looking for everyone to come together, Congress and White House, Republican and Democrat, and all the American people throughout this country, to dare to believe that that hunger we have for change and for hope can translate into real results, including a reinvention of America's competitive advantage that helps restore the strength of that middle class, that understands that two-thirds of our job growth comes from small- and medium-sized business, that gets lending going again, that gets job creation going again and moves us from rewarding speculation on Wall Street to job creation on Main Street.

I thank my colleagues tonight for joining with us on the eve of the State of the Union address.

□ 2115

GOVERNMENT SPENDING

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, Thomas Jefferson once wrote, To preserve the independence of the people we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. We must make our election between economy and liberty or profusion and servitude.

Unfortunately, it increasingly appears this Congress has chosen the latter path of profuse spending and the servitude to Big Government that results therefrom. For the next 60 minutes, I and my colleagues are going to talk about the problem our country faces from a very different perspective than you have heard during the last 60 minutes.

I want to start by pointing out the nature of this problem in terms of government spending. This chart shows the deficit each year, starting in 2000. In 2000 and 2001 under a Republican Congress and first a Democratic President and a Republican President we had a balanced budget and therefore we generated surpluses and, in fact, the two previous years before that we generated a total of $500 billion in surpluses that were paid down against the national debt.

Then came the recession and September 11, 2001, and spending increases. Many have, I think fairly, criticized the previous President and Congress for spending too much money during this period of time when deficits rose as high as $400 billion. In fact, this deficit in 2004 was the highest deficit in American history until we got to the very end of the Republican majority, when it went to $450 billion. Staggering sums of money; too much money spent.

But look what happened when the Democrats took the majority in the Congress in 2007. It skyrocketed to deficits that last year and this year are over $1 trillion: last year, $1.4 trillion; this year projected to be close to $1.5 trillion. To give you an idea how much money we're talking about, this year's budget is projected to spend about $3.6 trillion with revenues coming in of $2.2 trillion. So we're going to spend 50 percent more than we take in in revenues. And what are we going to do? We're going to borrow every penny of that money against our children and grandchildren's future.

Now, if this were going to resolve the problem, and some have argued on the other side of the aisle that the so-called stimulus, which contributed almost all of this deficit in this Congress, if they were going to argue that that was going to solve the problem and we would get back to balanced budgets and we wouldn't be borrowing against our children and grandchildren's future for as far as the eye could see, I would listen to their argument. I still wouldn't agree with them.

But their own budget belies what they claim about what they're doing with this so-called economic stimulus package because this is the projected budget for each year until 2019. For the next 9 years, it never goes below $700 billion and is around $800 billion, ending at close to 900, over $900 billion in 2019. Never does it go down, never does it even approach these numbers, which I and my colleagues who will speak with you tonight, all agree were excessive.

But they're nothing compared to what is being done right now, since the Democratic Party became the majority party in this Congress, and Speaker PELOSI has pushed these budget deficits that are absolutely staggering. What does it mean? It means that in 1990, the total national debt, the accumulation of those deficits was $2.86 trillion. And in 2007, when the Democratic majority took over, it was $8.45 trillion. In just two more years, it's now $12.18 trillion, rising by the end of the term of our current President, 6 years into the Democrats' control of the Congress, to $16.36 trillion, nearly doubling, and

then continuing at that upward arc even more dramatically after that.

This is the public debt outlook. This is the projection that says what the outlook was first in January of 2009 and then, after the stimulus had taken effect, after they had begun spending nearly $1 trillion that was allegedly going to stimulate the economy and create jobs for the American people, they came back and revisited it in August.

And while they were projecting this gradual but still very serious increase, it skyrocketed instead. Why? Because they have done nothing to control spending. They have done exactly the opposite. So now the President is going to come to the Congress tomorrow night and, as the President of the United States, we are all anxious to hear what he has to say about what we should be doing to address the problems of our country. And we are told by those who are in the know that the President will call for a spending freeze for 3 years. But what is he doing with the spending freeze but locking in those higher spending increases that have been passed through all the appropriations bills this year, some with 12, 14, 16 percent increases over the previous year, locking in those higher levels of spending when we all know that what really has to take place is to cut government spending.

What has been the effect of the President's efforts? Well, this is a chart showing job losses since the stimulus took effect in March of last year: 2.74 million more jobs have been lost in this country over the ensuing 10 months, notwithstanding the claim that this would create jobs and would halt the unemployment rate at 8 percent. Instead, it is now over 10 percent, and we've lost 2.74 million more jobs.

Well, what is the solution to this? A big part of it is something that 49 out of our 50 State governments have got to do, and the Congress should be required to do as well, and that is to balance the budget each year except in times of war or national emergency. In the last 40 years, those 4 years, in the late 1990s and into the early 2000s were the only 4 years in which the Federal Government balanced its budget. The other 36 years they ran a deficit. And you can see how that deficit is adding and mounting each year now, adding to that national debt. It should be the reverse.

In the last 40 years there have been economic crises like the one that we are in now, and there have been times of war when we might not balance that budget. But instead of four times out of 40 balancing it, it should be four times out of 40 not balancing the budget.

And that is why we need a balanced budget amendment in the United States Constitution; 49 out of 50 States have it. This Congress came very close to passing it as a part of the Contract with America in 1995. It passed the House of Representatives with a strong bipartisan majority, and was sent over to the United States Senate, and it failed in the Senate by one vote to get the two-thirds majority. It requires a two-thirds majority in the House, a two-thirds majority in the Senate, and then three-quarters of our State legislatures to ratify it.

Well, we got all but one vote that we needed in the Senate. Had that vote been provided to give us two-thirds, it would have been sent to the States. The President does not have any say in an amendment to the Constitution. So it would have been sent directly to the States. And I believe by now three-quarters of those States long ago would have ratified that balanced budget amendment, and we would be in a much different situation in this country today if we had done that.

Well, the American people have never abandoned this idea, even though the Democratic Congress long ago abandoned this idea, and that's unfortunate. But the American people, poll after poll shows that 75, 80 percent or more of the American people believe that the Federal Government should be required to balance its budget each and every year, except in times of war or economic emergency. And this would require a supermajority vote of the Congress to declare that they would not balance the budget in any particular year.

How popular is this? Well, here's what our current majority leader had to say about a balanced budget when we had that debate in 1995: the issue of balancing the budget is not a conservative or a liberal one, nor is it an easy one, but it is an essential one for us in this House, for the American people, and, most assuredly, for future generations.

Representative STENY HOYER, a member of the minority in 1995, voted for a balanced budget amendment; but we have not heard about a balanced budget amendment from this majority in this Congress at all. And we're here tonight to urge the Congress to bring up the balanced budget amendment that I introduced on the first day of this Congress, House Joint Resolution 1, a balanced budget amendment to the United States Constitution. And we will keep pushing for this until we have leadership in this Congress that will bring this bill to the floor for a vote so we can send it to the Senate again and challenge them again to provide those two-thirds votes needed and then send it to the States for ratification.

It is never too late for the Congress to do the responsible thing. But we have dug a much, much deeper hole as a result of the irresponsible budgets that have been passed by this Democratic majority in each of the last three Congresses and projected, as I pointed out, projected for the next decade, huge deficits as far as the eye can see, far greater than anything we have seen previously in the history of our country.

I'm joined by several of our colleagues, and I want to recognize the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN), who has been a real leader on this issue and has been working to organize support in the Congress for the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. I'm pleased to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. I thank the gentleman from Virginia for all your work as the prime sponsor of that resolution for a balanced budget amendment and certainly want to work with you to do everything I can to get that passed. You know, when we look at, I think as you mentioned, discretionary spending, nondefense discretionary spending now stands, I think, about $536 billion, up nearly 24 percent since the Bush Administration's last full budget in fiscal year 2008, which was $433.6 billion.

So we have a $1.4 trillion deficit right now. And the President is expected to address a joint session of Congress tomorrow night, and I think he's going to present two plans, from what I understand, to bring down the deficit. The first is he's going to freeze one-sixth of the budget that will be domestic discretionary nondefense spending, but only one-sixth of the budget; and over 10 years, the estimated savings, should that section of the budget not be allowed to increase, would be about—is estimated to be, by the administration, $250 billion. But when we look at the extraordinary increases that this administration's done, I think we're looking at nondefense discretionary spending went up 10.3 percent in fiscal year 2009, 12.3 percent as projected this year, when inflation is at an all-time low.

And I think that the other program that I believe that he's going to be presenting to the Congress is some sort of a Presidential bipartisan commission, controlled by his party, to lower the deficit. And first of all, I think if we look at the first plan, it's far too low. He needs to get spending down to where it was before he certainly got in office. But the second one, I think, is just going to be cover for a tax increase to have some kind of bipartisan increase for a tax increase without really reducing spending.

And I really want to rise in support of what I think the most important thing is that the United States can do, and that is the balanced budget amendment. And having been a former State legislator from one of those 49 States that requires a balanced budget, you have to make the hard decisions. And you rise in debate where you're debating tradeoffs, where you can't have everything, where you can't simply run a deficit for your operating budget. You can certainly go to the people or float bonds for certain capital improvement projects like roads and bridges and things like that, but you cannot simply increase spending that is out of balance with revenues that are coming in, unlike the Federal Government.

□ 2130

This is my first year in the Congress, and I see that as the most significant

problem facing the Congress, that you're in a situation where there are no tradeoffs, that an administration can come in and really try and have it all in terms of spending and put it at such an extraordinary burden, not simply on the economy in terms of inflation and high interest rates that could choke off this recovery, but to put a crushing debt on future generations yet unborn I think is extraordinarily unconscionable.

So with that, I rise in support with the gentleman from Virginia and look forward to working with you on what I think is absolutely the most critical thing. If there is one thing that we can do in the Congress of the United States to save this country from financial ruin—and without a strong economy we cannot have a strong defense to protect our national security interests—a balanced budget is the most critical thing that we can do for the future of this country in this Congress.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman. I hope he remains. There may be other things we may want to discuss about this.

But before we get back to him, I'd like to recognize the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) who is a very outspoken Member of Congress on this issue of fiscally responsible budgets and that we balance the budget of our country. And I will yield to the gentleman from Texas, and shortly we will get to the gentleman from Florida who I know wants to say a few words and then needs to leave, but I hope the gentleman from Texas can also remain and we will continue this dialogue.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the gentleman from Virginia, and I look forward also to working with you on the balanced budget amendment.

As our colleague from Colorado said, the single most important constitutional amendment that is bandied about these days, and there are several that are important, but there is none more important than a balanced budget. If we only could do one constitutional amendment in the next 10 years, let's do this one.

Think back. I wonder who those 35 Senators were in 1995 who all voted ''no'' on the balanced budget amendment, if any of them are still in Congress, if we could point to one of them and say, Had you voted ''yes'' in 1995, then surely during the surplus years we experienced in the late 1990s, it's easy to pass a balanced budget at that point in time because nobody's pig's getting stuck.

We would have avoided trillions and trillions of dollars in debt had one Senator moved over in 1995. It would be interesting to see if any of those 35 who voted ''no'' are still in the Congress right now and would fess up to having a good slug of this problem.

My colleagues all know that anybody can start a diet tomorrow. The easiest diet is the diet you start tomorrow. Wait until you start a diet today.

The single greatest threat to our way of life is not al Qaeda. It is not the Islamist jihadists, as bad as they are. They will get some of us, but they will not get all of us. The single biggest threat to our way of life in my view is the growth in this Federal Government as demonstrated by the growth in spending.

If you look at the chart, the more insidious two things about that chart are that, one, the 2010 deficit is estimated to be $1.4 trillion, which I think is not on that chart yet; two, the out-years, which are the least accurate, the out-years are all increasing. The deficit goes up. They can't even put together a set of numbers and facts that at least give the facade of showing they are going to drop spending in the out-years.

Mr. GOODLATTE. If the gentleman will yield, that is very similar to the fact over the weekend three different representatives of the administration got on television and claimed that the stimulus—which we've seen has not resulted in job creation but, rather, 2¾ million jobs lost—claimed, well, there would have been more jobs lost had we not had the stimulus, but they can come nowhere near agreeing with each other on what those jobs saved are.

I think the only really accurate figure is what is reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, which points out that we've lost 2.7 million jobs.

Mr. CONAWAY. Even over the weekend they were saying that yes, we've lost 7 million jobs but we've created X number of million jobs. The real issue is the net job loss, because those are folks that are out of work. That is kind of a hollow thing to brag about.

Another thing about the chart. It assumes that the Bush tax cuts from 2001 and 2003 expire. Hundreds of billions of dollars in new taxes are in those numbers, and those numbers are still as bad as they look and with the trillions of dollars of deficit that are accumulating.

Now, the bad news about this is that we're not going to pay that debt off. I had a fifth grade student in Fredericksburg, Texas. I was doing a town hall meeting for a school that was K–12. A little fellow raised his hand and said, Mr. Congressman, what's the plan to pay off the national debt? And I looked at him. I said, What? This is a technique you use to try to gain time to try to think of what your answer might be. He said, Yes, sir. What's the plan to pay off the national debt? I said, Young man, that's the single best question I've ever been asked. There is no plan to pay off the national debt.

So what we are doing is we're putting a floor under future generations' tax rates, because this cumulative debt, America will constantly pay the interest on this debt from now until eternity. So what we've done to future generations is you're going to have to tax yourselves enough to pay the interest on the debt from now on. That's before you get to start thinking about national security. That's before you get to start thinking about homeland security or anything else you might want to do with the world you inherit from us. You're going to have to pay the debt because your parents and grandparents didn't have the fiscal discipline to just say ''no.''

So I would love to stay around and visit with you this afternoon for some other comments, but I know our colleague from Florida wants to talk as well.

I couldn't agree with my colleague from Virginia any more. This is House Joint Resolution 1. It should be number one in our hearts and number one in the docket for this Congress. It should have been that a year ago in January, and it ought to be tomorrow on the ballot to be talking about because there is nothing more important to our way of life than gaining control of our profligate spending ways.

So I thank the gentleman for having this hour tonight.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman for his comments about House Joint Resolution Number 1. It is, by the way, the same balanced budget amendment that passed the House as a part of the Contract with America, missed by one vote in the Senate. Same language entirely. And it has over 170 cosponsors in the House right now, including many Democrats. It's bipartisan, and it needs to be bipartisan to get that two-thirds majority of the House to vote for it and pass it and be able to send it on to the Senate.

I would now like to recognize the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BUCHANAN) who has also been a leader on this issue and has, in fact, introduced a balanced budget amendment on his own. And we are proud to work together in promoting fiscal responsibility here in the Congress.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I would like to thank the gentleman from Virginia for his enormous leadership.

As I agree with all of my colleagues, everybody has a different reason why they run for Congress. I have been in business for 30 years. Your first term, my second term. But that was my number one issue by far is these runaway deficits. And since I came in 2006, we've got $1.4 trillion. We've picked up another $2 trillion. Another 20 percent we've added to the deficit in the last 3 years. It's crazy.

The numbers today were over $12 trillion in debt. And with the budget the Democrats have presented in terms of going forward, they're talking about close to $20 trillion in the next 6, 7, 8 years. If you took the number of 5 percent cost of money on $20 trillion, it's a trillion dollars a year before you pay $1 for Social Security, Medicare, or anything. It's unbelievable.

This past year, the deficit was $1.4 trillion. As bad as it's been in the past, if you look at $300 billion, $400 billion is way too much. We should have been balancing those budgets. But $1.4 trillion, that is three times larger, plus, than any other deficit from that standpoint.

The last 50 years—and what really motivated me is why this has to be a bipartisan effort. In the last 50 years, I think—and you might know exactly the number, but I think it's only been about four or five or six times we balanced the budget. Forty-four times we haven't. We're incapable of balancing this budget, with the exception of getting a constitutional balanced budget amendment.

Forty-nine out of fifty Governors have to balance their budgets. Our city in Sarasota, Florida, or Manatee County, they've got to balance their budgets. Families have to balance their budgets. Businesses can't continue to spend.

I grew up in Detroit down the street from General Motors. If you look at the most powerful, successful corporation in the world, made a lot of commitments to a lot of folks who used to be 30 and out for the blue collar worker. My brother was there when he was 18. Many of them looked at 30 and out. But now they've reneged on all of the benefits and everything else. We've got to stop it. It's crazy, and we've got to bring some common sense to this whole process.

That is why we've got to have a constitutional balanced budget amendment. As my colleague mentioned, we were one vote short in '94, and we've got to go back in that effort. It defies logic why we don't do that.

The other thing, I came here and I want to be the best I can, bipartisan. The Democrats talked about PAYGO. That's a joke. PAYGO, it sounded good. You know, it's better than nothing, I thought. But we ran our largest deficit ever—$1.4 trillion with PAYGO. You look at now we want to have a commission and talk about that on a bipartisan basis. Again, they won't get it done. I have absolutely no confidence that that is going to get done.

We need a constitutional balanced budget amendment that says if you take in $3 trillion—that is what we took in my first year in Congress—you don't spend more than that, $3 trillion. As we said, 49 out of 50 Governors can't spend more than they take in. In the State of Florida, our budget was $72 trillion a few years ago. It's down to $62 trillion. They've had to make the adjustments. They've had to find the efficiencies. And we've got to do the same thing here.

I tell people—I think it was roughly a year ago you might remember we had a bill here, Aid to Africa. We were giving them $15 billion a year. And the thought was in this environment, same environment we're in now, tough year, families are making cuts, businesses are making cuts, you think they might cut it 10 percent or maybe add 2 percent. We're a very generous Nation. They went from $15 billion to $50 billion. And I think every Democrat voted for it and half the Republicans.

So my thought was, Okay, here we go. We're going to go borrow the money from China. Taxpayers are going to pay interest on that for a long time, and our children and grandchildren. And it's going to go to Africa, and God only knows where it goes when it gets to Africa. I thought to myself, Why don't we have China give it to Africa? Why do we have to be the middleman in that process?

But the bottom line is we've got to recommit ourselves. I think what happened on Tuesday a week ago in Massachusetts, spending and runaway spending has got so many people in my district and I think across the country, they realize that we defy common sense up here. That's why they're so angry and mad. There are a lot of other issues, but I think the top of this is they're concerned about what we leave our children and grandchildren.

I was in Bradenton, Florida, at a town hall meeting. A gentleman stood up, 63 years old. He said, Congressman, I have never been to one of these. I don't get involved politically in this. But he said, I have five children and I think 13 grandchildren. It's the first time in my life—I've been a small business man all my life. I am very, very concerned about where we're at and where we're going. I feel like we're heading towards bankruptcy, what I see, what I sense, my business background. He said, We can't continue to keep spending.

And I share that feeling. I know that my colleagues all share that feeling today, and this is the most important issue. It's the reason I came in 2006. I have two children in their mid-twenties. Every generation has left it better for the next generation. I don't want our generation to be the first generation that doesn't do this. And we need to come together in a bipartisan basis and do what's best, in the best interest of not only Americans but America.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I'd like to talk a little bit about what those economic consequences are, not just for our children and grandchildren, which should be our greatest concern, but not too far down. And in a moment I will turn to the gentlemen from Texas and Colorado and ask them, to get the benefit of their thoughts about what the consequences are of these deficits running as far as the eye can see if we don't pass a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution and start living within our means like every family, every business, large and small, every local government, and yes, even every State government, some of which are not managed very well. But they have to come to terms with the consequences of their actions a lot more quickly than the Federal Government ever has because of the fact they don't have this requirement to balance the budget, and every year they kick the can down the road. They say, We can have it all, and we'll just borrow more money to pay for it.

Well, I've asked high school students when they have come to see me or when I've had an opportunity to speak to them in their classes, I said, Who do you think is going to bear the burden of this debt that we're piling up? And they know the answer to that. They know that it's falling on their shoulders, but they don't have an appreciation of how serious it is, how large a debt it is and how dramatically it can affect the future of our country in the long term and also in the not-too-distant future as well.

□ 2145

So I said, let me give you a starting point to think about that. I said, how much is $1 trillion? The economic stimulus package, $1 trillion, cha ching. The budget deficit, the $3.6 trillion spending at the beginning of the year—they projected $2.4 trillion in revenue, $1.2 trillion deficit. We now know that we are several months into that year, and lo and behold, it's even greater than $1.2 trillion. Over $1 trillion, the health care bill, the monstrosity that brought people out to the polls in Massachusetts last week, $1.1 trillion, according to the Speaker's budget projections; in the Senate, $800 billion.

But we all know that when you have a bill that has 10 years worth of taxes to pay for it and only 6 years worth of benefits that you are using smoke and mirrors and it costs way more than $800 billion over a full 10 years of benefits. Most economists say it will be over $2 trillion over 10 years to pay for either the House or the Senate health care reform bill.

So how much is $1 trillion? I said, let me give you a starting point. If you had a stack of $1,000 bills, nice, freshly printed, tightly packed $1,000 bills, just 4 inches high, you would have $1 million. These students were pretty impressed with that. Most of them had never seen a $1,000 bill, and to think that just 4 inches would be $1 million. I said, how high would that stack of $1,000 bills, not $1 bills, $1,000 bills, have to be to reach $1 trillion?

Well, one young lady said, would it be about 12 inches? And a fellow in the back of the room raised his hand. He laughed. He said, oh, no. It would be a lot more than that. It would be about 20 feet. I said, well, think about it this way. One billion is 1,000 times 1 million. And 1 trillion is 1,000 times 1 billion, or 1 million times 1 million. And so that stack of $1,000 bills that is 4 inches high, to be $1 million, would have to be 4 million inches high to be $1 trillion. Four million inches is 63 miles high. It reaches up into outer space. And that's just $1 trillion.

That's just for the stimulus, or just for the deficit for the coming year, or double that for the new health care bill that they want to add in terms of overall spending that will cost either the taxpayers of this country or borrowed against the future of our country.

When you're talking about trillions of dollars, you're talking about a staggering amount of money. Back in the 1960s, there was a very famous Senator

who was widely quoted as having said, $1 billion here, $1 billion there, pretty soon you're talking about real money. But do you know what? That is not what he said. Everett Dirksen, the Senator who said that, actually said, $1 million here, $1 million there, pretty soon you're talking about real money. And that was just 45 years ago that he said that. And we've moved from millions to billions to trillions because this Congress doesn't have the fiscal responsibility that would be required by a balanced budget.

There are consequences, serious consequences for every American family and every job holder in this country. And that's why I want to turn to the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Colorado to get their perspective on just what happens if we don't get this problem under control.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

It is stunning to think that a stack of $1,000 bills, 1,000 of those, which would equal 1 million bucks would be 4 inches tall. Another way to look at $1 trillion, if you were to try to spend $1 trillion in 1 year, to do that, you would have to spend $32,000 per second every second of the year in order to get, to fight your way through $1 trillion. It's a staggering amount of money.

The number that doesn't show on your charts there is the unfunded promises that we've made. There is about $62 trillion in unfunded promises that we've made. To pay off that $62 trillion—that is the present value of those unfunded promises, this Federal Government over the next 75 years would have to run a $62 trillion surplus. I don't know who thinks that is even remotely possible to make that happen. The 4 years out of the last 40, I think, that cumulative $17 billion in surpluses over that 40-plus year period, and now we've added another 10 years to that 40 of deficits.

The first-quarter deficit for fiscal year 2010 is the fourth-largest, and would have been the fourth largest annual deficit ever, just to show you how fast we are running through this money.

The doctor fix, I mentioned that—starting the diet tomorrow. I hope the President comes in tomorrow night and says, we have a looming problem with our doctors and the Medicare reimbursement issue. The Congress gave it a 2-month extension back in December. The fix he referred to is that doctors on Medicare get a 21 percent cut in their reimbursement rates. None of us want to let that happen, period, to our seniors and to our physicians. But by the same token, we don't want to take the fix and simply add that burden to future generations. Let's start tomorrow night with the first doctor fix, which will expire February 28, and have that paid for by cuts in other spending so that we don't, in fact, take a difficult problem—but it's the most, it's the most near-term difficult problem—and show the world that we can fix it.

The other thing I would like to make a point of before I hear from the gentleman from Colorado in terms of what would happen, the Democrats are talking about the economy this and jobs that, all those kinds of things, I don't think there is a single thing we could do more important to incentivizing American jobs than it would be to seriously address this looming financial crisis of the Federal Government. If we were to say, yes, we are serious about balancing a budget, I think the confidence that that would instill in the market, in small businesses and large businesses all over this country, would do more than any $787 billion stimulus, any $150 billion stimulus that the House passed over that one Republican vote in December, the $80 billion stimulus that's being contemplated in the Senate, nothing of that sort will have a dramatic impact the way that balancing this budget, or at least telling the American people we are serious about balancing this budget, with an amendment that requires it; not good faith efforts, but requires a balanced budget.

I don't think there's anything we could do that would stimulate jobs and this economy any better than doing that. The confidence it would instill in this country would be palpable, I would think, if we were to do that.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman. And I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. COFFMAN. I thank the gentleman from Virginia and appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Texas on this very critical issue about a constitutional amendment for a balanced budget to the U.S. Constitution.

Let me just say about what is the impact as a former small business owner and actually as a former State treasurer for the State of Colorado, what is the impact of this deficit spending on the economy as a whole?

First of all, it's interesting that you hear rumblings around the world from other countries about given the U.S., given their fiscal policies, given their lack of fiscal discipline and how that will impact the dollar in terms of the strength of the dollar, should the dollar still be used as the international reserve currency? But I think the immediate effect that we are going to see certainly is a weakened dollar. And a weakened dollar is going to lead to higher inflation rates. Particularly as the economy tries to expand, you will have private borrowing competing with public borrowing, and that will create a higher demand and higher interest rates. But certainly the perception of a prolonged weakening of the dollar is going to cost us more as borrowers. It will drive up interest rates.

Then also look at just the extraordinary inflationary impacts the chronic deficit spending will have on that economy. I think that those things are shorter. And I believe that those things in concert will choke off the ability for this economy to fully recover. If we do not control spending soon, it will choke off the ability for this economy to ever fully recover. We will never see, we will never see the prosperity that Americans have experienced up until now. And it has always has been the next generation always had it better than the last. And I believe that we are at a turning point now where unless this Congress changes its ways fairly dramatically fairly soon, this next generation will not have it better than the previous generation.

I yield back.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I agree with the gentleman entirely. We are at great risk.

And let's start with the stimulus. The group speaking just before us were touting the great benefits of this economic stimulus package. We've already seen that during the time that we have been in the process of spending this nearly $1 trillion, all of which, by the way, is borrowed against our children and grandchildren's future, every penny of it is added to the national debt, but before we mention that we've lost 2.74 million jobs since the stimulus program began, the stimulus is founded on an economic theory, and that is called Keynesian economic theory. This says that if there is an economic downturn, the government will borrow money and use that money to spend on various projects and programs to employ people, and they will then generate economic activity. They will spend the money they earn with other people. That will cause people to manufacture goods in response to that demand, and the economy will start growing.

And this is the last part. This is the part that is always left out when they talk about the economic stimulus package in Keynesian economic theory. The last part of Keynes' theory was that when that economic activity took place, and the result was a growing economy, and there would be increased revenues coming into the Federal Government, that they would use those revenues to pay back the money they borrowed to get the process going.

And every time there is one of these so-called economic stimulus programs, do they pay the money back at the end? No. And it's very clear that there's no such intention here when you have $800 billion-plus deficits as far as the eye can see, to say nothing of the unfunded liability, the promises that the gentleman from Texas referred to, that is even far, far greater than what we are seeing here on this chart.

And so, that is what really puts the lie to the idea that this stimulus is going to have any long-term good effect.

The first concern I have is that at some point in time the amount of money we've borrowed, when the economy does start to grow, not just in this country but elsewhere in the world, and in some economies, they are already growing, and, in fact, they are

growing at a pretty healthy pace in countries like China and Brazil. They're going to have increased demand to borrow money. And our government is going to have increased demand to borrow money. And that means that at some point, not right now because people are saving money at a higher rate than they ever had, and interest rates are very low, and banks are afraid to lend that money to a lot of people, therefore there is a lot of money in the bank that is not being lent. And therefore interest rates are low. But in the not too distant future, whether it's 1 or 2 years, we are going to see demand for that money rise. And then the point made by the gentleman from Florida, that you will have $14 trillion, $18 trillion $20 trillion accumulated debt and interest rates go up to 5, 6, 7, 8 percent.

I can remember back during the Carter administration in the late 1970s when the prime interest rate got over 20 percent. If we face those kind of interest rates with this amount of debt, the burden on our government is going to be staggering, and therefore the burden on our economy and our people. And it's going to result in very near-term staggering problems in terms of high interest rates, perhaps hyper-inflation related to the very weak dollar compared to other currencies around the world. And then we are going to have what it seems like we are already getting into right now, and that is some evidence of some growth in our economy, but continuing to lose jobs. And then, behind that, you have inflation set in. You're going to have the stagflation that people remember from the 1970s and early 1980s.

This is not a prescription for the future of our children and grandchildren. This is a prescription for an economy that will go downhill and have a very, very different future for this country and the people of this country. And it's not too distant when that kind of impact could take place.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the gentleman. I would just like to add to what you're talking about. U.S. taxpayers have benefited from artificially low interest rates because when the world's economy went bad, a bunch of the money that was out there fled. It was a flight to safety. That money fled into U.S. Treasuries. And we have basically been warehousing that money for folks all over the world at pretty near zero interest rates because they knew they would get it back from the American taxpayer.

What's happening now, with these increased deficits, is not only are we having to issue debt to pay off maturing debt, but we also have to issue new debt to fund these trillion-dollar deficits out there every year. Normally, you would expect that an increasing demand would cause the price of whatever it is you are demanding to get more of to go up. And that hasn't happened because the rest of the world, like I said, has fled into U.S. Treasuries.

Now, as the gentleman said, economies around the world are beginning to rebound. People are having opportunities to invest their money at higher interest rates or higher expected rates of return. And so we will very soon, one of the first indicators that things are going awry is as you begin to watch the weekly auctions of debt, our interest rates begin to inch up because we have to pay higher interest rates in order to attract lenders to our debt versus the opportunities they have got in other currencies.

□ 2200

This fallacy that the stimulus bill worked is based on the premise that government spending will solve the economic problems of this country.

If that is the case, then this government has spent more money in 2009, 2010, 2011 than has ever been spent in the history of man. So if runaway government of spending were the solution to a vibrant economy, why aren't we in the most vibrant economy ever known? Because we have spent more money out of the Federal Government than has ever been spent before.

It makes no sense that you can continue to borrow greater and greater levels of debt and continue to spend that on programs that, quite frankly, aren't in and of themselves stimulus programs. They are just basically money transfers or transfers of wealth between one group of people and the others. It doesn't create any additional wealth. That cannot sustain itself. But our colleagues across the aisle seem to ignore just the hard common sense that you cannot spend your way out of this problem.

I think it was Ben Franklin who said, You can't stand in a bucket and grab the handles and try to lift yourself off the ground, which is equivalent to trying to tax and spend your way out of a problem. And that is what we have been trying to do with this thing, which is a giant bucket with all of us standing in it.

Mr. GOODLATTE. If the gentleman would yield, I am curious what the gentleman thinks about the speculation the President tomorrow night will call for a spending freeze on discretionary spending.

Obviously, we are pleased that he would want to stop the dramatic trajectory upward in spending that we have seen from this Congress in each of the last 3 years since they have been in the majority. But is that enough? Is that going to solve this problem if we lock in at these higher spending rates that we are experiencing right now?

Mr. CONAWAY. If the gentleman would yield, I would feel a lot better about our President tomorrow night if he would say not only are we going to freeze spending, but we are going to freeze it at 2008 levels.

I go back a couple years. What has happened with the $787 billion stimulus, much of that money went into already-existing programs and elevated the floor of current spending. And then, on top of that, the 2010 appropriations bill, as our colleague from Colorado said, double-digit increases on that. So we are spending a significant amount of money more in 2010 than we did in 2008.

So if the President would say, All right, let's reset the clock back to 2008, when he first got here, at those levels and then freeze it there, I would feel a lot better about what he is trying to propose tomorrow night.

I do want to point out that it seems as if over the weekend he was going to freeze spending except for defense, homeland security, VA, and foreign affairs. Then I heard today or yesterday that, well, even within the discretionary spending that is going to be frozen, if programs create new jobs, then they are not going to be frozen. So it will be interesting to see what the fine details are tomorrow night on what the President has to say.

Mr. GOODLATTE. And I would add to that that it would be wonderful if this President of the United States, or any leader of our country, would step forward and say what we really need is the kind of discipline that requiring each and every year that we balance the budget would impose upon this Congress. Because we make tough decisions; but, most of the time, when the going gets really tough, they spend money on both.

We talked about PAYGO. The gentleman from Florida mentioned that as well and pointed out that it is really meaningless. If you look at it, they imposed these new rules after the adoption of this new health care bill and the enormous cost of that and claimed that it is being paid for, but do so with smoke and mirrors by taxing for 10 years but only providing benefits for 6 years, and claiming they are going to cut $500 billion out of Medicare at a time when the number of people eligible for Medicare is going to skyrocket.

Starting this year, 2010, those who turn 65 were born after World War II; and for the next 15 years, the number of people who are eligible for the Medicare program is going to increase dramatically.

During that time, I think we are going to see a need to have significant reform of the Medicare program. But the money saved is going to have to be made available to have more people covered under the program, not to divert it to set up a whole new government spending scheme.

We have been joined by the gentleman from Iowa, and I would like to yield to Mr. KING for his comments about the balanced budget amendment.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) for leading on this Special Order tonight and for leading on fiscal responsibility here in the United States Congress.

This balanced budget amendment is something that I am proud to be an

original cosponsor of. I have done so every time that this has been offered since I have been here in Congress. And the dialogue that is here tonight adds so much to something that has been missing completely, I think, from the administration and from the White House.

We went from a point of Republicans pushing towards a balanced budget and listening to the PAYGO arguments of the Blue Dog Democrats demagoging on the issue. I don't know where they are today. It seems to me that they have gone underground. Maybe they are the Ground Hogs rather than the Blue Dogs at this point.

I don't hear anything from them about balancing the budget any more, because they understand that in order to fund this kind of profligate spending that we have, this $1.4-plus trillion deficit created by this Obama budget, that, by their method, we would have to raise taxes dramatically.

What I wanted to do is keep the taxes low, slow the growth in government; and for years I said, slow the growth in government so that the economy can catch up. I am now to this point where I would say the other way is that I don't believe the economy can catch up with the spending that we have. I think we actually have to shrink government in order to get it back in line.

This is going to be a very big task. It isn't going to happen under Speaker PELOSI's watch. It isn't going to happen if President Obama has a veto pen to control our spending in this Congress. But we do have an obligation to advance, as much as we can, this constitutional amendment. We have an obligation to offer a balanced budget, which we did this year. The Republican study committee balanced budget, that is something that I had pushed for for some time, and we will have a balanced budget offered this year.

So I just encourage all of my colleagues, Madam Speaker, and everybody in the United States of America to step up to this level of responsibility. If we can do it with our family checkbook, we must do it with our government checkbook. If we fail to do so, our economy will continue in this downward spiral.

We have got to get our capital, our money, our spending back underneath us and realize that government cannot grow us out of this economic problem that we are in. It has got to be the private sector. And the private sector cannot continue to pay the taxes to service the interest and the debt of a deficit that we have been spending under this administration.

I would point out, also, that Speaker PELOSI took the gavel at the end of November elections in 2006, January of 2007. At that time, we saw capital investment in industry go significantly downward. And I watched the members here and the freshmen from the other side tonight talk about how this was all Bush's problem. Well, if they are taking responsibility for anything that turns good, they have to accept the responsibility for what has happened since Speaker PELOSI took the gavel. All spending starts in the House of Representatives.

I thank the gentleman from Virginia, and I yield back.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman. And the gentleman raised a very interesting point about how we grow this economy and what this does to it, because he correctly points out that we are going to grow this economy in the private sector, people who will go out and take the risk of creating a new business or expanding the business they have and creating new jobs as a result of that by offering a product or a service that people want and are willing to pay for and can afford to pay for it.

But if the government is out there borrowing $1.3 trillion, $1.5 trillion, $900 billion, and then $800 billion-plus every year thereafter as far as the eye can see, what is that going to do to the amount of capital that is available in the private sector? Especially if interest rates go up, and the government is absorbing so much of the credit that may be available around the country and other countries, and their growing economies are also competing for those same limited resources, we are going to find it very, very hard for free enterprise to survive if our government keeps spending more than it takes in and keeps growing in the enormous size.

It is projected that if you continue this rate of spending, we are going to have government spending 28 percent of our gross domestic product. The Federal Government, not even counting State and local governments, historically, it has ranged between 18 and 20, 21 percent, which is pretty high, in my mind, and many others as well. But it is nothing compared to having that shoot up to 28 percent. That is a huge additional amount of spending, more than $1 trillion each and every year.

And as you can see from this chart, almost all of it borrowed, borrowed against the future not only of our children and grandchildren but of the jobs that people hold today and the jobs that 15 million Americans who are out there looking for work hope to get if some employers will take the chance and can get the credit to allow them to start or expand their business.

We have been joined by another Member. I want to point out the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) are members of the House Judiciary Committee, as am I. This is the committee that has jurisdiction over all constitutional amendments, and it is the place where we are pushing the hardest to try to get the Democratic chairman of the committee to examine this legislation, just as it was not that many years ago and passed the House of Representatives on more than one occasion, and on one occasion came within one vote of passing the United States Senate. Think of what a different country we would have today if we had been living under balanced budgets for the last decade instead of what we have seen.

I would now like to yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. I sure thank my friend from Virginia for yielding.

And, yes, we need a balanced budget amendment, and that will do great things. It will strengthen the dollar. It will show the world that we are responsible when it comes to spending for a change. And also, of course, we know that takes ratification of the States and passing both Houses, and we just flat need to do that.

In the meantime, we understand the President may come into this very Chamber and stand right up there and actually suggest that perhaps we ought to freeze the budget of three Departments.

□ 2210

Well, I am so glad that our President is coming around and getting on board with some Republican proposals. This is H.R. 4408. But rather than three departments, this is—and I will read from the bill. It was filed last year. Got lots of Republicans on as cosigners. No Democrats yet. Hope they will come on board once the President starts talking about this. But it says, to amend the Balanced Budget and Deficit Control Act of 1985 to eliminate automatic increases for inflation from CBO baseline projections for discretionary appropriations, and other purposes. It will end the automatic increase in every discretionary budget in the Federal Government.

Now we're talking about being responsible with our spending. No automatic increases every year. Nobody I know of in America gets that kind of thing. If they're working, if they produce, perhaps they'll get an increase. Well, the government shouldn't get automatic increases every year. If you're going to get an increase, it has to be justified. And that has been lacking for so long.

I will just read here. It says, This act may be cited as the Within Our Means Budget—WOMB—Act of 2009; whereas, from passage of this bill will come a new birth of freedom for American taxpayers and an end to the automatic increases for each department that has been bankrupting America.

There are all kinds of good solutions. So I'm proud the President's coming around. Perhaps if we can push him a little further, we can make him even a little more responsible so we start reining in the greatest budget deficit in a 1-year history that has just gone on under this President's watch.

So I appreciate my friend from Virginia yielding, and I look forward to starting to get Democrats, now that the President is talking about some good Republican ideas.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Well, I thank the gentleman for his comments. You

know, Washington, D.C., has a spending addiction, and it has proven to be an addiction that the Congress cannot control without a balanced budget amendment requiring that it make the difficult decisions to balance it each and every year. We have gone in a few short years from a deficit of billions of dollars to a deficit of trillions of dollars and we're printing money at an unprecedented pace, which presents risks of inflation, the likes of which we have never seen. Our debt is mounting rapidly and so is the waste associated with paying the interest on that debt, yet Congress has so far refused to address these unsettling problems.

This is not a partisan addiction. It reaches across the aisle and afflicts both parties, which is why neither party has been able to master it. We need outside help. We need pressure from outside Congress to force us to rein in this out-of-control behavior. We need a balanced budget amendment to the United States Constitution. Families across our country understand what it means to make tough decisions each day about what they can and cannot afford. According to a recent Zogby Interactive survey, approximately 70 percent of Americans said they have reduced spending on entertainment in the past year; 40 percent have limited or canceled vacation plans due to the economic environment; 40 percent have decreased spending on food or groceries; almost 10 percent have either changed their education plans or have chosen not to pursue education plans at all. Most troubling, 16 percent have foregone medical treatment or prescription drugs.

These numbers show how sobering our economic recession is, but they also show something more. They demonstrate a basic principle that honest, hardworking American citizens understand: When your income drops, your spending must drop, one way or the other. Yet, far too frequently this fundamental principle has been lost on a Congress that is too busy spending to pay attention to the bottom line. If Americans must exercise restraint with their own funds, then government officials must be required to exercise an even higher standard when spending other people's hard-earned income.

I urge my colleagues to support the balanced budget amendment to the United States Constitution, House Joint Resolution 1, and I yield back my time.

HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. CHU). 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. I appreciate the honor to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the House. I appreciate the previous hour, the gentleman from Virginia leading it, talking about the responsibility that we all have to provide a balanced budget here in this Congress and recognizing that the political forces that are at play here, let's say in Congress and across the country, everybody wants their measure. It has been something where Federal dollars have been distributed on down through the chain from the Federal Government to the State to the counties to the cities, other political subdivisions, parishes. Other examples of that, individual organizations get appropriations.

It has been very, very difficult for this Congress to find the discipline to produce a balanced budget. So that's one of the reasons why I believe strongly that we have got to amend the Constitution so that we have real strict constraints, because Congress hasn't shown the discipline to balance the budget.

That would not be the case for the individuals that are here on the floor tonight that are pushing so hard for this constitutional amendment. Every one of us that are cosponsors of the resolution led by Mr. GOODLATTE would vote for a balanced budget, of course, and we would also and have supported a constitutional amendment.

I wanted to transition the discussion just a little bit tonight, Madam Speaker, from this fiscal responsibility on over to the health care responsibility. First, I'd take us back to the President's statements and throughout the campaign and into his Presidency and after he was inaugurated as President over here on the west portico of the Capitol building, and that was January 20th of last year. That first anniversary just rolled around last Wednesday, Madam Speaker.

The President of the United States, President Obama, said that we are in an economic problem—I don't want to overstate the language he used, but we couldn't fix the economy without first fixing health care, that health care is apparently a contributor. Too much health care spending is a contributor to the economic problems that we are in. So it didn't make sense to me and it didn't connect that when you have what was described as an economic meltdown, a chance that we might be losing the fiscal structure of currency and trade between the countries and the global financial structure, if we're risking a meltdown of the global financial structure, I don't know how we could think the problem of spending too much money on health care, solving that is going to solve the economic potential meltdown. But that was the position that the President took, Madam Speaker, when he said over and over gain we can't fix the economy without first fixing health care.

So, even though it didn't make sense, that was the position that President Obama took, and here we are. The average industrialized country spends about 9.5 percent of their GDP on health care. Our numbers are about 14.5 percent of our GDP. Some will say a little over 16 percent of our gross domestic product on health care. So the President's proposal is we spend too much on health care, but his proposed solution is spend more on health care. In fact, spend a lot more on health care, even to the point where he drew a line and said, I won't sign a bill that costs more than $900 billion.

So the House went through a lot of logical contortionism and contrived a bill that tried to stay underneath that level and then sent it over to the Senate, where they went through a few more, let me say, accounting contortionist activities to try to be able to proscribe their bill from going over $900 billion, why? Because the President said he didn't want to sign a bill that costs more than $900 billion.

□ 2220

Well, it turns out that the accounting gimmicks were so stark that anybody else would have been laughed out of the Econ 101 classroom if they had proposed such a thing as, let's say, 10 years of revenue and 5½ to 6 years of cost to get down to a number that's just slightly under $900 billion. When you look at the first real 10 years, according to Senator JUDD GREGG from down this hallway in the Senate, the first real 10 years is $2.5 trillion. We have some other numbers out of the House side that shows around $2.1 trillion in cost for the first 10 years. And when you look at what JOHN SHADEGG has put together, you really see some numbers that escalate all the way up to $6 trillion.

So the President's problem is, we have an economic problem that he wants to solve by, first, fixing health care because we spend too much money, and we're going to fix it by spending a lot more money, trillions of dollars more, $1 trillion to $2 trillion to $3 trillion to maybe as much as $6 trillion more. Illogical? As I said, you'd be laughed out of an Econ 101 classroom to come up with an argument that you could do an accounting that showed 5½ years of cost and 10 years of revenue and then claim that it only costs $900 billion under that.

So we know that's, number one, a flawed premise, a flawed result. The American people understood that, even though the people in the echo chamber in the White House and the leadership chambers here in the House and in the Senate didn't seem to understand that. The second thing, the President of the United States consistently said that we need more competition in health insurance, that the insurance companies aren't competing, they don't have competition. So in order to do that, he proposed that we create a Federal health insurance program. A Federal health insurance program, that the Federal Government get in the business of competing against the private sector health insurance industry.

Now I wonder if the President was briefed on how many health insurance companies we have in the United States. That number is 1,300. There are

1,300 health insurance companies in the United States. Now that would seem to be a lot of competition to me, to have 1,300 companies and have the Federal Government get into this and create one more company—the Federal Government, as big as it is, as much advantage as it would have. Then we would have, though, 1,301 companies in the United States selling health insurance. How many policy varieties do we have? Well, Madam Speaker, that number falls in the area of 100,000 possible policy varieties out there in the marketplace.

So 1,300 companies, 100,000 policy varieties that one could choose from if they could buy insurance across State lines. The President wouldn't go for allowing people to buy insurance across State lines. That would be a little bit too much liberty for an American to have. So instead, he would want to impose a single-payer—he said he was for single-payer many times during the campaign—a single-payer plan, which would be a Federal health insurance plan to supplant or replace all 1,300 companies and 100,000 policies with the beautiful, wonderful Federal Government offerings that would surely be adequate for anybody in America and satisfy all of us, unless we just weren't quite enlightened yet. That seems to be the message I'm hearing from the White House.

So we find out that we had two flawed premises. One was, if we spend too much money on health care, spending more doesn't solve that problem. The second premise was, if health insurance companies need more competition, the way to get it is not to put the Federal Government in the business and try to replace them and drive them out of business. The way to get it is to open up sales across State lines so that that young man that is paying $6,000 a year for health insurance in New Jersey can buy his health insurance from Kentucky, where a similar policy would cost him $1,000 a year, not $6,000. That would be an example of what's going on. If we took the House version of the health care bill, a young man in Indiana, would see his health insurance premiums go up 300 percent. His $84 a month would be $252 a month, almost exactly a 300 percent greater health insurance premium because of the mandates and the language that is in the House bill or in the Senate bill.

So the American people watched this, Madam Speaker. They watched it all across America. We watched the reaction, the rejection of the American people of this irresponsible spending. It was discussed pretty deeply in the previous hour. The nationalization of these huge entities, which was discussed by the Democrats in the hour before. It sounded to me like George Bush had nationalized all of these companies and had taken over the private sector, and now here we are, President Obama is stuck with all of that, and that they don't really have any choice, except to go do a lot more of what it was that they said that George Bush did that was wrong.

Well, I'm not here to make a statement into the RECORD that George Bush got it all right, Madam Speaker. He got a lot of it right. A few of the things history will judge that he didn't get quite as right. But what we have seen in the last 16 or 17 months—and at least 12 of them have been under the Obama presidency—we have seen the nationalization of eight huge formerly private-sector entities, entities that are making a profit and competing in the private sector. That's three large investment banks, AIG the insurance company, Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, General Motors, Chrysler. And throughout all of that, put on one end the $700 billion worth of TARP and on the other end the $787 billion worth of economic stimulus plan that looks like maybe only about a third of that has been spent at this point, but they still want another $150 billion or more dollars in Son of Stimulus, or Stim II, some call it.

This is Keynesian economics on steroids, and I have heard the President say—and I doubt if he will make this statement from this Well, Madam Speaker, tomorrow night—I have heard him say that Franklin Delano Roosevelt's New Deal actually did work, but the problem that he had was in the second half of the decade of the 1930s. He failed to spend enough money. If he would have just spent a lot more money, then the New Deal would have actually been a good deal, but FDR got a little nervous about spending too much money, so he pulled back. Those were the words the President used, ''pulled back.'' And then what we had, according to his description, was a recession within a depression, and it was brought about by the Federal Government not spending enough money. Well, this wild program, these Keynesian economics on steroids have been driven by this presidency—not driven by George Bush—driven by President Obama.

And by the way, every nickel and dime, every nationalization, every single move that was taken in the last months of the Presidential campaign and in the last months of the Bush presidency, were all things that were approved by and supported by President Obama. He voted for TARP. He spoke for TARP. He sat at the table in the White House and spoke in favor of TARP. That's $700 billion, and you can't hardly say that it was not President Obama's responsibility when he spoke for, went to the White House and negotiated for it, voted for it and took it over—and by the way, that TARP was only—and I say only, Madam Speaker. The original TARP was $350 billion. That's half of what Henry Paulson asked for. The other $350 billion had to be approved and authorized by a President to be elected later, by a Congress to be elected later. That's this Congress, this 111th Congress. That's this President, President Obama. It's the Pelosi Congress, the Reid Senate, and the Obama presidency, all of this except $350 billion in spending.

So it brings us to this point where the American people have seen that they thought that they had elected people that were responsible, that understood high finance and the whole big picture that a government has to do so well—that is this constitutional Republic, this representative form of government, Madam Speaker. And so when we saw the TARP plan come through and the nationalizations of a couple large banks and then AIG, and we watched how some of those insider deals worked out pretty good in the long run for those people that were inside, as we marched down this line—Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac—the American people were getting evermore nervous at the spending and the nationalization, the government takeover of private business.

But when they got to the takeover of the car companies, Madam Speaker, that, for sure, wasn't George Bush. That was all President Obama. When that happened, the American people's lightbulbs came on because they know cars. And when the car czar turned out to be a 31-year-old fellow that had never sold or made a car—we don't know if he actually ever fixed one or what he drove—but in any case, he was not qualified to be the car czar, and I think that that was a universal opinion or he wouldn't have been gone.

But the American people saw with that example that the Federal Government, that they really didn't know what they were doing inside the White House echo chamber, and they got ever more uneasy, ever closer to the civil type of a revolt that took place. We saw it happen in Virginia, and then we saw it happen again in New Jersey, and then in Massachusetts a little over a week ago when SCOTT BROWN was elected to the United States Senate—the most improbable place. And when the exit polling was tabulated, and they asked people, Why did you go vote for SCOTT BROWN? Over 70 percent said, I did so because I want to kill the bill.

□ 2230

I want to kill the socialized medicine bill. Madam Speaker, that bill may be dead. On the other hand, it might be a—I know it's a monster. It might be a cold-blooded monster. And on a cold day, and it is a cold day here, you can't tell if a cold-blooded monster is alive or dead. But I want to make sure that it's dead and that bill stays dead and that the American people are glad that it is dead, and they don't want to see it resurrected by the White House, by the Speaker of the House, by the majority leader of the United States Senate or anybody else.

They breathed a big sigh of relief and a shout of joy went up all over America when Massachusetts elected SCOTT BROWN, because people are going to be allowed to keep their liberty. And we

want to make sure they're allowed to keep their liberty. And for that reason, some of us, and my colleague from Texas certainly in the middle of this, worked to put together a declaration of health care independence. We want to put a marker down that we all adhere to, that we can keep our word on because there remain people in government, I mean, at least in Congress, that do give their word and keep their word.

As cavalier as it's been dealt with here in the last few months coming out of the White House, those of us that'll sign on this declaration of health care independence, we intend to lay our word down and keep our word. And I say that here, and I haven't backed up on mine. Neither has the gentleman from Texas. I think I'd get along pretty good in east Texas. There's some times I'd like to go down there and visit those folks because it's quite interesting the people that they send up here from that territory. And I'd like to yield so much time as he may consume to my friend, the gentleman from Texas, Judge GOHMERT.

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, I thank my friend from Iowa (Mr. KING). And I know from having visited Iowa, it's composed of extraordinary people as well. And I tell you, just in the last month we have seen extraordinary things across the country, from Massachusetts, for one, for, we saw when we had a Senator take—basically hold up the health care bill, many of us hoped it was going to be on good principle, but it turned out it was just for money to take back to his State.

But here, again, you had to love the people in America's heartland. I think the gentleman from Iowa knows where Nebraska is. And here the Senator comes back and says, you know, gee, I negotiated hundreds of millions of dollars for you here in this State at the expense of the whole rest of the country. And what did Nebraskans say? The vast majority said, we don't want that dirty money. That's not ours. We don't want extorted money. We don't want dirty money. We just want fairness. And you've just got to love folks that have that sense of equity and fairness and justice and understand where the country came from.

And so it's that spirit, that same spirit that started a revolution back in—going back to 1775 and 1776, with the production, as we know, in July, of the Declaration of Independence. And what a historic time that was. What a powerful time that was. And we know, going back to those days, that now we have the letter that John Adams wrote Abigail after the signing of the Declaration of Independence. In the last part of the letter he says, talking about the celebration and the incredible event that had occurred, the coming together, the first draft of course that Jefferson did, and of course the first person he showed it to was then John Adams.

They politically were at odds, but they were friends at that time, very close friends, even though they fussed and argued over political issues. And then Adams was just taken aback with how fantastic the document was. He may or may not have made some minor changes. And then second to see it was Benjamin Franklin. Now, Benjamin Franklin made more changes, the editor and publisher that he was. And then that was brought to the body, and they debated and they fussed and they came up with this, the final declaration. And after they had come together, they signed it.

The last part of John Adams' letter to his wife, Abigail, was this, his words: I'm apt to believe that it, the day of the signing of the declaration, will be celebrated by succeeding generations as the great anniversary festival. We call it July 4, Independence Day. It ought to be commemorated as the day of deliverance by solemn acts of devotion to God Almighty. John Adams' words. It ought to be solemnized with pomp and parade, with shows, games, sports, guns—of course we use fireworks instead of guns quite so much now—bells, bonfires, illumination from one end of this continent to the other from this time forward forever more.

Then he goes on very seriously to Abigail, and he says, You will think me transported with enthusiasm, but I am not. I am well aware of the toil and blood and treasure that it will cost us to maintain this declaration and to support and defend these States. Yet, through all the gloom, I can see the rays of ravishing light and glory. I can see that the end is more than worth all the means, and that posterity will triumph in that day's transaction which I trust in God we will not rue.

So that's basically the gist of the end of the letter, and that was quite an occasion. In other correspondence he had said, you know, we have within our grasp the opportunity to govern ourselves that people have only dreamed about, that theologians have written and talked about, but it's within our grasp to govern ourselves. But then we also know that one of Thomas Jefferson's great lines was, The normal course of things is for liberty to yield and government to gain. And that's what we've been seeing, particularly for the last year or so.

Liberty has been yielding and government has been gaining. We know that government is where the jobs have been gained, not in the private sector, not liberty jobs, not jobs of freedom, but government taking more and more away from the private sector. And then we see this health care monstrosity, 2,000 pages, not about health care. You know, we've heard people say, it's about the government taking over one-sixth of the economy. But I like the way our friend, TOM PRICE, put it. It's not about taking over one-sixth of the economy. It's about taking over 100 percent of every individual. That's what it's about.

And so, as my friend from Iowa knows, we've spent many, many hours with friends like MICHELLE BACHMANN and others, so many others up here on Capitol Hill, putting our heads together and working, giving and take, to come up with a document that really declares what we believe about health care. And I imagine my friend from Iowa is as sick as I am of hearing people, even here on the floor, come in and say, well, Republicans, they don't want reform. They're the party of no, no, no. We have over 40 bills that are good solutions to health care problems.

And I know that my friend from Iowa agrees: we need reform. We want reform to health care. We cannot have the costs continue to skyrocket like nothing else in this country. We can't have that. We need reform, but we don't need more government. We need health care reform. And it was in that spirit of coming together, not with something as dramatic as John Adams and Thomas Jefferson and Ben Franklin and those incredible intellects came up with with the original Declaration of Independence, but really with that, just a modicum of that great spirit of independence that they had and not wanting government to gain and liberty to yield, but wanting liberty to triumph and yet everyone have the opportunity for life, liberty and pursuit of happiness.

□ 2240

So in that spirit, the Declaration of Health Care Independence was put together. No one got shot. No one lost their fortunes, as did so many of those 56 signers of the original Declaration. We owe them so much. But we also owe them not to continue to allow liberty to yield and government to gain. They told us what would happen. Read their writings. Read their quotes. We owe them better than that.

And that is why it's going to be so great to have so many people coming together and say, I am making this declaration. I am pledging that we are going to adhere to those principles of liberty and yet providing a better chance for health care with affordable health care under patient control where the relationship between a doctor and patient doesn't have a government intermediary, doesn't have an insurance company getting in between the patient and doctor.

It gets us back to something that has been missing for so long, and that is a regular doctor-patient relationship. And to think in that 2,000 pages, one of the biggest parts of it is we're going to bring all of the health care records to Washington and we're going to store them here for you because that way we will know all of your deepest, darkest, private secrets. There is nothing your government won't know once we get holed up every one of your most private medical records. That was a big deal.

You hear them say, well, we'll cut this out, we'll cut that out, because they know when they have every person's medical records in Washington,

D.C.—and under both the Senate and the House bill you make the Internal Revenue Service the enforcement arm for a health care bill, the worst of all world's—the government knowing all of your most private secrets about your own body and the Internal Revenue Service having access to them and to your finances to bring about, as TOM PRICE says, a hundred percent control over your body, that is something that should be intolerable. That is why we need a Declaration of Health Care Independence.

And I know there are friends across the aisle who believe abortion is just fine; it's just tearing the tissue out. I know we have other friends like BART STUPAK who know what abortion is, that it's taking a life. But surely, surely we can get the vast majority in this body to agree that taxpayers should be protected from being forced to pay for abortion when they know and believe in their hearts it is taking the life of our most vulnerable people.

There is just so much that needs to be done to drive a stake through the heart of this terrible monstrosity called the health care reform bill.

With that, I yield back to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, listening to the gentleman from Texas recount the circumstances by which the Declaration of Independence was written, and I recall reading through a fair amount of that history and watching a movie or two, some of the frustration that Thomas Jefferson felt with John Adams' scrutiny of his language and later on Ben Franklin's and then the broader Congress, I've never been in a position where I could so sympathize with Thomas Jefferson as I do. But also I so much more appreciate the artful work of the Declaration of Independence because it was a product of a lot of fruitful minds that had to come together and to be able to take all of the ideas and patch them together and then turn it into something that is beautifully eloquent at the same time. It's pretty hard to do. It's like a piece of sheet music and trying to patch in different stanzas here and there and have it come out and have it actually play right before the orchestra.

And the Declaration of Independence has stood up under the tests of time as one of the most beautifully written documents anywhere. But part of the reason is not just its eloquence but because it speaks to the heart of humanity. We know we hold these truths to be self-evident, that we are endowed by our Creator with certain unalienable rights.

I wonder what Thomas Jefferson would think if he could go down do to the Jefferson Memorial and realize that of the four panels inside of the memorial, three of them—the quotes of Jefferson—three of them referenced his belief in God. It's hard for the people on this side to argue that Jefferson was a Deist when three of his quotes referenced God.

And, by the way, there are two typos in there, Madam Speaker, that I would challenge the historians to go down there and check on them. One of them comes to mind right away. The other one I'll think of when I go back down there to read it.

I wanted to take up this issue of our Declaration of Health Care Independence which will be rolled out tomorrow, and we will lay it out in more of a clear, concise form. But it's laid out on these principles that you've heard Mr. GOHMERT talk about and the prediction of what would happen—let me say what would have happened if that horrible socialized medicine bill would have been sent to the President's desk where, if he could sign his name at all, he certainly would have signed the bill. He had no reservations about what was coming out of the Pelosi House and Reid Senate. The people of Massachusetts did; the President did not. And the American people line up against this in any form, any of these forms that have been proposed, at least 70 percent in opposition.

And so here's why first the American people lined up against this socialized medicine proposal, either the House or Senate version or the ObamaCare as it's sometimes described, because we know that a Washington takeover—and the American people know, Madam Speaker, that a Washington takeover of American health care would deny fundamental personal and economic liberties, and it would devalue our individual liberties, and it would reduce the principle of limited government as established by the Constitution. That's number one.

It would have increased costs and taxes upon every entity that we could possibly mention, and it would have crippled our American economy, and it would have created inescapable new taxes, mandates. If the Federal Government were for the first time in the history of the United States to produce or approve a product and then require every American to purchase that product—the people that couldn't afford it, send them a check and then say, Use this voucher to buy yourself some health insurance, or, by the way, If your employer has 50 or more employees, they have to provide your health insurance for you. Unless you're in the construction business, then it's five or more employees because of the exemption that was written in by the construction labor union. So all of these little construction companies that are sitting here with five and maybe tomorrow are going to have six employees, they're only going to have five—those that have six through 49 would be treated differently than every other employer because they were in the construction business, because somebody in the construction business had unions that were strong enough to leverage a piece of favoritism into the legislation.

But if there is a mandate there, it is a tax. Whether it is a tax that is levied and you have to pay the tax to the IRS and they go out and buy your insurance for you or if the Federal Government mandates you go out and buy that insurance, the only difference is who actually handles the transaction. You handle it yourself to avoid the IRS levy against you, which would be the fine. The punishment for not paying it, the same thing. A mandate to buy insurance, to compel people to buy a product produced or approved by the Federal Government for the first time in history that that has ever been done is a tax, a new tax, and it's a new tax on everybody that has to participate that wasn't otherwise or wouldn't otherwise have been participating.

That is one of the other bad things about this. It would institutionalize, Madam Speaker, a massive, ever-expanding Federal bureaucracy that is impersonal and impractical. And that bureaucracy would devise new ways to grow and get more power and diminish the liberties of the American people. That's the nature of bureaucracies. They've always done that. And we've put people in white shirts and ties and sent them off in an expensive Federal building, and then they set about building empire. And they'll come back here and say, We need a little more empire, and they'll write rules that we'll never see. And those rules will have the full force and effect of law, because this Congress has abdicated a lot of our responsibility when it comes to rules.

So the bureaucracy grows. The huge administration state grows.

And it also would have—and I say ''have'' because I believe this bill is dead and I want to make sure it stays dead—it would have empowered bureaucrats to interfere with a doctor-patient relationship and that the process of doing so would have undermined quality, would have limited choice, would have increased the costs.

These were the downsides that were coming at the American people that caused them to rise up and express themselves in two Governor races. Those were nationalized races in Virginia and in New Jersey. And when they had the opportunity to have a national election for a United States Senator in Massachusetts, they took it.

□ 2250

The American people appealed to the decency of the elected majorities. And their leaders here in this Congress did not respond, except to do more force-feeding of liberal, social engineering policies, expensive policies and things that people don't want. The level of elitism and arrogance is breathtaking. And I don't think it has ever reached this high in the history of America. That cavalier disregard for the Constitution, when someone would ask Speaker PELOSI, where in the Constitution do you see the constitutional authority to pass a national health care act such as you have done here out on the floor of the House of Representatives? A cavalier attitude, Madam Speaker.

We take an oath to this Constitution. And people will take the oath. They will do so with their hand on a Bible, and they will walk out with no other thought to it at all. There is a whole movement over on this side of this Congress that believes the Constitution doesn't mean what it says. They will make that argument. I sit on the Constitution Subcommittee. I have heard the argument over and over again, a living, breathing Constitution. Some time back in the 1930s, the Supreme Court had some language threaded into a decision that says that the Constitution is living and breathing.

If the Constitution is living and breathing, if it doesn't mean what it says, then, Madam Speaker, I would ask the question, what is it for? Who is protected by a Constitution that is living and breathing and changing and can be amended by the whim of any judge in any Federal courtroom anywhere in America? I had an attorney tell me once, if you give me a favorable judge and a favorable jury, I will amend the Constitution in any courtroom in the land. And that happens by precedents that find their way up to the Supreme Court.

I take this stand, Madam Speaker. That's this: This Constitution does mean what it says. The text of it means what it says. And it means what it was understood to mean at the time of the ratification, either the base document, or the amendments if things flowed through. And if it's something else, then the Constitution is no guarantee whatsoever. It simply is an artifact of history, or else it can serve as a shield for someone in a black robe to hold up and make the argument that you're a layperson, so you can't begin to understand what this Constitution means. Leave it to us. We're the professionals in the black robes. We dropped the powdered wigs; we still have the black robes.

I don't think putting a robe on makes a person exclusive when it comes to understanding the English language. I think we have a lot of people—and I'm a ditchdigger by trade. A lot of people digging ditches can read this Constitution and understand what it means. I think we have a lot of TEA party patriots that do read the Constitution and understand what it means. We see a lot of people standing under American flags and yellow ''Don't Tread on Me'' flags with a Constitution in their pocket. They understand what it means better than some of the people who have taken an oath of the Constitution in this House of Representatives, Madam Speaker.

This Constitution is threatened by socialized medicine, the bill that has to stay dead.

We also offer solutions and a framework to go forward, a solution and framework to go forward, and we say, we the people and representatives of the United States, make this declaration, that as a matter of principle, we want to protect the doctor-patient relationship which the gentleman from Texas talked about. And we want to reject this national debt that gets heaped up on us over and over again that was the subject of the previous hour. And we want to improve quality of care, and we want transparency in the negotiations. And we want to treat every American citizen in this same fashion that we treat our public officials, and vice versa. If it's good enough for an American citizen, it ought to be good enough for an elected public official, wherever they might be serving.

And I appreciate the discussion about the funding for abortion. When there's a policy that is seeking to be advanced by this side of the aisle in the United States Congress that would compel the taxpayers to fund abortions, something that is abhorrent to the value system of America, the majority value system of America, that is about as egregious as it can get, to be roped into being a citizen, held down to pay your taxes and have that money extracted out of your pocket to go to the Planned Parenthood or the abortion clinic.

When you think of conscientious objecting taxpayers, that is about as close as you can get to having a complete revolt on your hands. And when I looked out last Friday at the March for Life, the numbers in the Mall here and standing on that stage, people as far as the eye could see. It was reported to be in the neighborhood of 200,000 pro-life people bussed from all over this country, and some flew in to come and stand up and march, pray and speak for life, as they do every year, as they do every day in these United States. That is the largest continuing demonstration in the history of this country. There's no movement that has brought those numbers of people here to Washington, D.C., year after year after year for 37 years. And to think what they would have had to say and do if there had been a socialized medicine bill passed that compels people to fund abortions or brokers policies that pay for abortions. Those people that came, I among them, would have been in even greater numbers than 200,000. And at some point they aren't going to be as polite as this good group of people are when they see that happening.

So I'm glad that marker has been put down. The new mandates that are being proposed on patients, employers, on States—we've heard from the States. In fact, that is the Corn Husker Kickback. ''Exempt me from the cost of the new mandates'' is what that statement was. But in reality, there was a moral portion that was negotiated in that, too, and it was language that didn't hold up to the standard of the Stupak amendment, which wasn't good enough for me. I supported it, but I would have liked to have done more and better.

It was an eroded standard that was offered in the United States Senate. And it was rejected by the pro-life organizations in the country. That moral position appeared to have been traded off for a monetary one, which is an exemption from paying the increases in Medicaid that would come about because of the socialized medicine bill in the Senate that brought about these special deals. Special deals, Madam Speaker, for—let's see, let's go to Maine. Was that $11 billion for community health clinics in Maine? Eleven billion dollars. Well, there's a kickback there. That didn't get a lot of publicity. But that is part of the deal.

The exemption from the—say the elimination of the Medicare Advantage programs in Florida for that Senator NELSON, the Corn Husker Kickback in Nebraska, the Louisiana Purchase in Louisiana, the list goes on. We don't know what all is in the bill. Those we do know about. Those are all special deals. All those special deals are completely rejected by this declaration.

Another one of those mandates that came would be setting up health insurance policies in the country that are funded by the taxpayer and that compel employers to insure their employees or individuals to buy the insurance if they are not working or if they have an employer that is not mandated to buy. And within all of that we would fund illegals, give them their own health insurance policies so we could put another, bigger magnet out here, a jobs magnet, a welfare magnet, and now your own private health insurance policy magnet, argued and defended for by LUIS GUTIERREZ, for example, and Mr. HONDA of California. Many others believe that it's a matter of social justice that American people would owe a health insurance policy, an individual health insurance policy, to people that break into the United States illegally.

What a reach that is from a justice standpoint.

We cannot be expanding any further benefits, health care benefits to illegals in America. We provide emergency services by law. And a lot of times, we don't backfill the bank accounts of the health care providers. For example, if you go down to Arizona, in Arizona the most southerly trauma center is the University of Tucson Hospital. That is at least 70 miles north of the Mexican border because the rest of those hospitals have closed. They can't afford to provide free health care services to the illegals. And the American taxpayers can't afford to pay them either. So those are some of the things that are on the list here and things that are important for us to talk about.

I'm happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas to pick up where I left off.

Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate the gentleman from Iowa pointing these things out. And I do recall in the President's address here in this very Chamber back in September, I believe he said in that speech that there would be no funding abortion. Now the trouble for us was that some people in this body actually read and had been reading the House bill. And there was one section there, and I don't have the bill

with me, I have got a copy all tabbed that I have gone through because I was reading the bill. And shockingly, even though, the President said there won't be a penny going for abortions, you turn right there, and there's a section title that says ''abortions,'' for which Federal funding can be spent or approved. And you go, whoa, I guess the President didn't know about that.

□ 2300

We heard the President say there is no money in this health care bill that is going to go for illegal aliens, and I think one of our friends hollered out about that time. When the fact is, as we know, when the House health care bill passed, one of the things that had been written up in the local papers were there were Members across the aisle that said: if you put a requirement in this bill that people show identification to show that they are legally here, they are legal residents and therefore legally getting the health care insurance benefits, then we are voting against the bill.

Some of us think that should have been the motion to recommit, and that would have of course either gotten the bill pulled or it would have gone down in defeat if our friends across the aisle who said they would vote ''no'' if that was in there had been voted for and approved.

But the way it stood, I think most everybody in here knew, except for the President—we know he wouldn't lie because the Parliamentarians told us that—but when he said that there would be no funding for illegal aliens, he didn't know, apparently, because if he did, it would have been a lie. So, obviously he didn't know that unless there was a requirement for identification in order to get the proceeds, then they are entitled to get the proceeds, illegally here or not. And obviously he didn't know that, or he wouldn't have said it.

I have a dream that one day the President's promises are going to be kept. I have a dream it is going to happen. And I know when the President told America eight different times on television that we are going to have all these negotiations on C–SPAN, I know some day we are going to have all these negotiations on C–SPAN. It hasn't happened yet, because I have been trying to find out where the negotiations are going on so we could have true transparency.

It was a great idea when the President said it, so that people all over the country can see who is negotiating for them, who is negotiating for the pharmaceuticals, who is negotiating for the insurance companies, who is negotiating for the plaintiffs' lawyers, who is negotiating for AARP, and who is really standing on the side of the retired folks. We would be able to see all that and it would be transparent.

When I heard him saying that over and over on television throughout the Presidential campaign, I have to say, I thought, now, that is not a bad idea. That is a good idea. We will make this totally transparent. And even though I am a Republican, I have to say, the President had a good idea.

Now, the trouble is we have got to get him to follow through. Once he won the election based on things he promised, we need to get him to follow through, because he did have some good ideas and the American people liked those ideas.

If you go back and look at the exit polling data from 2008, November, when the President won, indications are two-thirds of the people in America said they voted for President Obama, and jobs and the economy was the number one issue. I believe it was about 10 percent who said that health care was a big deal to them, health care reform. So I think he misread the results.

People wanted job assistance, get jobs going. We know that 70 percent of the jobs come from small business; yet his stimulus bill provided less than 1 percent in loans and assistance for small business.

He told America, well, this is going to create infrastructure. Might as well do that. And it turns out less than about 7 percent of that bill went for infrastructure.

So I think it is important that when the President has a good idea, this body follow through, whether the President wants to follow through or not. And these things should be transparent. It should be open.

The 40 bills that we have as solutions and great ideas to helping reform health care, because we want reform, we need reform, they ought to be listened to. There are some great ideas. And one of them would be complete transparency, and that is one of the things we want people to pledge, that you need transparency.

The President was right when he was a candidate. He hasn't been right on that point since he has been President, but he was sure right as a candidate. And you look at the Declaration of Health Care Independence that we hope that lots of folks will sign tomorrow, transparency is a critical issue.

Now, when you have a health care system where the big insurance companies, whether it is Blue Cross or Aetna or any of them, where they get one really, really cheap price and the government pays a small amount, but if you come in and pay cash because you are a hardworking, lower-middle class person that is struggling to make every dime and to make every dime stretch, and then you come in and you pay several times what the insurance company or the government pays when you are paying cash, the system is upside down. It needs reform.

And we do need to say, as candidate, now President, said, you have got to have transparency. You have got to see who is selling out whom. And so if there were a group that said, We are for retired persons, and yet they didn't care what their members said, and they were losing members right and left who were dropping their dues, but you found out they make a lot more money from selling insurance than they do from people paying dues and they are getting a special deal and have millions more buying their insurance, then you would have some idea.

And they also maybe negotiate that their executives will not be under the same pay cap that most other executives under the Federal insurance exchange part of it, people would notice that if they are watching it on C–SPAN, and they might get upset at anybody who says, I am representing retired persons, publicly, but in negotiations they cut deals for their executives and not for their retired people.

Those are the things that need to be brought out. Those are the kinds of things that I know folks tomorrow, when they sign the Declaration of Health Care Independence, will be thinking about. You need transparency. You need accountability and oversight.

One of the things we saw with the Madoff scandal, with the credit default swaps scandal, with AIG overextending on selling those, Goldman Sachs selling themselves in with AIG, and then their former chairman getting them the massive bailouts so that they could have the biggest, most healthy profiting year in history this last year, all these kinds of things going on, you need transparency and you need somebody standing up for the people. You need reform. And the government should be about oversight. It should be about making sure there is a fair, level playing field.

And then the government doesn't play. They are referees. We don't need them as players. We need them as referees. That is an obligation this body has fallen down on badly in the preceding years, and it is time we got back to it.

Those are things that need to be part of reform. The government should be about making sure people play fair, not being the bully player on the field that muscles everybody else off of it. Those are the kinds of things we need to be about.

And when you think of the things that have been represented and what turned out to be true, people were told, well, this group came out with a study that said if you are between 40 and 50 and you are a woman, you shouldn't get a mammogram. And then they are told, well, that wouldn't have the power of law. Then they get to finding out, well, gee, if this bill passes, what that body just said is going to be part of the law. And if you are 40 to 50, you don't get a mammogram.

How many women have had their lives saved because they were able to get a mammogram between 40 and 50, and they found that little tumor early while it was still localized, at a time where they were allowed in the United States to have a 98 percent chance of success and no cancer at 5 years;

whereas, in England, where they have the socialized medicine that some of our friends across the aisle are trying to drive us to, they have about 20 percent less success, and about 20 percent more die of cancer. They don't need to if you let them have the mammogram when they need it.

And those are the kinds of things that need to come out. People need to know those. I yield back.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I thank the judge from Texas.

On the transparency side of this discussion, too, to broaden that out, Madam Speaker, when I address transparency, I am speaking of two things. One is transparency in the negotiations, so everything is out there in sunlight. And the other is transparency in billing, so people know what is being paid for health care services.

The part about the negotiations that is so important, if they took place on C–SPAN out in the open, out in the light of day, if it is a big negotiating table that is there and in comes Big Pharma and here comes AARP, here is the health insurance companies, here is a doctor sitting over here. The patients, I would like to think they have a place at the table, but I am not sure just what entity speaks up so well for them.

□ 2310

But here's how a piece of legislation gets passed in this Congress today. This is what happens. Think of the scales of justice, blindfolded. Justice is blind, and here they are balancing these scales of justice. That's what I see. There's an image in that; that image of justice and equity. I'm reluctant to use the word ''fair.''

But in legislation, it works out this way. It's kind of a scale, and somebody comes up with a bad idea. Let's just say it's cap-and-trade or it's socialized medicine. They put all their ideas over here and, clink, here's the way the scale sits. All the bad ideas weigh it down. And then people start to say, Well, wait a minute. I've got a couple of ideas that are pretty bad. Let's take them off the table and put an idea over here you think is a good idea. And then it starts to weigh a little bit. You don't see that scale move. It's still sitting there.

Then one large entity after another starts to come to a conclusion that passage of this bad bill is inevitable. So they take away their opposition to a bad bill and they begin to negotiate for their own carve-outs and exemptions in a bad bill so it damages everybody but them. When they get their carve-out, the political capital over here that is on the ''no'' side either goes to neutral or over here on the plus side because they've agreed to support a bill now because they've got their exemptions so they're not affected by the bill. That might be the Cornhusker Kickback. That might be the Florida exemption for Medicare Advantage or the $11 billion in clinics in Maine or the Louisiana Purchase or it might be exemptions from executive pay controls in Big Pharma. It could be anything. They will add and add and add over on this side until all of this ''no'' political capital that knew it was a bad idea when it began, enough that has moved over to the plus side or moved to neutral to where if you put that final little weight on the scales—I like to call it the straw that breaks the camel's back—clink, it goes over this way.

Now there's enough support to pass a bill. And that's when they ram it through and they don't let you up for air because they're afraid they will lose votes. When that little moment comes when they think they've got the votes, it comes through. That's why the United States Senate was doing business for 3 constant weeks without a break and that's why they were doing business on Christmas Eve, to pass socialized medicine with a 60–40 majority on December 24, Christmas Eve, because they finally stacked the scales to the point where, clink, it would go over on the side where they could barely pass the bill. That's what they did.

If those kind of negotiations are taking place out in the open where the American people understand it, they would be revolted by the concept of how this is business, how very little of it is a discussion about what is the best policy for America and how much of it is a discussion about how you get the support of this group or that group or how you leverage to get the vote of a Member of Congress or United States Senator. Instead of evaluating the policy and stepping back and looking at it objectively and coming up with new ways to make something right for the American people, it becomes a political equation.

If we could get it out in the sunlight, we could get rid of some of those political equations and come a lot closer to getting the right policy for the American people. That's why transparency matters so much. That's why C–SPAN in those negotiation rooms would matter so much. That is actually a very big part of this Declaration of Health Care Independence. And I am proud to be part of it, and I'm looking forward to our press conference tomorrow.

I'd be happy to yield just a moment to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GOHMERT. I understand we just have 1 minute left, but I appreciate so much Mr. KING from Iowa taking this time to point out what we need in the way of health care reform. It isn't the massive 2,000-page monstrosity. It's true transparency. It's true accountability. And I appreciate this discussion with my friend from Iowa tonight.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I thank my friend from Texas for being up late at night and coming down here. When you have a friend that will stand with you like Judge GOHMERT, in the end we can, I think, together, do some good things for the American people, Madam Speaker. So we'll be working to get to that point.

We want to empower rather than limit an open and accessible marketplace of health care choice and opportunity. And if we're going to do business now, the rules have changed. There are new rules for the road. These are the new rules for road, and we're going to find out when people are serious. If they're ready to address lawsuit abuse, the people that are advocating for socialized medicine, if they're ready to address lawsuit abuse, we're ready to do business. If not, there's a new sheriff in town.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ELLISON (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of travel problems.

Mr. ORTIZ (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of health reasons.

Mr. CRENSHAW (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for January 19 through 27 on account of medical reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MALONEY, 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. FORTENBERRY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, February 2.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, February 2.

Mr. DREIER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, February 2.

Mr. CAO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2950. An act to extend the pilot program for volunteer groups to obtain criminal history background checks, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced her signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2949. An act to amend section 1113 of the Social Security Act to provide authority for

increased fiscal year 2010 payments for temporary assistance to United States citizens returned from foreign countries, to provide necessary funding to avoid shortfalls in the Medicare cost-sharing program for low-income qualifying individuals, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House reports that on January 22, 2010 she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 4462. To accelerate the income tax benefits for charitable cash contributions for the relief of victims of the earthquake in Haiti.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 27, 2010, at 10 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Speaker-authorized official travel during the fourth quarter of 2009, pursuant to Public Law 95–384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO PANAMA, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN DEC. 11 AND DEC. 14, 2009

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. John A. Boehner	12/11	12/14	Panama		906.00		(3)				906.00
Hon. Dan Boren	12/11	12/14	Panama		906.00		(3)				906.00
Hon. Kevin Brady	12/11	12/14	Panama		906.00		(3)				906.00
Hon. David Dreier	12/11	12/14	Panama		906.00		(3)				906.00
Hon. Devin Nunes	12/11	12/14	Panama		906.00		(3)				906.00
Hon. Peter Roskam	12/11	12/14	Panama		906.00		(3)				906.00
Hon. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen	12/11	12/14	Panama		906.00		(3)				906.00
Paula Nowakowski	12/11	12/14	Panama		906.00		(3)				906.00
Michael Sommers	12/11	12/14	Panama		906.00		(3)				906.00
Jennifer Stewart	12/11	12/14	Panama		906.00		(3)				906.00
Committee total											9,060.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

HON. JOHN A. BOEHNER, Jan. 11, 2010.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2009

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. ROBERT A. BRADY, Chairman, Jan. 8, 2010.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2009

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Raul Grijalva	10/8	10/11	Spain		799.00		6,338.00				7,137.00
Julia Hathaway	11/8	11/15	Brazil		2,236.32		5,487.70		58.16		7,782.18
Committee total					3,035.32		11,825.70		58.16		14,919.18

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. NICK J. RAHALL II, Chairman, Jan. 5, 2010.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO DENMARK, EXPENDED BETWEEN DEC. 7 AND DEC. 22, 2009

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Stacee Bako	12/07	12/09	Denmark		2,426.00		8,371.00				10,797.00
Don Kellaher	12/07	12/09	Denmark		2,426.00		8,371.00				10,797.00
Hon. Nancy Pelosi	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Hon. Steny H. Hoyer	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Hon. F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr.	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Hon. Charles B. Rangel	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO DENMARK, EXPENDED BETWEEN DEC. 7 AND DEC. 22, 2009—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. George Miller	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Hon. Henry A. Waxman	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Hon. Edward J. Markey	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Hon. Joe Barton	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Hon. Earl Blumenauer	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Hon. Jay Inslee	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Hon. Shelley Moore Capito	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Hon. John Sullivan	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Hon. Marsha Blackburn	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Hon. Emanuel Cleaver	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Hon. Gabrielle Giffords	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Hon. Bart Gordon	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Hon. Fred Upton	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Hon. Diana DeGette	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Hon. G.K. Butterfield	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Hon. Tim Ryan	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Hon. Sander M. Levin	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Hon. Wilson Livingood	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Hon. Brian Monahan	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
John Lawrence	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Karen Wayland	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Stacee Bako	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Andrew Hammill	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Kate Knudson	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Bridget Fallon	12/15	12/19	Denmark		5,075.00		6,358.00				11,443.00
Bina Surgeon	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Mary Frances Repko	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Don Kellaher	12/16	12/19	Denmark		5,075.00		4,163.00				9,238.00
Nona Darrell	12/13	12/19	Denmark		9,481.00		4,163.00				13,644.00
Tony Jackson	12/13	12/19	Denmark		9,481.00		4,163.00				13,644.00
Josh Mathis	12/14	12/19	Denmark		5,298.00		6,719.00				12,017.00
Phil Barnett	12/14	12/19	Denmark		4,629.00		5,712.00				10,341.00
David Cavicke	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Lisa Miller	12/13	12/21	Denmark		11,619.00		8,962.00				20,581.00
Peter Spencer	12/13	12/19	Denmark		9,481.00		6,719.00				16,200.00
Andrea Spring	12/13	12/21	Denmark		10,995.00		6,720.00				17,715.00
Lorie Schmitt	12/10	12/21	Denmark		11,174.00		8,333.00				19,507.00
Greg Dotson	12/12	12/21	Denmark		10,728.00		7,963.00				18,691.00
Alex Barron	12/10	12/21	Denmark		11,174.00		8,333.00				19,507.00
Christopher King	12/15	12/19	Denmark		6,990.00		6,719.00				13,709.00
Shimere Williams	12/15	12/21	Denmark		6,990.00		6,719.00				13,709.00
Tara Rothschild	12/14	12/21	Denmark		7,213.00		6,719.00				13,932.00
Margaret Caravelli	12/14	12/21	Denmark		7,213.00		6,719.00				13,932.00
Gerry Waldron	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Ana Unruh-Cohen	12/14	12/19	Denmark		5,298.00		4,163.00				9,461.00
Jeff Duncan	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Eben Burnham-Snyder	12/16	12/21	Denmark		6,767.00		10,038.00				16,805.00
Joel Beauvais	12/10	12/20	Denmark		11,264.00		8,983.00				20,247.00
Michael Goo	12/09	12/19	Denmark		10,150.00		7,268.00				17,418.00
Tom Schreibel	12/13	12/19	Denmark		9,481.00		7,983.00				17,464.00
Harlan Watson	12/06	12/21	Denmark		14,277.00		6,719.00				20,996.00
Bart Forsyth	12/13	12/22	Denmark		9,481.00		8,993.00				18,474.00
Ed Rice	12/13	12/22	Denmark		8,821.00		10,264.00				19,085.00
Steve Rusnak	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Carey Lane	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Committee total											553,564.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

HON. NANCY PELOSI, Jan. 11, 2010.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5748. A letter from the Chief, PRAB, Office of Research & Analysis, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — The Emergency Food Assistance Program: Amendments to Requirements Regarding the Submission of State Plans and Allowability of Certain Administrative Costs (RIN: 0584-AD94) received December 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5749. A letter from the Acting NRCS Farm Bill Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Agricultural Management Assistance Program (RIN: 0578-AA50) received December 17, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5750. A letter from the Acting NRCS Farm Bill Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regional Equity (RIN: 0578-AA44) received December 17, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5751. A letter from the Under Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act by the Defense Information Systems Agency, Case Number 08-06, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

5752. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Allowability of Costs to Lease Government Equipment for Display or Demonstration (DFARS Case 2007-D004) (RIN: 0750-AF85) received December 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5753. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Technical Data and Computer Software Requirements for Major Weapon Systems [DFARS Case 2006-D055] received December 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5754. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Govenors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the System's ''Major'' final rule — Risk-Based Capital Guidelines; Capital Adequacy Guidelines; Capital Maintenance: Regulatory Capital; Impact of Modifications to Generally Accepted Accounting Principles; Consolidation of Asset-Backed Commercial Paper Programs; and Other Related Issues [Regulations H and Y; Docket No. R-1368] received January 13, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5755. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Financial Stability, Department of the Treasury, transmitting letter summarizing the actions taken by the Department of the Treasury in response to recommendations issued in the Government Accountability Office's report on the Troubled Asset Relief Program; to the Committee on Financial Services.

5756. A letter from the Deputy to the Chairman for External Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Risk-Based Capital Guidelines; Capital Adequacy Guidelines; Capital Maintenance; Capital-Residential Mortgage Loans Modified Pursuant to the Home Affordable Mortgage Program (RIN: 3064-AD42) received December 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5757. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' final rule — School Improvement Grants; American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA); Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as Amended (ESSA) [Docket ID: ED-209-OESE-0010] (RIN: 1810-AB06) received January 13, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

5758. A letter from the Deputy Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Organ-Specific Warnings; Internal Analgesic, Antipyretic, and Antirheumatic Drug Products for Over-the-Counter Human Use; Final Monograph; Technical Amendment [Docket No.: FDA-1977-N-0013] (formerly Docket No.: 1977-N-0094L) (RIN: 0910-AF36) received December 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5759. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Designated Seating Positions [Docket No.: NHTSA 2009-0189] (RIN: 2127-AK65) received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5760. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Air Brake Systems [Docket No.: NHTSA-2009-0175] (RIN: 2127-AK62) received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5761. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Vehicle Identification Number Requirements; Technical Amendment [Docket No.: NHTSA 2008-0022] (RIN: 2127-AK63) received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5762. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.622(i), Final DTV Table of Allotments, Television Broadcast Stations. (Bangor, Maine) [MB Docket No. 09-122] received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5763. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Mandatory Reliability Standards for the Calculation of Available Transfer Capability, Capacity Benefit Margins, Transmission Reliability Margins, Total Transfer Capability and Existing Transmission Commitments and Mandatory Reliability Standards for the Bulk-Power System [Docket No.: RM08-19-000, RM08-19-001, RM09-5-000, RM06-16-005; Order No. 729] received December 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5764. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Cote d'Ivoire that was declared in Executive Order 13396 of February 7, 2006, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5765. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Addition of Certain Persons on the Entity List: Addition of Persons Acting Contrary to the National Security or Foreign Policy Interests of the United States and Entry Modified for Clarification [Docket No.: 0911171410-91427-01] (RIN: 0694-AE78) received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5766. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Updated Statements of Legal Authority to Reflect Continuation of Emergency Declared in Executive Order 12938 and Changes to the United States Code [Docket No.: 0910231376-91377-01] (RIN: 0694-AE76) received December 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5767. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting Periodic Report on the National Emergency Caused by the Lapse of the Export Administration Act of 1979 for February 26, 2009 — August 26, 2009; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5768. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commmerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Reporting of Offsets Agreements in Sales of Weapon Systems or Defense-Related Items to Foreign Countries or Foreign Firms [Docket No.: 080722875-91412-02] (RIN: 0694-AE40) received December 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5769. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, President's Pay Agent, transmitting a report justifying the reasons for the extension of locality-based comparability payments to categories of positions that are in more than one executive agency, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5304(h)(2)(C); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5770. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's Performance and Accountability report for fiscal year 2009; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5771. A letter from the Chief Financial Officer, Farm Credit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's consolidated report addressing the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act and the Inspector General Act Amendments of 1978, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5772. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting letter of notification of new mileage reimbursment rate for Federal employees who use privately owned vehicles while on official travel; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5773. A letter from the Assistant Deputy Associate Administrator for Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-38; Introduction [Docket FAR 2009-0001, Sequence 9] received December 9, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5774. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Government Accountability Office, transmitting letter of compliance to the requirement in the Competition in Contracting Act of 1984; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5775. A letter from the General Counsel, Selective Service System, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5776. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator For Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Groundfish Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Individual Fishing Quota Program; Western Alaska Community Development Quota Program; Recordkeeping and Reporting; Correction [Docket No.: 0911161406-91407-01] (RIN: 0648-AY37) received December 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5777. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Department of Defense, transmitting recommendation for the authorization of the Comprehensive Plan report on the Mississippi Coastal Improvements Program (MsCIP); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5778. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety and Security Zone, Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal, Romeoville, IL [Docket No.: USCG-2009-1004] (RIN: 1625-AA11) received January 6, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5779. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security and Safety Zone; Cruise Ship Protection, Elliott Bay and Pier-91, Seattle, Washington [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0331] (RIN: 1625-AA87 and 1625-AA00) received January 9, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5780. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, Sunset Beach, North Carolina [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0985] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 6, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5781. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Naval Training December 2009 and January 2010; San Clemente Island, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0920] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 6, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5782. A letter from the Assistant Chief Counsel for General Law, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' final rule — Pipeline Safety: Integrity Management Program for Gas Distribution Pipelines [Docket No.: PHMSA-RSPA-2004-19854; Amdt. 192-113] (RIN: 2137-AE15) received December 10, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5783. A letter from the Trial Attorney, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' final rule — Positive Train Control Systems [Docket No.: FRA-2008-0132, Notice No. 3] (RIN: 2130-AC03) received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5784. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and E Airspace; Fort Stewart (Hinesville), GA [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0959; Airspace Docket No. 09-ASO-30] received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5785. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company GE90-110B1, GE90-113B, and GE90-115B Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0143; Directorate Identifier 2009-NE-05-AD;

Amendment 39-16135; AD 2009-25-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5786. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300-600 Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-1114; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-157-AD; Amendment 39-16134; AD 2007-10-10 R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5787. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company CF6-80C2 Series Turbofan Engines; Correction [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0018; Directorate Identifier 2009-NE-01-AD; Amendment 39-16044; AD 2009-21-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5788. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Model 747-400, -400D, and -400F Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-1222; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-153-AD; Amendment 39-16160; AD 2008-10-06 R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5789. A letter from the Regulations Officer FHWA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Discontinuance of form FHWA-47 [FHWA Docket No.: FHWA-2009-0029] (RIN 2125-AF31) received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5790. A letter from the Regulations Officer FHWA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Bridge Inspection Standards [FHWA Docket No.: FHWA-2009-0074] (RIN: 2125-AF33) received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5791. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Use of Additional Portable Oxygen Concentrator Devices On Board Aircraft [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0767; SFAR 106] (RIN: 2120-AJ55) received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5792. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's annual report to Congress and the National Transportation Safety Board on the regulatory status of open safety recommendations relating to several safety issues; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5793. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30703 Amdt. No. 3354] received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5794. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30701 Amdt. No. 3352] received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5795. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30704; Amdt. No. 3355] received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5796. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30702; Amdt. No. 3353] received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5797. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of a Special Air Traffic Rule in the Vicinity of Luke Air Force Base (AFB), AZ [Docket No.: FAA-2008-1087; Amendment No. 93-95] (RIN: 2120-AJ29) received January 21, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5798. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting Informational copies of the Reports of Building Project Survey for Panama City, FL and Clarksburg, WV; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5799. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting Statement of actions with respect to a Government Accountability Report numbered GAO-10-2; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

5800. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting Statement of actions with respect to a Government Accountability Report numbered GAO-10-3SU; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

5801. A letter from the Chief, Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Countries Whose Pleasure Vessels May Be Issued Cruising Licenses (CBP Dec. 08-27) received December 15, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5802. A letter from the Chief, Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Remote Location Filing [USCBP-2006-0001] (RIN: 1505-AB20) received December 29, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5803. A letter from the Chief, Trade & Commercial Regulations Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Haitian Hemispheric Opportunity Through Partnership Encouragement Acts of 2006 and 2008 [Docket No.: USCBP-2007-0062] (RIN: 1505-AB82) received December 15, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5804. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Relief and Guidance on Corrections of Certain Failures of a Nonqualified Deferred Compensation Plan to Comply with Sec. 409A(a) [Notice 2010-06] received January 13, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5805. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Automatic Approval of Changes in Funding Method for Takeover Plans and Changes in Pension Valuation Software [Announcement 2010-03] received January 13, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5806. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Special Rules for Certain Transactions Where Stated Principal Amount Does Not Exceed $2,800,00 (Rev. Rul. 2010-2) received December 28, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5807. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Auction Rate Prefered Stock-Extension of Date for Addition of a Liquidity Facility [Notice 2010-3] received December 28, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5808. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Determination of Issue Price in the Case of Certain Debt Instruments Issued for Property (Rev. Rul. 2010-1) received December 28, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5809. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Apportionment of Tax Items among the Members of a Controlled Group of Corporations [TD 9476] (RIN: 1545-BI62; RIN 1545-BG39) received December 28, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5810. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Temporary guidance regarding certain stock distributions by publicly traded real estate investments trusts (REITs) and regulated investment companies (RICs) (Revenue Procedure 2010-12) received December 28, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5811. A letter from the Senior Advisor for Regulations, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Technical Revisions to the Supplemental Security Income (SSI) Regulations on Income and Resources [Docket No.: SSA 2008-0034] (RIN: 0960-AG66) received January 11, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5812. A letter from the Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting a proposed bill to amend titles II and XVI of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5813. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's Performance and Accountability Report for Fiscal Year 2009; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5814. A letter from the General Counsel, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting a letter reporting that the Office of Government Ethics did not conduct or initiate competitions in FY 2009; to the Committee on Outer Continental Shelf (Ad Hoc).

5815. A letter from the Vice Chairman, Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, transmitting the Board's quarterly report to Congress on the Status of Significant Unresolved Issues with the Department of Energy's Design and Construction Projects (dated December 07, 2009); jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations.

5816. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting fourth quarterly report of FY 2009 on Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Veterans' Affairs.

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. POLIS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1038. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3726) to establish the Castle Nugent National Historic Site at St. Croix, United States Virgin Islands, and for other purposes; and for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4474) 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 (Rept. 111–401). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. WU (for himself and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 4502. A bill to strengthen the capacity of eligible institutions to provide instruction in nanotechnology; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (for himself, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. CARTER, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. JORDAN of Ohio, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. MANZULLO, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. CANTOR):

H.R. 4503. A bill to provide for consultation by the Department of Justice with other relevant Government agencies before determining to prosecute certain terrorism offenses in United States district court, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 4504. A bill to authorize the Federal Communications Commission to issue regulations against the censorship of Internet search results, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THORNBERRY (for himself and Mr. SNYDER):

H.R. 4505. A bill to enable State homes to furnish nursing home care to parents any of whose children died while serving in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H.R. 4506. A bill to authorize the appointment of additional bankruptcy judges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODRIGUEZ (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. GONZALEZ):

H.R. 4507. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize the Secretary of Homeland Security to establish the Cyber Security Domestic Preparedness Consortium, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 4508. A bill to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. SCHRADER (for himself, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 4509. A bill to reauthorize the national small business tree planting program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 4510. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to apply the ban on contributions and expenditures by foreign nationals to domestic corporations in which foreign principals have an ownership interest; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 4511. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit corporations which employ or retain registered lobbyists from making expenditures or disbursements for electioneering communications under such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 4512. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to implement country-of-origin disclosure requirements with respect to motor vehicle fuels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 4513. A bill to create jobs by providing targeted tax relief to individuals and small businesses, curb frivolous lawsuits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and 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. CLAY (for himself, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. SESTAK, and Mr. TIBERI):

H.R. 4514. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study to determine the suitability and feasibility of designating the Colonel Charles Young Home in Xenia, Ohio as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H.R. 4515. A bill to make certain technical and conforming amendments to the Lanham Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 4516. A bill to provide stability in the financial services industry by promoting transparency, simplicity, fairness, accountability, and equal access in the market for consumer financial products or services and ensuring that no financial company becomes too big to fail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HALL of New York (for himself, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 4517. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to apply the ban on contributions and expenditures by foreign nationals to domestic corporations which are owned or controlled by foreign principals, to increase the civil penalties applicable to foreign nationals who violate the ban, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HALL of New York:

H.R. 4518. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny a deduction for image advertising expenses for any trade or business the gross receipts of which exceed $100 million; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 4519. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to make publicly available on the Internet the electronic communications of certain TARP recipients; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself, Mr. DENT, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 4520. A bill to help prevent the occurrence of cancer resulting from the use of ultraviolet tanning lamps by imposing more stringent controls on the use of such devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H.R. 4521. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to agree to requests by lessees to amend certain oil and gas leases issued for Central and Western Gulf of Mexico tracts, to incorporate price thresholds applicable to royalty suspension provisions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SIRES, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. LANCE, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BOREN, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. YARMUTH, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HOLT, Mr. STARK, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. JONES, and Mr. TIERNEY):

H.R. 4522. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to apply the ban on contributions and expenditures by foreign nationals to domestic corporations which are owned or controlled by foreign principals; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PERRIELLO:

H.R. 4523. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to apply the ban on contributions and expenditures by foreign nationals to domestic corporations whose shareholders include any foreign principals; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SHULER (for himself, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. PERRIELLO):

H.R. 4524. A bill to authorize funding to protect and conserve lands contiguous with the Blue Ridge Parkway to serve the public, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 4525. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to expand the eligibility for concurrent receipt of military retired pay and veterans' disability compensation to include all members of the uniformed services who are retired under chapter 61 of such title for disability, regardless of the members' disability rating percentage; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, and Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ (for himself and Mr. JORDAN of Ohio):

H.J. Res. 72. A joint resolution disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Religious Freedom and Civil Marriage Equality Amendment Act of 2009; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado (for himself, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. SNYDER):

H. Con. Res. 230. Concurrent resolution recognizing the 150th anniversary of the Colorado National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COSTELLO (for himself, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H. Con. Res. 231. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that a commemorative postage stamp should be issued to honor the life of Elijah Parish Lovejoy; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LEE of New York (for himself, Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. CAO, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. KIND, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, and Mr. HARPER):

H. Con. Res. 232. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that a site in Arlington National Cemetery should be provided for a memorial marker to honor the memory of the 14 members of the Army's 24th Infantry Division who have received the Medal of Honor; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NYE:

H. Res. 1037. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the actions by United States Armed Forces and first responders to help the people of Haiti after the recent devastating earthquake reflect the highest level of dedication and heroism; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LEE of New York (for himself, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. PAULSEN, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H. Res. 1039. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of American Heart Month and National Wear Red Day; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SNYDER (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. BERRY):

H. Res. 1040. A resolution honoring the life and accomplishments of Donald Harington for his contributions to literature in the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

227. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Resolution No. 103 memorializing the Congress of the United States to Enact the Investment in Rural Afterschool Programs Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

228. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to House Resolution No. 562 memorializing the Congress in its health care reform decisions to apply the American Cancer Society's guidelines for breast cancer screening; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

229. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to a letter urging the U.S. Congress to meet its fiscal obligation to the citizens of Micronesia, the Marshall Islands and Palau who reside in Hawaii; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

230. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Resolution No. 100 urging the U.S. Congress and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to take immediate actions to prevent the Asian Carp from entering the Great Lakes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 21: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H.R. 39: Mr. LOEBSACK and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 43: Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. PITTS, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. JONES, Mr. TIERNEY, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 197: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 211: Mr. GRAVES.

H.R. 272: Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 394: Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 476: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.

H.R. 510: Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 519: Mr. MCMAHON.

H.R. 537: Mr. REYES.

H.R. 560: Mr. TIAHRT.

H.R. 571: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 678: Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. WEINER, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 690: Mr. MICHAUD and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 745: Mr. HALL of New York.

H.R. 795: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 997: Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 1020: Ms. CHU and Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 1026: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 1159: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 1177: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. BRIGHT.

H.R. 1204: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina.

H.R. 1310: Ms. CHU.

H.R. 1314: Mrs. CAPPS and Mr. KISSELL.

H.R. 1326: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 1347: Mr. KRATOVIL.

H.R. 1526: Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN and Mr. MITCHELL.

H.R. 1557: Mr. ADLER of New Jersey.

H.R. 1583: Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 1587: Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 1588: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 1806: Mr. PERRIELLO.

H.R. 1826: Mr. KENNEDY and Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 1835: Mrs. EMERSON and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.

H.R. 1866: Mr. REHBERG.

H.R. 1873: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1895: Mr. ADLER of New Jersey.

H.R. 1957: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 1964: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Ms. WATSON.

H.R. 2149: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 2254: Mr. ROONEY, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. LINDER, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 2296: Mr. COSTELLO.

H.R. 2377: Ms. BERKLEY and Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 2478: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 2480: Ms. NORTON and Mr. KISSELL.

H.R. 2521: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.

H.R. 2546: Ms. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 2547: Ms. JENKINS and Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 2553: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 2563: Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN.

H.R. 2579: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 2597: Ms. RICHARDSON and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 2669: Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 2733: Ms. KOSMAS, Mr. SHULER, Mr. BACA, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 2740: Mr. WEINER.

H.R. 2799: Mr. WHITFIELD and Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.

H.R. 2855: Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 2866: Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 2882: Ms. HARMAN and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

H.R. 2906: Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 2946: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California and Mr. MASSA.

H.R. 2964: Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mrs. SCHMIDT.

H.R. 2969: Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 3012: Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 3017: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. NYE, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona.

H.R. 3047: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 3077: Ms. WATSON.

H.R. 3078: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 3156: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. PERRIELLO, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. LEE of California, and Ms. WATSON.

H.R. 3164: Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 3189: Ms. MARKEY of Colorado.

H.R. 3249: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 3277: Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 3286: Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 3380: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mrs. DAHLKEMPER.

H.R. 3464: Mr. CHILDERS.

H.R. 3549: Mr. MICA.

H.R. 3564: Mr. CLAY and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 3582: Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 3627: Mr. LUJÁN.

H.R. 3652: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 3656: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.

H.R. 3695: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LEE of New York, and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.

H.R. 3712: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. TURNER, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. BARTLETT.

H.R. 3721: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 3734: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 3749: Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN.

H.R. 3752: Mr. MORAN of Kansas.

H.R. 3758: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 3790: Mr. COSTELLO and Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 3813: Mr. MURTHA.

H.R. 3822: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 3824: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 3838: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 3914: Ms. MARKEY of Colorado.

H.R. 3943: Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. AKIN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. MCCAUL, and Ms. WATSON.

H.R. 3995: Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 4000: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois and Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 4022: Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 4037: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 4051: Mr. MURTHA and Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 4053: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 4090: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania and Mr. ETHERIDGE.

H.R. 4091: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 4104: Mr. MASSA and Mr. GORDON of Tennessee.

H.R. 4112: Mr. WILSON of Ohio.

H.R. 4116: Ms. GIFFORDS and Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 4144: Mr. KLEIN of Florida and Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 4148: Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 4149: Mr. TOWNS.
H.R. 4177: Mr. ORTIZ and Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 4191: Mr. CARDOZA.
H.R. 4199: Mr. HODES.
H.R. 4202: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. TONKO, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, and Mr. HODES.
H.R. 4220: Mr. CARTER.
H.R. 4226: Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 4234: Mr. GOHMERT and Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 4241: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 4247: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HOLT, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 4258: Mr. MANZULLO and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 4269: Mr. MASSA.
H.R. 4274: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Ms. RICHARDSON.
H.R. 4278: Mr. ARCURI.
H.R. 4295: Mr. MAFFEI.
H.R. 4302: Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 4311: Mr. MCMAHON.
H.R. 4312: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 4324: Mr. NYE, Mr. HARPER, and Mr. KLEIN of Florida.
H.R. 4343: Mr. COHEN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 4356: Mr. OLVER, Mr. FARR, and Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan.
H.R. 4378: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SHULER, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 4386: Mr. INSLEE.
H.R. 4393: Ms. KOSMAS.
H.R. 4400: Mr. ELLISON, Ms. KOSMAS, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. BUCHANAN.
H.R. 4403: Mr. NYE.
H.R. 4413: Mr. EDWARDS of Texas.
H.R. 4427: Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. SOUDER, and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 4453: Mr. MCCOTTER and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 4459: Mr. GALLEGLY.
H.R. 4465: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 4472: Mr. MCCOTTER and Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 4490: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. WOLF, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. PENCE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. MANZULLO.
H.R. 4493: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.J. Res. 13: Mr. MORAN of Virginia and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.J. Res. 37: Mr. MANZULLO.
H.J. Res. 66: Mrs. BLACKBURN and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H. Con. Res. 227: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. PIERLUISI.
H. Res. 111: Mr. PETRI and Mr. CHILDERS.
H. Res. 213: Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HONDA, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H. Res. 243: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H. Res. 267: Mr. MCCOTTER, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. TANNER.
H. Res. 278: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H. Res. 330: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BOREN, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. BERRY, Mr. BRIGHT, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. MINNICK.
H. Res. 375: Mr. GRAYSON and Mr. MASSA.
H. Res. 443: Ms. CHU.
H. Res. 611: Mr. YARMUTH.
H. Res. 704: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. ROSKAM.
H. Res. 872: Mrs. MYRICK and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H. Res. 874: Mr. CONAWAY.
H. Res. 879: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. OWENS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Ms. KOSMAS, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, Mr. CHILDERS, Mr. BOREN, Mr. TONKO, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. SUTTON, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. BOYD, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. BERRY, Mr. SCHAUER, Mr. HIMES, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. WATT.
H. Res. 925: Mr. WAMP, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H. Res. 929: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ELLISON, and Ms. DEGETTE.
H. Res. 958: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H. Res. 990: Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
H. Res. 996: Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MARCHANT, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. TOWNS.
H. Res. 1003: Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. RUSH, Mr. WEINER, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. OBERSTAR, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. COSTA, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. WELCH, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H. Res. 1011: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. NYE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H. Res. 1014: Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. LANCE, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. KIRK, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. HOLT, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MASSA, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. SIRES, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. TONKO, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. LOBIONDO, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Mr. HODES.
H. Res. 1019: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
H. Res. 1022: Mr. ELLISON and Mr. NADLER of New York.
H. Res. 1024: Mr. STARK, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H. Res. 1029: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. PLATTS.
H. Res. 1033: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. SHUSTER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. HERGER, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. WOLF.
H. Res. 1034: Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. BERMAN.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. RAHALL

H.R. 4474, the Idaho Wilderness Water Facilities Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

95. The SPEAKER presented a petition of The City of Key West, Florida, relative to Resolution No. 09-292 urging the Congress of the United States to adopt the Military Readiness Enhancement Act of 2009; to the Committee on Armed Services.

96. Also, a petition of San Francisco Labor Council, California, relative to a Resolution in solidarity for the people of Honduras and urging the U.S. Congress to take strong measures against the repressive coup government in Honduras; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

97. Also, a petition of Board of Supervisors of San Francisco, California, relative to Resolution No. 488-09 urging the Congress of the United States to legislatively support a strong Tready to address Climate Change; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

98. Also, a petition of The City of Key West, Florida, relative to Resolution No. 09-293 urging the Congress of the United States and the President to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

99. Also, a petition of The Legislature of Rockland County, New York, relative to Resolution No. 596 petitioning the Congress of the United States to Introduce and Pass Legislation Establishing a U.S. Commission Aimed Soley at Monitoring and Combating Modern-Day Slavery in All Its Forms; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Foreign Affairs.

100. Also, a petition of City Council of Watsonville, California, relative to Resolution No. 207-09 supporting the Dream Act of 2009 to Relieve Obstacles to Higher Education and Permanent Residency for Long-term Immigrant but Non-Resident Minors; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Education and Labor.

101. Also, a petition of The Legislature of Rockland County, New York, relative to Resolution No. 535 urging the U.S. House of Representatives to pass H.R. 1691; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and Education and Labor.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 156 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JANUARY 26, 2010 No. 10

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable JEANNE SHAHEEN, a Senator from the State of New Hampshire.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty and everlasting God, the Author and Giver of all good things, nourish our Senators with Your goodness that they may produce the fruits of exemplary works that honor Your Name. Lead them by their setbacks and victories into a deeper knowledge of Your plans and purposes for this land we love. Give them light for their darkness and strength for every aspiration that seeks to glorify Your Name. May the knowledge of Your redeeming providence be a lamp illuminating the way ahead. Lord, strengthen them by Your spirit, using them as channels for Your coming kingdom. Make them positive people who are expectant of Your best for our Nation and world.

We pray in Your powerful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable JEANNE SHAHEEN 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.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. BYRD).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, January 26, 2010.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable JEANNE SHAHEEN, a Senator from the State of New Hampshire, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
President pro tempore.

Mrs. SHAHEEN thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Madam President, following leader remarks, the Senate will resume consideration of H.J. Res. 45, a joint resolution increasing the statutory limit on the debt. The time until 11:30 a.m. will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees. At 11:30 a.m., the Senate will proceed to a series of two rollcall votes. Those votes will be in relation to the Baucus amendment No. 3300 regarding a Social Security exemption, to be followed by a vote on the Conrad amendment No. 3302 regarding a fiscal task force. The Senate will recess from 12:30 p.m. to 2:15 p.m. today for the weekly caucus luncheons.

We are operating under an agreement that limits amendments to the debt limit resolution, and only a few amendments remain in order. I encourage Senators with amendments on the list to come to the floor to offer their amendments if they would like their amendments to be considered.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Madam President, with respect to the time under my control for debate with respect to the Baucus and Conrad amendments to H.J. Res. 45, I ask unanimous consent that the time be provided to Senators BAUCUS and CONRAD and that they equally divide and control this time that was under my designation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IRAN SANCTIONS ACT

Mr. REID. Madam President, at the end of last December, I made a commitment to bring S. 2799, the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions Accountability and Divestment Act, to the Senate floor. This critical legislation would impose new sanctions on Iran's refined petroleum sector and tighten existing U.N. sanctions. The act will create pressure on the Iranian regime and help stop Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon. I thank Senator DODD, Senator KERRY, and many other Senators for their hard work.

I have had conversations with the distinguished Republican leader. We are committed to finding a time to do this legislation. This is going to be a piece of legislation dealing with just this narrow issue. We cannot get into foreign aid and all those other things. I am reaching out to my Republican colleagues to help me find a path to get that done in the next few weeks. We started this session by working on important legislation to prevent the Federal Government from defaulting on its obligations, including my amendment to put in place strict statutory requirements that will ensure the cost of any new spending or tax cuts will not increase our deficit. But everyone should know that I am looking forward to moving on the Iran Sanctions Act, as I have indicated, but we are going to need some cooperation to get this legislation done. I had a conversation with the Republican leader yesterday, and it is our goal to finish the legislation on the debt limit quickly. Hopefully, we can do that and maybe the Bernanke nomination by Thursday or Friday.

The Republicans have scheduled a retreat. We are going to have one next week. When this was scheduled, no one

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

knew when the President was going to give his State of the Union Message. But it happens it is on tomorrow. So we have the State of the Union tomorrow night. We have the retreat tomorrow. We are not going to have any legislative issues here unless the Republicans have agreed. We are not going to interfere in any way with their retreat. These are extremely important. The two caucuses can move alone and not be bothered by other things. It is very important. We are going to do the same next week. I think what we have done in the last year or so has been important. We used to do these retreats on Fridays, but with schedules such as they are, not many people showed up, or not as many as we wanted. With the new schedule of having votes on Tuesday and Thursday, in fact, it causes people to want to be here on Wednesday.

I look forward to working with the Republican leader and others in coming up with a glidepath to finishing these matters as quickly as we can. By virtue of some cloture motions I filed, we are scheduled for votes in the morning. I want to do everything I can to avoid that and will maybe put those over until Thursday or maybe try to get rid of those votes today would be the best thing we could do.

I am happy to yield to my friend the Republican leader.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, a year ago this week, millions of Americans were looking to Washington with the hope that always comes with a new beginning. In the midst of a terrible economic downturn, a new President was vowing to meet our problems head-on. Americans hoped for every success, but in the 12 months that have passed since then, Americans have not seen the improvements they were hoping for. Far from it. Since last January, nearly 3.5 million Americans have lost their jobs and nearly 3 million have lost their homes. Americans are still struggling, and they are looking to Washington for the policies that will right our economic ship.

To their credit, the President and his allies in Congress tried to do something about our economic situation. Unfortunately, their policies missed the mark, and 2009 was another very difficult year. Americans waited patiently for the administration and Congress to implement policies that would create the conditions for creating jobs, growing businesses, and helping struggling middle-class families weather the recession. Instead, they got policies that vastly increased government spending and put a crushing amount of debt onto the Federal credit card. Then Americans looked on in disbelief as the administration spent almost an entire year—an entire year—pursuing a closed-door, partisan health care plan that would have raised their taxes and their health insurance premiums and slashed Medicare for seniors in the middle of a recession.

By the time November came around, Americans had clearly run out of patience—not with the President, whom they like, but with the administration's policies. They rejected a trillion-dollar stimulus bill that was supposed to stop unemployment at 8 percent but did not. They rejected a budget that will double the national debt in 5 years and triple it in 10. And they rejected a health care plan that would have led to higher costs, lower quality, and massive new government spending. The American people have spoken clearly. They want a new policy direction.

This is why some of the comments we have been hearing in the administration about its plans for the year ahead are so distressing. The lesson of the last year should be crystal clear: Americans are not happy with the administration's approach. They are tired of the spending, debt, and government takeovers. They want a step-by-step approach to our problems, not grand government experiments and schemes. Yet some in the administration seem to believe that the message of Virginia, New Jersey, and Massachusetts is something entirely different. They seem to think the voters are frustrated at nothing in particular, that they are just angry in general. The proper response to these elections, the administration seems to think, is to retool its message to make people believe it is finding new ways to help the economy, even as it continues to pursue the exact same policies as before. One of the President's top advisers insisted over the weekend, for example, that the administration will continue to pursue its plan for health care even as it works to retool its message on the economy. This is a clear sign that the administration has not gotten the message; that it has become too attached to its own pet goals; that it is stuck in neutral when the American people are asking it to change direction. And then the administration said over the weekend that Americans will not know what is in the Democratic plan for health care unless and until it is passed. That is precisely the problem. Americans do not want to have to learn about what politicians in Washington are doing to their health care after the fact. They want to know the details before the changes are approved, not later.

Americans are not frustrated in general; they are frustrated with an administration that insists on taking them in a direction they do not want to go and which does not seem to be interested in acknowledging the direction in which Americans actually want to go.

These are some of the signs that the administration has not gotten the message. But it is not too late. Tomorrow night, the President will deliver his State of the Union Address. It is my hope that he deals not in a retooled message but in a changed direction and that he advances it with the same kind of enthusiasm and intensity that he attempted to advance his health care plan.

Here are some of the things the President could do tomorrow night:

First, put the 2,700-page Democratic health care bill on the shelf and leave it there. The best first step we could take in righting our economic ship is to take this job-killing and tax-increasing monstrosity off the table once and for all and move toward the kind of step-by-step approach Americans really want.

Second, declare that taxes will not go up at the end of the year as scheduled for millions of American families and businesses. Even some Democrats are calling on the President to do this. Struggling small businesses are asking themselves whether they can hire new workers. The prospect of a massive tax hike makes it far less likely that they will.

Third, return unused TARP money and put it toward paying down the deficit. Taxpayers who bailed out the banks last year are wondering why their money is still laying around unspent. Money that has come back to the Treasury should be used to pay down the deficit, not used on new spending programs.

Fourth, job programs. The stimulus was sold to the public on the promise that it would hold unemployment at 8 percent. A year later, unemployment is at 10 percent, its highest level in a quarter century. At a time of trillion-dollar deficits, the President should direct unspent stimulus funds to pay down our debts right now, rather than have the money spent on questionable projects 9 years down the road.

Fifth, no more debt. Later this week, the administration, with an assist from Democrats in Congress, plans to increase the amount of money available on the Federal credit card by nearly $2 trillion. In other words, they want to increase the amount of money we can borrow by an amount equivalent to what it cost to pay for the entire Federal budget 10 years ago.

Sixth, explain to the American people how the Federal Government will end its ownership of auto companies, insurance companies, and banks. Americans do not think the U.S. Government should be one of the largest shareholders of GM, Chrysler, and AIG.

Seventh, energy. Nuclear power is one of the cleanest, most efficient sources of energy. The President should commit to expanding it. Until these clean green sites are up and running, he should allow the States to drill for oil and natural gas off their shores, if they want to.

These are just a few concrete things the President could do to show the

American people he is committed to working with both parties to address the problems Americans are most concerned about, such as doing whatever it takes to create jobs and get people who have lost their jobs back to work.

Americans aren't looking for cosmetic proposals. They do not want the administration to push sweeping changes it wants but to nibble around the edges when it comes to changes the American people want. It is time for the White House to show it is listening to the American people. If the President opts for solutions that reflect the real concerns of the American people, if he moves to the middle with commonsense bipartisan ideas on job creation, then he can expect the support of Republicans.

It is not too late. It is not too late to deliver the kind of commonsense reforms Americans want.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

INCREASING THE STATUTORY LIMIT ON THE PUBLIC DEBT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.J. Res. 45, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 45) increasing the statutory limit on the public debt.

Pending:

Baucus (for Reid) amendment No. 3299, in the nature of a substitute.

Baucus amendment No. 3300 (to amendment No. 3299), to protect Social Security.

Conrad-Gregg amendment No. 3302 (to amendment No. 3299), to establish a Bipartisan Task Force for Responsible Fiscal Action, to assure the long-term fiscal stability and economic security of the Federal Government of the United States, and to expand future prosperity and growth for all Americans.

Reid amendment No. 3305 (to amendment No. 3299), to reimpose statutory pay-as-you-go.

Baucus amendment No. 3306 (to amendment No. 3299), to establish a Bipartisan Task Force for Responsible Fiscal Action, to assure the long-term fiscal stability and economic security of the Federal Government of the United States, and to expand future prosperity and growth for all Americans.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the time until 11:30 shall be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, I understand there has been a time allocation amongst several of us, but I would like to yield 5 minutes of the time reserved to me to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. GREGG. Madam President, if the Senator will yield, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized to manage the time on our side.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GREGG. After the Senator from Illinois, I will yield up to 10 minutes to the Senator from Alabama.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I thank the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, the Senator from Montana, for yielding 5 minutes.

I have listened carefully to the statement made by the Republican minority leader on the floor, and I think he has characterized the last year leaving out some very important facts, some glaring omissions in his statement.

What the Republican leader failed to mention is, when this President came to the White House, he inherited the worst economic mess in the history of this country since the Great Depression. The President turned to both parties—Democrats and Republicans—and said: We need to turn this economy around and do it quickly. He, personally, appealed to the Republican Members of the Senate and the House to join him in a bipartisan effort to turn this economy around. At the end of the day, the President put forward a plan to reinvest in America and recover this economy that didn't draw one single Republican vote of support in the House and only three Republican Senate votes. It was, in fact, largely a Democratic effort but not because the President didn't try to include the Republicans in this effort.

What has been the net impact? The Senator from Kentucky comes to the floor and is very critical of the state of the economy. It is easy to be critical. But let us understand from where we came. When the President took office, we were losing in the range of 800,000 jobs a month in America—800,000 a month. It was awful. Now we are down to about 10 percent of that total per month that we are losing. It is still too high. We want to start gaining jobs. But understand, in 1 year, we have reduced by 90 percent the monthly loss in unemployment. It is a trend line which is positive, moving us toward a growing economy and growing employment. That is because the President took leadership, took control, and—largely with Democratic votes—passed a stimulus package.

Also, remember that in April of last year—2009—the Dow Jones industrial index was at 6,500. This morning it is at 10,000. That index, which at least is a reliable index of some economic growth, showed almost a 60-percent increase in value over this 1-year period of time.

To be totally dismissive of this effort by the administration is to ignore the obvious: We have come a long way. We have stared down at the abyss and we have drawn back and we are starting to regain our stride, as we should. But to dismiss this and say it is just a vain effort that had no impact is to ignore the obvious.

Let me also say about the health care bill that we know—and the Senator from Montana, as our leader in the Finance Committee, knows this personally—of the efforts the Senator from Montana made to reach out to the Republican side of the aisle. He had 61 personal meetings with Republican Senators—Senators Grassley and Enzi and Snowe—in an effort to make this a bipartisan bill. Sadly, it didn't result in a bipartisan bill but not for lack of effort on our side, not for lack of effort in the Senate HELP Committee or the Senate Finance Committee, where 170 Republican amendments were adopted. Yet, at the end of the day, only one Republican Senator—Senator SNOWE of Maine—would cast a favorable vote for the committee effort. To argue this has been a partisan effort, well, it has been, to some extent, but not for lack of effort on the Democratic side to engage the Republicans.

What if the Republicans had their way on health care? What if we literally walked away from this challenge? I tell you what will happen: In 7 years, the Medicare Trust Fund will be exhausted. Under the bill we had before the Senate, we added 9 years of life to that Medicare Trust Fund. If we do nothing, as many Republicans would have us do, that Medicare Trust Fund will start to fail in 7 years.

Let me also add, if we do nothing, the number of uninsured will grow from 47 million today in America to 57 million and continue to grow. People will lose their insurance, and those insured will have little protection as this market becomes even more ruthless.

Finally, let me add, the cost of health insurance, if we do nothing, is going to grow dramatically. We expect it to more than double in 10 years. Think about that—what it means to individual wage earners, businesses, and families if more and more money has to be plowed into health insurance costs with no increase in coverage. That is the reality of the Republican approach. Do nothing or do little but go slowly. Take tiny, little pieces of this instead of looking at the challenge we face. That may be the political reality, but I don't applaud it.

Our effort at comprehensive health care reform took on an issue which is central to our economy's growth. If we don't deal with the cost of health care, unfortunately, we are going to find ourselves in a very difficult competitive position in the world.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama.

BERNANKE REAPPOINTMENT

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I wish to share a few remarks on the reappointment of Mr. Bernanke as Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. I do

believe we should state our views about it. I stand in opposition to his nomination; I intend to vote against it.

First, I believe the financial debacle this Nation is desperately attempting to work its way through did not have to happen. That free economies have a tendency to boom and bust, there can be no doubt. But sound Federal economic and fiscal policy that promotes stability and a sound dollar can mitigate against the excesses of market cycles and keep them from ratcheting out of control, as we have seen here.

What role did Mr. Bernanke play before the bubble burst? For 3 years, he served on the Federal Reserve Board, where much of our Nation's financial policy is set and, in 2006, he followed Mr. Greenspan as Chairman. The American people have a right to ask: How did he perform during that period? Did he see this crisis coming, did he give warning, and did he take any actions that could have ameliorated or avoided the catastrophe that has befallen us? The minutes of the Federal Reserve Board during the critical 2003 time period show he was what the Wall Street Journal called ''the intellectual architect'' of the loose money policies that, as the Journal notes, kept:

> . . . monetary policy exceptionally easy for far too long as the economy grew rapidly from 2003–2005. He imagined a ''deflation'' that never occurred, ignored the asset bubbles in commodities and housing, dismissed concerns about dollar weakness, and in the process stoked the credit mania that led to the financial panic.

That is what the Wall Street Journal said about it, and I think that has to be considered an accurate and fair comment. Only responsible actions, perhaps painful to us now in the short run, founded on mature understanding of the forces that actually control world economies will do today. The time for artificial government policies and spending and stimulus is past. Nothing comes from nothing. Reducing deficits significantly will be necessary and will be painful, but only such a policy, resolutely executed, will inspire real confidence that we are on the right track.

> Transferring massive private debt to massive government debt, as we have done, tripling our total national debt in 10 years—as we are on the path to do under the President's own budget—is wrong and unacceptable. Experts and the normal person know such policies will only end poorly. We need the kind of responsible policies the bipartisan team of Fed Chairman Paul Volcker and President Reagan executed, policies that led eventually to 20 years of sound growth. But, for sure, stabilizing an economy in turmoil was difficult for them and for the American people at the time, for a while. But the people understood sound policy was needed in the early 1980s, and they stayed with their strong leaders through the tough times. The people knew then we had acted irresponsibly—as we have today—and they knew a steep hill had to be climbed to get us on sound footing. They met the challenge.

I am not seeing that kind of leadership today. President Reagan knew he would be criticized, but he knew this great Nation would rebound. He had confidence in our people and in free markets. He did not, for one moment, believe expanding government would lead to economic growth.

During this time of economic turmoil, I don't think we are hearing that kind of economic straight, honest talk. We are told not to worry; that we are going to spend our way out of debt. We will have the government stimulate the economy. Well, if that is so easy, why don't we do it every day—just spend, spend, spend forever? If that doesn't work, we can have another stimulus package, they tell us. Deficits don't matter. Debt doesn't matter. We will worry about the consequences of that later. The President of the European Union said this strategy was the economic ''road to hell.'' And I think that is an embarrassment to the United States. The Chinese are aghast. But this is the plan of the President and Mr. Bernanke—spend it now, worry later.

Mr. Bernanke's nomination is before us today. He was the prime architect of the policies that got us into this mess. He did not see it coming. He supported the disastrous $800 billion stimulus package, every penny of which was mainly social spending—had to be borrowed, and it has not produced the kind of jobs and growth we needed because it was not focused sufficiently on job creation.

Mr. Bernanke also supported the $182 billion bailout of AIG, and now we know most of that money was used to compensate AIG's counterparties, such as Goldman Sachs and Deutsche Bank at 100 cents on the dollar, which I think is unthinkable. Last November, the TARP inspector general, Neil Barofsky, reported that the Federal Reserve did not believe AIG's counterparties posed a systemic risk to the economy, which frankly calls into question the entire justification for the bailout.

Amazingly, Chairman Bernanke has learned little from these errors, and that worries me. Tragically, he is supporting or acquiescing in policies that I think have proven not to work and are contrary to sound common sense. If there is any dispute about his leadership, I call my colleagues' attention to his speech on January 3. There he plainly refused to acknowledge his loose money policies were a significant factor in creating the bubble and the inevitable bust. Incredibly, he relied on half-truths to justify his abandonment of the Taylor rule, a formula that has proven to work to contain the temptation for excessively low interest rates.

While anyone can make a mistake, becoming too insulated, too arrogant, too political, and coming to believe tried and true principles no longer apply in the new world of today, is especially dangerous. He has not admitted his mistakes nor is he calling us to the tried and true. Sound money, low taxes, solid, steady growth, and increased productivity based on the historic principles of a free economy—principles that are as immutable as the law of gravity—are the foundation of economic growth, not government spending and Fed maneuvering.

At one of my townhall meetings, a man offered that his daddy always said, ''You can't borrow your way out of debt.'' How true. Shouldn't we be hearing such common sense from the Fed? You can't produce something from nothing. There is no free lunch. Somebody will pay. Our ''masters of the universe'' think these rules don't apply to them—a most dangerous arrogance indeed.

Right now, the American people, our constituents, are the ones paying. It is time for the ''masters of the universe'' who are responsible to pay—those who rejected the tried and true; those who believe that since we are blessed with their leadership, with their brilliance, America doesn't have to move forward steadily and soundly; that the old verities do not apply and, if things get a bit dicey, why by exercising their skill and exceptional knowledge they can fix it before anything bad happens. Did that happen before, in 2007? They were not so smart then.

I think these are the most dangerous leaders—the ones who know the rules but believe they are so brilliant that they may ignore them.

Mr. Taylor, the one of the rule, laid it out in the Wall Street Journal on January 11, 2010. I don't see how anyone can seriously argue that keeping interest rates so low, maintaining easy money, during the 2002–2005 period did not play a significant role in the bubble and the resulting bust. Not only was Chairman Bernanke intimately involved in the creation of these disastrous policies, as was President Obama's Secretary of Treasury Geithner, but he maintains today his violation of the Taylor rule was no harm no foul.

Chairman Bernanke should be rejected for his grievous previous mistakes that helped cause this economic debacle, and he should be rejected, even more emphatically, for his failure to learn from his mistakes.

In December, former Chairman Alan Greenspan testified before the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Government Affairs, saying:

> The challenge to contain this threat is more urgent than at any time in our history. Our nation has never before had to confront so formidable a fiscal crisis as is now visible just over the horizon.

That is a real warning.

We need a courageous Chairman of the Fed, of the quality and firmness of Chairman Volcker, one who average Americans, and importantly, our top corporate leaders, will recognize as being a consistent voice and force for sound financial policy—one who knows he is not so brilliant that he can cease to be bound by the iron laws of economics and markets.

We need a courageous Fed Chairman who has the firmness of Mr. Volcker to lead us through this period. I have not

seen that in Mr. Bernanke and will oppose his nomination.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 3302

Mr. BENNET. Madam President. I would like to express my strong support for the Conrad-Gregg fiscal task force amendment. I thank Chairman CONRAD and Senator GREGG for crafting a proposal that rises above petty Washington partisan bickering.

When my oldest daughter Caroline was born in 1999, our Nation's debt stood at about $5.6 trillion. Our country welcomed her with an unpaid bill totaling $20,000—the amount every American would have to pay up in order to balance the budget.

But there was reason for hope. A President was working with Congress, using pay-go and discretionary spending limits—and reducing our annual deficit down to virtually zero, even running a surplus in a much stronger economy than today's.

Two years later, we welcomed Caroline's younger sister Halina into our family. Our debt had jumped to about $5.8 trillion. She also owed about $20,000. We had a new administration with new priorities—tax cuts that were not paid for, a prescription drug plan that was piled on the deficit, and unfunded mandates like No Child Left Behind, and the war in Iraq.

In 2004, we welcomed our youngest daughter Anne. The debt had skyrocketed to over $7.3 trillion. Anne's share of the national debt stood at $25,000.

By Caroline's 10th birthday last year, the national debt stood at about $11 trillion—double what it was when she was born. She owed about $36,000 at this point. I would have to say that is a lousy birthday present for any 10-year-old.

Now we have had to deal with the worst recession since the Great Depression, and the necessary steps we have taken to provide middle class and small business tax cuts and preserve jobs for police officers and teachers have contributed to the red ink.

Today, our debt stands at just over $12 trillion. Each person owes about $40,000. By 2019, the White House projects that it will double yet again. If we do not come to our senses soon, we may pass the point of no return with this unfair and vast mortgage on our children's future.

The other day I was at a house party in Denver and I was talking about how we were passing this debt on to our kids and they were going to have to pay it back. Caroline was with me. We walked outside the party and she said: Daddy? I said: What? She said: Just to be clear, I am not paying that back. Which I think is the right attitude we should have. We need to take care of it now.

No Member of this body wants my three daughters or any child to inherit the fiscal mess we have caused. Yet partisan stalemate prevents reform from even getting off the ground.

For my part, I introduced the Deficit Reduction Act, which would reinstitute discretionary spending limits and cap our deficit to 3 percent of the GDP, and I cosponsored pay-go. Yet even ideas as basic as these have faced stiff opposition.

We need the Conrad-Gregg amendment. Their commission would enable Congress to reduce the deficit without the usual backroom deals, appeasing of special interest groups, and engaging in partisan blamesmanship.

It is a shame that a commission is necessary. But it is. We have to take the partisanship out of reducing the deficit or nothing will get done. The commission can do this. Sadly, Congress, left to its own devices, has proven that it will not.

Conrad-Gregg is a chance to make Congress live by fiscal rules. I commend the President for expressing his strong support for this amendment.

And to my Republican and Democratic colleagues, now is our chance to show that you are serious about real reform—serious about reducing our deficit.

I urge my colleagues to follow JUDD GREGG's lead, and to follow KENT CONRAD's lead. They designed this commission to allow for everyone's point of view.

When I think about extending the debt limit, I cannot help but return to my daughters and all the children across this country. They have their entire lives in front of them.

Most of us in this body are parents or grandparents or aunts or uncles. One way or another, we are in public service to help our kids. Let's view the Conrad-Gregg proposal through their eyes. They are depending on us to plan for their future—to pay for our tax cuts and to restrain our spending impulses to only the most important priorities.

I urge support for the deficit commission proposal. We need 60 Senators to stand for fiscal responsibility. Let's not allow this chance for bipartisan breakthrough to pass us by. Vote yes on Conrad-Gregg. I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. CONRAD. I thank the Senator from Colorado for his very powerful and persuasive remarks this morning. I hope colleagues are listening. This is a time that will define part of our economic future. This vote this morning will be a vote that will be recorded in history.

Senator BEGICH is seeking time.

Mr. BEGICH. Madam President, I am seeking to speak on this issue.

Mr. CONRAD. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Alaska, Senator BEGICH.

Mr. BEGICH. Madam President, I rise today to support the Conrad-Gregg amendment. Our economic recovery and our Nation's long-term economic health are at risk. Americans are watching and waiting for Congress and the administration to do the right thing and not accept the status quo.

Deficit and debt will rise to an unprecedented level in the coming decades without major changes in our fiscal policies. As of today, our national debt has reached a staggering $12.3 trillion. It has continued to climb at an average of $3.89 billion per day since the fall of 2007.

I am not complaining. Like you, we are freshmen here. But we were dealt the cards and we have the responsibility to take care of it and handle it. If we do not address this, the Federal debt will go skyrocketing from 53 percent of our gross domestic product at the end of fiscal 2009 to more than 300 percent of GDP in 2050. If we take no action, that will be almost three times the existing record which was set back when the debt had reached 122 percent of GDP at the end of World War II. That would leave the economy vulnerable to significant harm.

Since 2001 we have acted as though debts and deficits did not matter. The national debt has nearly doubled since then because of the way we have paid for things such as wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and the Bush tax schemes. Congresses of the past dealt with these by not paying for them and that has made the recession worse. We are on track to double it yet again. Our economic future is on the line and we must work together to fight for stability and a solution.

The fiscal situation is wreaking havoc in my own State of Alaska. Alaska's unemployment rate is at a record level of 8.4 percent. Our economic security clearly is at risk. China is our No. 1 creditor and has put us on notice regarding their concerns about American economic decisions. What would happen if China and other foreign nations decided they would no longer engage in financial relationships with the United States? The answer is frightening: higher taxes and interest rates.

To my friends across the aisle, let's put aside partisan politics and do what is right for the American people. Many of you are preparing to vote against raising the debt limit as well as the Conrad-Gregg amendment and others. In fact, six of my Republican friends withdrew their support for this amendment this past Friday, just 24 hours before the Obama administration endorsed it. What does that say to the American people? What does it say to the American families trying to balance their family budgets? It says politics as usual.

I know my own constituents expect me to play by the same rules they do, to be responsible and pay the bills. I remind all of you that increasing the debt limit does not authorize a single cent of new spending. It simply enables

the Government to pay the bills and prevents the truly dire consequence that would cripple us if the nation were ever in a position of being in a default.

You have a unique opportunity to show Americans that you are willing to put aside your political differences for economic security and the future of this country. I call upon my six colleagues to reconsider and join me in doing the right thing.

Americans are frustrated by the political games that are played here in Washington. I stand here before you wondering if some of my friends across the aisle are suffering from amnesia. How is it that so many of my Republican colleagues voted seven times to raise the debt limit when they were in the majority and voted at least that many times for policies and spending that were not paid for, but today they stand prepared to vote against America simply paying the bills? I call upon my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the Conrad-Gregg amendment or, if that fails, other options that I know will be prepared by Senator BAUCUS and others. It is critical that we deal with this deficit.

Again, I am not complaining. I got elected. I ran for this office. We were dealt the cards and it is the responsibility of this Congress to step up, pay the bills, and look at the long-term future. As Senator BENNET laid out, speaking about his family, his child doesn't want to pay the bill in the future. We have a responsibility and it is a painful responsibility because the bills have mounted and there has been a lack of that responsibility over the last decade plus. But it is incumbent upon us to reach across the aisle and figure out the right solution for the long term.

I yield the remainder of my time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Alaska, Mr. BEGICH, for his strong statement. I also thank him for his attention to the deficit and debt. In meeting after meeting, the Senator from Alaska has been one of the leaders, along with Senator BENNET of Colorado and Senator UDALL of Colorado.

Over and over, they have emphasized the need to our colleagues to face up to the debt threat. I very much appreciate their leadership.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized.

Mr. GREGG. Madam President, I also wish to express my appreciation to the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Colorado, Senator BENNET, for supporting this effort by myself and Senator CONRAD.

It is important to note what we are trying do is address what is coming at us as a fiscal crisis of inordinate proportions which will probably leave this Nation in a situation where it will either be fiscally bankrupt or confronting a massive reduction in the standard of living for our children.

It is a serious issue. I am glad there is a coming together on both sides on the need to address it. At this time I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Colorado, Mr. UDALL.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam President, I want to start out by acknowledging the tremendous leadership of Senator GREGG and Senator CONRAD. Their work together is a breath of fresh air in a town that, unfortunately, has become polarized over these last months. But the amendment today before us is a chance to start anew.

In that spirit, I rise today in support of the Conrad-Gregg amendment of which I am an original cosponsor. As we have heard, the amendment would create a bipartisan task force to comb through the Federal budget and then make recommendations for reining in our annual exploding deficits.

In this light, I also applaud President Obama's call yesterday for a 3-year freeze in Federal discretionary spending. This is a bold announcement. The President has made clear he has heard the American people, including those from Colorado who have asked that the Federal Government get control over its ever-increasing deficits and debt.

Deficit spending, kept as a manageable percentage of our economic output, is one thing, but a deficit of the magnitude that we now face is not sustainable. The trajectory we are on makes our current annual deficit look like peanuts. We are at, in sum, a critical point in our Nation's economic history. If we fail to address this issue now, the Federal deficit will have significant economic ramifications in the short run, as Senator GREGG has pointed out, and it will severely undermine the prospects for our children and our grandchildren in the long run.

Our exploding debt could drive disastrous inflation and leave future generations with fewer resources to invest in, among other things, infrastructure and education. My colleague from Colorado, Senator BENNET, put it in perspective when he said: Each and every Coloradan today owes $40,000 to our national debt. In addition, American taxpayers last year put forward $250 billion to our creditors just for interest payments on our debt. Think what that $250 billion could have done if it was not directed to those interest payments.

If we do nothing, by the year 2019 the American taxpayers will owe over $700 billion in annual interest alone. That is more than we spent last year to fund two wars and finance all of our other defense responsibilities.

So we have a daunting challenge. We need to spur job creation, spend wisely, and also chart a course for a balanced Federal budget. Our government, as Senator BENNET pointed out, should live by the same budgeting rules hard-working Colorado families live by every day. It makes no difference what your political party is, commonsense budgeting is just good policy.

In the coming days I look forward to hearing more about President Obama's proposals to put a freeze in place. I want to study the budget the White House will send us too. I am going to keep fighting for other solutions, practical solutions, to restoring fiscal responsibility, such as tough statutory pay-go rules, earmark reform, a line-item veto authority for the President, and offering the Conrad-Gregg fiscal task force that is before us today.

Unfortunately, as is often the case, partisan politics continues to get in the way of pragmatic solutions, and there has been more interest in casting blame for deficit spending than breaking the mold and trying a new approach. Well, I have something to say today. Both parties are responsible for the present situation. So let's quit pointing fingers and let's go to work and bridge our political divides. We can do that by putting in place this bipartisanship fiscal task force to review the entire budget and then force us to take a vote on those recommendations.

It will be a hard pill to swallow, but it is medicine that we need to take. In today's political atmosphere, it is unfortunate that the Democrats and Republicans have a hard time finding common ground. But this Gregg-Conrad Commission provides a strong example of how we indeed can and must work together on bipartisan solutions to meet our Nation's most pressing problems.

Coloradans, I know, expect no less from me or from Senator BENNET. The fact that President Obama has signaled his strong support for this amendment underlines the critical importance of this effort.

Back in Colorado, back in New Hampshire, back in North Dakota, and throughout the rest of the United States, families are tightening their belts, living within their means, and paying down their own personal debt. When they look at Washington, all they see is partisan bickering and exploding national debt, and no efforts to find viable solutions.

So, in my opinion, and the opinion of many Senators, the best and perhaps the only way to effectively address this potential calamity of a tsunami of debt is through a special process such as that being proposed by Senators CONRAD and GREGG.

I urge my fellow Senators to support this amendment. We can move ahead in a responsible and important way.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Colorado, Mr. UDALL. Over and over, he has emphasized the need for fiscal responsibility in dealing with the long-term debt. I very much appreciate his words this morning.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, I do not think there is any disagreement among Senators that it is important to reduce our deficit and debt. That is not the issue at all. So that should be off the table. The question is how.

Madam President, the journalist Brooks Atkinson once said:

> The perfect bureaucrat . . . is the [person] who manages to make no decisions and escape all responsibility.

The Senators from North Dakota and New Hampshire have come up with the perfect process to transform all Senators into bureaucrats. They have come up with a process that saves all Senators from making decisions.

They have come up with a process to escape Congress's central responsibility.

At the core of the Conrad-Gregg proposal is the idea that Senators could not amend this new commission's recommendations. Senators could not change the commission's product. Senators could not exercise their central responsibility as legislators.

Two things most define a Senator. Senators can amend legislation, even with different subjects. And Senators can debate legislation, sometimes at length. The Conrad-Gregg proposal curtails both of those defining powers.

The Conrad-Gregg proposal completely eliminates the ability to amend. And the Conrad-Gregg proposal sharply limits the ability to debate.

And that is why the first amendment that this Senator offered would protect Social Security. The Conrad-Gregg proposal would not allow Senators to offer amendments to protect Social Security later. So that is why we have to vote to protect Social Security now, while we still can.

The Conrad-Gregg proposal would allow Senators to escape responsibility for cutting Social Security later. So that is why we have to vote now, while we still can, to ensure that this new commission cannot cut Social Security later.

Social Security is a solemn contract that we as a Nation made with our seniors. They were the Greatest Generation. They fought World War II. They fought in Korea. They worked a lifetime. They paid their taxes. And now, we owe them the benefits that they earned.

Social Security is one of the greatest poverty-fighting machines ever invented. If Social Security did not exist, 44 percent of America's seniors would live in poverty today. Social Security lifts 13 million American seniors out of poverty.

America's seniors rely on Social Security. For two-thirds of America's seniors, Social Security provides most of their income. For one-third of America's seniors, Social Security provides almost all of their income.

The chairman and ranking Republican member of the Budget Committee have painted a big red bull's-eye on Social Security. Their commission is a Social Security-cutting machine.

This morning, we will put that proposition to the test. If Senators want to put Social Security on the cutting table, then they should vote against my amendment. But if they truly want to protect Social Security, if they do not want this new commission to cut Social Security, then they should vote for my amendment.

At least with regard to Social Security, let us not stand by like bureaucrats. Let us take responsibility. And let us protect this vital lifeline.

I regret that I have only one other amendment slot available to me. Because I also want offer an amendment to protect veterans programs. We owe a solemn duty to America's veterans, as well.

I also want to offer an amendment to protect America's ranchers and farmers from this commission's cuts.

I also want to offer an amendment to protect America's poorest citizens from this commission's cuts to Medicaid.

The point is: We don't know where this commission will cut. All we know is that if we adopt this new Conrad-Gregg commission, we will not be able to offer amendments to stop it from cutting Social Security, Medicare, veterans programs, farm price supports, or the safety net for the poorest among us.

Yes, we should address the fiscal challenges before us.

But that does not mean that we have to become bureaucrats. That does not mean that we have to stop making decisions for ourselves. That does not mean that we have to give up all responsibility.

For those who favor creating a fiscal commission, there is an alternative. Pending before the Senate, in addition to the Conrad-Gregg commission, is this Senator's amendment to create a fiscal commission.

My amendment would create the exact same commission as the Conrad-Gregg amendment. But my amendment would not create new fast-track procedures for the commission's product.

Thus, my amendment would allow Members of Congress from both parties to come together to formulate policies to address our fiscal challenges.

But my amendment would protect the rights of Senators to offer amendments to the commission's recommendations. My alternative would allow Senators the best of both worlds—a bipartisan statutory commission, without the damage to the Senate's process.

Some who advocate the Conrad-Gregg amendment have asserted that we have employed special procedures like the Andrews Air Force Base summit to enact prior budget agreements. They cite these budget agreements as a reason to adopt the Conrad-Gregg amendment.

But let's look at two recent budget agreements, those of 1990 and 1997. Both of these agreements led to substantial deficit reduction.

Congress enacted both of these budget agreements using the existing budget process. Both in 1990 and in 1997, Congress employed the budget reconciliation process to enact these agreements.

And as a result, the Senate considered numerous amendments to each of these amendments.

The 1990 budget agreement had the support of the first President Bush as well as the Democratic leadership of Congress. Even so, the Senate considered 23 amendments. The Senate voted on 21 amendments to that legislation. That was a broad, bipartisan agreement. But the Senate still allowed amendment. And then, the Senate passed that landmark legislation, using the existing budget process.

Again, in 1997, the President and the congressional leadership came together in a bipartisan budget agreement. That time, in 1997, it was President Clinton and the Republican leadership in Congress. And even though it was a bipartisan agreement, the Senate considered 77 amendments. And the Senate voted on 47 amendments to that legislation. And then, the Senate enacted that landmark legislation.

Thus, in the two most successful recent bipartisan efforts to enact substantial deficit reduction, the Senate employed the existing budget process. And the Senate allowed Senators to amend those agreements.

That is the process that Congress employed in 1990 and 1997. And that is the process that Congress should employ to implement any bipartisan agreement today.

This Senator knows something about bipartisan agreements. This Senator knows something about legislating.

Moving major legislation is not easy. But it is not impossible, either.

This Senate has, in recent memory, passed legislation to reform health care. We have enacted legislation to expand coverage for children. We have enacted legislation to provide life-saving prescription drugs to America's seniors. We have enacted legislation to cut taxes broadly for middle-income Americans.

And this Senate has, within the memory of this Senator and many of our colleagues, enacted major deficit reduction legislation in 1990, in 1993, and again in 1997.

None of those efforts came easily. But then, few good things in life do.

That does not mean that they were impossible. That means that they took skill. That means that they took effort. That means that they took courage.

Bureaucrats do not enact great legislation. Senators do.

I call upon my colleagues. The people of our States elected us to do this work. Let us not shirk our responsibility.

Let us make decisions for ourselves. Let us accept the responsibility that

our constituents gave us. And let us reject this commission.

AMENDMENT NO. 3300, AS MODIFIED

Mr. BAUCUS. I ask unanimous consent that my amendment No. 3300 be modified with the modification I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UDALL of New Mexico). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 3300), as modified, is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

(__) (a) LIMITATION ON CHANGES TO THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, it shall not be in order in the Senate or the House of Representatives to consider any bill or resolution pursuant to any expedited procedure to consider the recommendations of a Task Force for Responsible Fiscal Action or other commission that contains recommendations with respect to the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program established under title II of the Social Security Act, or the taxes received under subchapter A of chapter 9; the taxes imposed by subchapter E of chapter 1; and the taxes collected under section 86 of part II of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code.

(b) WAIVER.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(c) APPEALS.—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

Mr. BAUCUS. This modification, which I make on behalf of Senator GRASSLEY and myself, would make clear that changes to Social Security taxes would be off the table, as well.

The Parliamentarian's Office has advised us that this is how the Chair would have interpreted my original language. This modification makes that entirely clear.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, would the Chair advise us as to the status of the time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire has 19 minutes, 13 seconds remaining. The Senator from Montana has 4 minutes remaining. The Senator from North Dakota has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. GREGG. I yield 5 minutes of my time to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire and the Chair.

Mr. President, this debate is about the economic future of the country. This is the headline in Newsweek magazine from December 7, 2009: ''How great powers fall. Steep debt, slow growth, and high spending kill empires—and America could be next.''

If you go to the inside of the story, it reads:

This is how empires decline. It begins with a debt explosion. It ends with an inexorable reduction in the resources available for the Army, Navy and Air Force. . . . If the United States doesn't come up soon with a credible plan to restore the federal budget to balance over the next five to 10 years, the danger is very real that the debt crisis could lead to a major weakening of American power.

That is what this debate is about. We are on a course that is totally unsustainable. We are headed for a debt of 400 percent of the gross domestic product in 50 years. That is the estimate of the Congressional Budget Office and others who have looked at it, including the Government Accountability Office and the Office of Management and Budget. All of them have warned that we are on an utterly unsustainable course.

The National Journal, in an article on November 7 last year, said:

The debt problem is worse than you think.

In the article, they said:

Simply put, even alarmists may be underestimating the size of the (debt) problem, how quickly it will become unbearable, and how poorly prepared our political system is to deal with it.

Senator GREGG and I, after several years of effort and consultation with our colleagues, have come up with a proposal we will be voting on in just minutes. It provides that all task force members are directly accountable to the American people. There are 18 members of the task force—16 Members of Congress evenly divided between Democrats and Republicans and 2 representatives of the administration, with the Secretary of the Treasury being specifically named.

For those who have asserted that this is an outsourcing of our responsibility, no, this is an outsourcing to ourselves. Sixteen of the 18 members of the commission are Members of Congress. Two are representatives of the administration. It is currently-serving Members of Congress selected by the Democratic and Republican leaders, with the Treasury Secretary and one other official representing the administration. These are people who are accountable to the American people. This is not an abdication of responsibility; this is an acceptance of responsibility, an acknowledgment that what we have been doing has not worked. What could be more clear?

The record is there for everyone to see—a doubling of the debt in the previous administration, a scheduled doubling of the debt in the current administration if we fail to act. The fiscal task force we have proposed has everything on the table, spending and revenues.

The proposal we have made provides for an expedited process, with recommendations to be received after the 2010 election, with fast-track consideration in the Senate and the House. It is true, we have a proposal that does not permit amendments. Why? Because all of us know the game that is played. If we permit amendments, there will be a Democratic amendment and there will be a Republican amendment. There will be a dozen other amendments that will suggest they have a way of doing what needs to be done, and that will then permit them to actually vote against the final resolution. That is what has happened year after year, as the debt has mounted and mounted.

What we are proposing leaves no place to hide. Let's give 18 Members and representatives of the administration the responsibility to come up with a plan, and then let's vote on the plan, with the final vote before the 111th Congress adjourns. Every Member of this Senate will have a chance to vote. When they say this is outsourcing, it is outsourcing to Members of Congress and the administration to come up with a plan. There is no outsourcing of the vote. The vote is going to occur right here and in the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. GREGG. I yield the Senator an additional 4 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CONRAD. In addition, we have done everything we can, Senator GREGG and I, to ensure a bipartisan outcome. Fourteen of the 18 task force members must agree to the recommendations. Final passage requires supermajorities in both the House and Senate. The President still retains his veto power. Make no mistake, Congress makes this decision and the President must agree.

The President has issued this weekend a very strong endorsement of the proposal. He said:

That's why I strongly support legislation currently under consideration to create a bipartisan, fiscal commission to come up with a set of solutions to tackle our nation's fiscal challenges.

The American people support this effort. In a recent poll by Peter Hart, 70 percent favor the creation of a bipartisan commission.

On the question of what is included, we have said everything should be included. Why? Look at where we are. The red line is the spending line. Spending as a share of our national income is the highest it has been since 1950. Spending is the highest it has been in 60 years, and revenue is the lowest it has been in 60 years. Of course, the task force has to look at both.

The assertion has been made that the task force would put the bull's-eye on Social Security and Medicare. We have just learned from the Congressional Budget Office that Social Security is cash-negative today, and the report just released 1 hour ago by the CBO says that Social Security is going to be cash-negative every year but two until 2016 and then it is going to be permanently cash-negative. Those who want to defend Social Security are going to have to change Social Security because Social Security is headed for insolvency. The same is true of Medicare. Medicare is cash-negative today. The trustees tell us it will be bankrupt in 2017, 7 years from today.

Let me conclude by saying that over and over we have heard people come to the floor and say: We know we have a problem. How do we deal with it? I suggest to my colleagues, trying what we have been doing is a proven failure. It is time for something different. It is time for an attempt that brings both sides together, Republicans and Democrats, with an assurance that the recommendations of the commission come to a vote to face up to this debt threat. Make no mistake, this country confronts one of the greatest economic challenges in our Nation's history. The question before us today is, Do we have the courage to stand up to it?

I know groups on the right and the left are right now calling our colleagues asking them to vote no. Groups on the right are saying: Well, this could lead to more revenue. Groups on the left are saying: This could lead to reductions in entitlement programs.

Everything must be on the table. America must take charge of its economic destiny. Now is the time. Now is the opportunity. This is a bipartisan proposal to take the debt threat on in a bipartisan way. I urge my colleagues' support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. GREGG. What is the time situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire has 9½ minutes. The Senator from Montana has 4 minutes. The Senator from North Dakota has 6 minutes.

Mr. GREGG. Did the Senator from Montana wish to speak?

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GREGG. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3300

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, let me first address to my colleagues the issue of the Baucus amendment, as modified now by the Grassley language. I think it is an important amendment.

A lot of my colleagues on our side of the aisle have come up to me and said: We are concerned about the tax issue. I know a lot of people on the other side and our side of the aisle said: We are concerned about the Social Security issue. As I understand the Baucus-Grassley amendment, it essentially says: There is a 60-vote point of order now on Social Security benefits and taxes, so that before you can proceed to the commission's up-or-down vote, you will get two more votes—one on Social Security benefits and one on payroll taxes. So there can be no question but that those two extraordinarily sensitive issues are raised and are aggressively handled in a bipartisan way because you would have to waive it with 60 votes.

That is an important point. The reason I raise it is because I don't think there is a real issue here with Social Security benefits or taxes. I know the interest groups out there are ginning up the issue. That is what they do. That is how they make their money. That is how they get to drive around town in limousines. They send out fundraising letters and say: Conrad-Gregg is going to destroy Social Security or it is going to raise taxes. But that is not going to happen. Who is on the commission? There are eight people appointed by our leadership, Senator MCCONNELL and Congressman BOEHNER, and there are eight people appointed by your leadership, Senator REID and Speaker PELOSI.

So we are giving them a gun. Do you think they are going to put the gun to their head and pull the trigger on taxes or on Social Security? Of course not. They are going to act responsibly. The proposal they come back with is going to be bipartisan. That is the whole purpose. It is fair, it is balanced, and it will make progress. It will not completely resolve the problem, but it will make progress, and it will say to the world: We are making progress on this absolutely critical problem; which is the fiscal insolvency of our Nation that we are headed toward.

We know, without question, our country goes into what amounts to fiscal bankruptcy probably within 7, maybe 10 years. We will be unable to catch up with the debt we have put on the books. We will be unable to pay for that debt in a reasonable way because, basically, people are going to start saying: I am not going to lend you guys any more money, except at outrageous interest rates.

So we have to take action. We can wait until the time happens. We can wait until we hit this wall. We can wait until we go off this cliff, where our debt goes to 100 percent of GDP, which we know will happen. Today it was reported our deficit this year is going to be at least $1.34 trillion, and for as far as the eye can see it is going to be $1 trillion-a-year deficits and the debt will have doubled in 5 years and tripled in 10 years.

The practical implication of that is our Nation is on a path that is absolutely unsustainable, where our children will get a country where they cannot afford to pay down that debt or, if they do pay it down, it is going to basically take away the resources they would have used—our kids would have used—to buy a house, send their kids to college or get a new car.

Something should be done now. Why wait until we hit the wall? Isn't it our job, as responsible people, as the people who have been entrusted with the governance of this Nation, to do something? If you want to look at the scene of the crime where this has happened, it has happened in the Congress. We are the ones who have put on the books the policies which have led to this crisis, this looming crisis. So it should be our job to straighten it out. That is what this commission, this task force does. It is balanced, it is fair, and it is structured in a way that will be bipartisan because it requires a supermajority—14 of the 18 people—just to report the proposal. Then it requires a supermajority to pass it in both Houses. Then the President has to sign it or it comes back for a 67-vote veto override vote, which is a true supermajority.

So this proposal will be absolutely bipartisan, it will be balanced, it will be fair, it will address the outyear fiscal insolvency of this Nation, and it is the only game in town. There are a lot of other proposals floating around this place, but they are all political cover. That is all they are. They are all political cover. They are structured basically to give people a vote so they can go back and run a campaign ad and say: I was acting responsibly. I voted for the XYZ proposal. But none of those proposals work. We know they do not work. We have been here before. We have seen this before. We have seen this story before. Regular order does not work around here.

So unless you have fast-track approval, unless you have an up-or-down vote, unless you have no amendments—for the reasons the Senator from North Dakota has outlined—unless you have a balanced commission with a supermajority to report, you do not get bipartisanship, you do not get fairness, and you do not get action. So what we propose leads to action.

I wish to say, again, especially to people on my side, if you are concerned about this tax issue—which I think is a straw dog because I know MITCH MCCONNELL is not going to appoint four Senators to this group who are for some sort of massive expansion in taxes, and certainly Congressman BOEHNER is in the same camp, so I think it is a straw-dog argument being ginned up by people who basically have other agendas, in my opinion—but if you believe it is a serious argument, then the Baucus amendment takes it away. It essentially takes it away, the Baucus-Grassley amendment.

So I would hope people would look at that amendment and agree with the chairman of the Finance Committee, the Senator from Montana, Mr. BAUCUS, that this is an appropriate amendment because it redresses the concerns around here on the issue of taxes and on the issue of Social Security and it makes this whole process even stronger.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. BAUCUS. Thank you, Mr. President.

I thank the Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. GREGG.

There is a real reason why it is important to protect Social Security. Social Security is probably the most successful social program this Congress, this country, has ever adopted. Look

how many people it has helped. If we did not have Social Security today, 44-some percent of American seniors would be living in poverty—that many. At one time, it was 50 percent. It is close to 50 percent of America's seniors who would be living in poverty today without Social Security.

These are mostly people who have worked hard during their lives: the World War II generation, the product of the Great Depression, the Korean war. These are hard-working Americans, the real soul of America, by and large, and they deserve Social Security.

About one-third of America's seniors today get almost all their income from Social Security. About one-third get almost all their income from Social Security. So why in the world would we even contemplate cutting Social Security? It makes no sense. That is why I offer this amendment, to make it clear we do not cut Social Security.

Social Security, also, is not a big problem in our American fiscal situation. Social Security does not go ''belly up'' until about the year 2043. It is not a big problem in our fiscal situation. It is not. There are also reasons why we protect Social Security. Other reasons are recognized by this Congress. In 1985, for example, Senator Hawkins from Florida offered an amendment that passed that Social Security be exempt from the reconciliation process. That is in the law today. In 1990, we took Social Security out of the unified budget. That is in the law today.

This body, this Congress, over the years, has recognized the importance—not the importance, the critical importance—of Social Security. It is so important that it should not be part of reconciliation, and it should not be part of the unified budget. We should protect Social Security. So I say to my colleagues, vote for this amendment I am offering to protect Social Security. Show to American seniors we hear their needs, we are taking action to protect them.

I hope very much this amendment passes because then it will take one item off this budget commission, if it passes; and it should not pass, in my judgment. I will have more to say about that later because the regular order has worked here. We have cut the budget three times in the regular order since 1990. It works. That is what we, as Senators, should do. We should use the regular order to make sure we do get our fiscal situation back in order. But first let's vote for the amendment to protect Social Security.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I have no problem with the amendment offered by Senator BAUCUS. Basically, what it does is creates another 60-vote hurdle to any work the commission would do, and this underlying proposal requires 60 votes. So I do not see the Baucus amendment as a problem for the vote that will follow. So I would say to Members, Senator BAUCUS has made a strong argument for his amendment and to have another 60-vote hurdle does not change what would be required to get a commission recommendation because we would require 60 votes.

The far larger question is whether we have an alternative approach to what we are currently doing. What we are currently doing I do not think is poised to deal with the challenge of the debt threat confronting the United States. I do not think it is possible for it to cope effectively with what we confront.

Is the Senator from Minnesota seeking time?

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. No, I am not. Thank you.

Mr. CONRAD. I do not see that the Baucus amendment does fundamental damage to the amendment that follows, and to put up another 60-vote hurdle to protect Social Security is not an unreasonable request by the Senator from Montana, the chairman of the Finance Committee.

On the second vote, I think it is absolutely critical we continue the momentum that has been building to sending a message to the American people and the markets all across the world that the United States is prepared to stand and deal with this debt threat.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, the Senate is at its best when we tackle challenges together, Democrats, Republicans, and Independents working together to solve the big problems that confront this country.

Today we face a monumental problem—our fiscal crisis. Consider the measure before us now; legislation to increase the statutory limit on public debt to over $14 trillion—a staggering number. Many of us are loathe to approve this measure to allow the Federal Government to add nearly $2 trillion to our national debt.

Yet the alternative is also not acceptable; namely, that the United States default on its obligations. If we fail to increase the national debt limit, the United States would have to suspend payments for Active-Duty military salaries, for Social Security benefits, for veterans' compensation and pension payments, and for unemployment benefit and Medicare payments to States.

Still, we should not approve this dramatic expansion of public debt without taking steps here and now to reverse course and get control over this economic crisis. We can do that in a bipartisan manner by approving the Conrad-Gregg amendment. This amendment, which I have cosponsored and which has the support of President Obama, would put in place a commission to make recommendations on how to reduce the deficit. These recommendations would be considered by the House and Senate under fast-track procedures and would not be amendable.

Like so many Americans I have become increasingly alarmed by the magnitude of mounting debt our country carries and the potential impact of our unfunded liabilities. I believe that if we fail to act, we will be confronted with an economic tsunami that will far surpass the current crisis. The adoption of this amendment to authorize a fiscal commission will be the first step toward preventing the economic disaster that is looming on the horizon. And, adoption of this amendment will send a message to the American people that Democrats, Republicans, and Independents are ready to work together to put our country first and address the critical issues of the day.

Earlier this year I joined my colleague, Senator VOINOVICH, in introducing a similar bipartisan proposal, the SAFE Commission Act, and last month I joined the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, Senator CONRAD, and the ranking member, Senator GREGG, in introducing the Bipartisan Task Force for Responsible Fiscal Action Act of 2009, a bill which is reflected in the amendment before us. Both bills call for a fiscal commission to make recommendations on how to restore fiscal sanity and balance. And both bills require that the recommendations be considered under fast-track procedures under which amendments are not allowed. My committee, the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, held a hearing on fiscal commissions last year and heard testimony from Senators CONRAD and GREGG as well as former Federal Reserve Chairman Greenspan and former Comptroller General David Walker in support of this concept.

As our long-term economic challenges mount, the need for this type of commission is ever more evident. I have no doubt that all my colleagues are aware of the daunting numbers:

Our national debt is about $12 trillion and rising.

Nearly half of the $7 trillion in publicly held debt is held by foreign governments.

Interest on Treasury debt securities this year is $382 billion. Consider now many worthwhile programs we could fund with $382 billion.

Our current national debt pales in comparison to our unfunded promises and commitments.

Current unfunded liabilities considered together total $56.4 trillion, according to information published by the Peter G. Peterson Foundation.

Mr. President, $36.3 trillion of this is Medicare benefits not covered by taxes and other contributions, and $6.6 trillion of this amount is Social Security benefits not covered by taxes and other contributions.

This unfunded liability comes to $483,000 for each American household.

Total spending for this current year is around $3.7 trillion, and only $1.2 trillion of this is discretionary, or subject to appropriations. Simply put, we have very little control over most of our spending. And this pattern only

gets worse as the 77 million baby boomers retire in ever larger numbers further straining the balance sheets for Medicare and Social Security. My great concern in the context of health care reform has always been that we not do anything to exacerbate the uncontrollable costs on our national ledger.

Our children and grandchildren must pay these bills and face the economic perils that large deficits can induce, including reduced national savings, pressure on interest rates, and dependence on foreign governments to finance our debt. Recently, a lead Moody's analyst, when commenting on our current and projected deficits, stated that the AAA rating of the United States is not guaranteed.

The solutions to addressing our staggering fiscal imbalances revolve around implementing unpopular measures like cutting spending or raising revenues, and controlling health care costs. Yet Congress as an institution has proven itself incapable of enacting such bitter medicine. Our constituents don't want their taxes raised, their benefits cuts, or their Federal services pared back. The very structure of Congress makes it difficult to advance the kinds of legislative proposals that are necessary to achieve substantial and long-term fiscal balance in the face of constituent opposition. And the partisanship that has become pervasive makes a difficult task impossible.

This is why I am convinced that the only way to enact real fiscal reforms is by a special process such as that contained in this proposal to establish a fiscal commission. I commend President Obama for coming out in support of this amendment and urge all Members of this body to vote for this amendment and in doing so vote for the future vitality of our economy and strength as a nation.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, this vote is a difficult one for procedural and process reasons. Many of us worry about the precedent of circumventing key Senate committees on such vital issues where Congress's responsibility is clear and compelling.

Still, a larger and looming reality is staring us in the face. This is no ordinary moment. We cannot continue our current fiscal path and rely on China to finance our debts for decades. With the Federal budget deficit at $1.4 trillion this year alone and the Federal debt at above $12 trillion, it is undeniable that we must together address soaring Federal spending and revenue issues, and we must also find real answers that preserve critical programs like Social Security and Medicare for future generations.

We have been in difficult fiscal circumstances before. When I first came to the Senate, we were saddled with then-record deficits and I broke with many in our caucus to support the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985. That initiative wasn't perfect but it was a start—and it marked a break with an attitude that the sky was the limit for spending. During the 1990s, I supported spending cuts and fiscal restraint that helped lead to budget surpluses. Unfortunately, in 2001 we began an 8-year period where the Vice President of the United States himself famously advised that ''deficits don't matter.'' Run-away spending coupled with massive tax cuts for those at the top helped turn projected surpluses into all too real record deficits. Two wars, and a near-financial collapse, bail-out, and a needed stimulus have all added to the situation we face today. We need to put aside partisan differences and work together to control the deficit.

That is why I have voted in favor the Conrad/Gregg amendment which creates a bipartisan fiscal task force. These issues cannot be ignored. There are many ways we must tackle them in the years ahead—and this commission should be just one of them, and I also believe Congress should have the opportunity to amend the task force recommendations. I will continue to work with Senate Budget Committee Chairman CONRAD and President Obama to develop a task force that will put our Federal budget on a sustainable path.

In the past, I have introduced line-item veto legislation and cosponsored legislation to address corporate subsidies. These ideas need to be revisited. We should be open to all ideas that will reign in looming deficits. The bottom line is undeniable: these questions cannot be deferred or denied, they must be addressed, and that will require more—much more—than this single vote by the Senate.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, people are angry and they are anxious. They are worried their middle class way of life is slipping by. During the last several months as I listened to people they had very clear messages.

First, ensure the solvency and stability of Medicare and, they said, no Medicare rationing.

Second, they said to get the government's fiscal house in order. They said to be as frugal as they have to be in their own homes.

I absolutely agree the government has to get its fiscal house in order. And I am unrelenting in making sure that Medicare is there when people need it, and is there in the way their doctor says they need to have it.

I fear this commission is a back door to rationing Medicare. I pledged during health care reform, and I pledge now, I will not ration Medicare.

I agree that Congress needs a gut check on spending, but we don't need a gutless vote. I worry that this commission will be a fast track process to ration Medicare run by a group with limited accountability selected by the very same politicians who were incapable of making the tough decisions. I will not vote for a commission to ration Medicare.

Social Security is not the real cause of the debt crisis. It has never added to the debt. It can be fixed through regular order with small tweaks that don't cut benefits.

I believe tough decisions on the budget and revenue should be made in the full light of day and through regular order with full accountability, and without subcontracting responsibility to a commission.

I support the goal of fiscal responsibility. We need urgent action. We must clean up the mess of many years of failed economic policies while ensuring the long-term health and economic security of Americans through the protection of Medicare and Social Security and at the same time, be aware that we must deal with job creation and the wrenching problem of home foreclosures.

I have made tough budget decisions in the past. I opposed tax cuts that went to the lavishly wealthy and cuts that let hedge fund managers pay lower taxes than their secretaries. I opposed tax cuts for corporations that shipped jobs overseas. I have used the powers of both my office and of other institutions to fight waste, fraud and abuse.

In the late 1990s, I was one of nine votes against repealing the Glass-Steagall Act which allowed banks to make risky bets with families' checking accounts with little regulation and no accountability, leaving taxpayers to clean up the mess with TARP. And it created the go-go permissiveness that got our economy into a ditch with a big recession that is part of the debt problem.

During the prescription drug debate I voted against the bill because Bush and the Republican Congress refused to allow the government to negotiate with drug companies for lower prices. It was just one more give away for drug and insurance companies so they could charge seniors and the government more for prescription drugs.

I have stood for strong and independent inspectors general at Federal agencies so they have power to ensure fairness and accountability. I asked the Department of Justice IG to investigate when political appointees were awarding grants to their friends. And IG made recommendations to reform the grant process.

I asked the Government Accountability Office to recommend reforms for the Chesapeake Bay Program to focus the bay program on results because the bay program was fudging its data to overstate progress in cleaning up the bay.

I have fought on my own committee against botched government boondoggles—lavish conferences with $4 meatballs at the Department of Justice, satellite construction contracts that have run billions over budget and years behind schedule, and Enron-like accounting in the AmeriCorps Program.

And I have supported strong protections for whistleblowers, so talented civil servants can come forward about wrongdoing without fear of retribution

when they uncovered corrupt practices. I believe some commissions can work, like the Bipartisan Policy Center's Debt Reduction Task Force headed by Pete Domenici and Alice Rivlin that will issue tough recommendations on revenue and spending.

I look forward to their findings and I want to hear recommendations from others. I would support a commission like the one proposed by Senator BAUCUS where there could be amendments and full debate so we could vote to stop the rationing of Medicare and raising taxes on the middle class.

I support the goal of fiscal responsibility. I don't support this process with its fast-tracking, muffling of amendments and limited debate. This is not the way to address programs touching every American family. I don't support shifting the burden and risks to seniors and their families.

I will not support this commission or rationing Medicare, raiding Social Security or any backdoor way of raising taxes on the middle class.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I agree with strong comprehensive efforts to eliminate the annual Federal deficit and reduce the national debt. Regrettably, the events of the past several decades demonstrate that Congress has failed to demonstrate the political will to deal with the deficit and debt.

However, I am concerned about legislation to delegate to a commission Congress's core constitutional responsibilities on matters like Social Security, Medicare, and revenue.

I was deeply involved in a related issue when I was the lead party-plaintiff and personally argued against the closing of the Philadelphia Navy Yard in the case of Dalton v. Specter. In a similar context, the Congress created a military base closing commission which decided which bases to close with only a yes-or-no vote by Congress on the entire package. I argued the case personally in the Supreme Court of the United States in 1994 and the Court upheld the closing of the Philadelphia Navy Yard in the context that the Court would have had to overturn closures of some 300 other bases involved in the same commission report.

It is a tough vote to again vote to raise the debt ceiling, but it is indispensable if the U.S. Government is to function and retain its credit standing in the world commercial markets. I will continue to work and to press my colleagues to exercise the political will to eliminate the deficit and reduce the national debt.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota has 4 minutes.

Mr. CONRAD. How much time does Senator BAUCUS and Senator GREGG retain?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana has 1 minute. The Senator from New Hampshire has 20 seconds.

Mr. CONRAD. All right.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I am sorry, what is the time again?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire has 20 seconds.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, would the Senator like me to yield half my time to him?

Mr. GREGG. No. I will yield my 20 seconds to the Senator from North Dakota to complete our presentation.

Mr. CONRAD. I thank the Senator.

Let me go back to where I began.

What is this about? This is fundamentally about the economic future of the United States. Newsweek magazine, cover story, December 7: ''How Great Powers Fall.'' ''Steep debt, slow growth, and high spending kill empires.''

Colleagues, is there any doubt we are on a collision course with economic reality? The Congressional Budget Office, 1½ hours ago, issued a new report saying the deficit for this year will be $1.350 trillion—$1.350 trillion—and, in coming years, staggering deficits for as far as the eye can see. The debt—which swelled to more than double its 2001 level during the previous administration's 8 years—the debt is expected to rise by a similar magnitude over the next 5 years and then again in 10 years.

There is, to me, no question that doing things the same old way that has led to this crisis is unlikely to lead to a different result. Senator GREGG and I have a special responsibility to our colleagues with respect to the budget. The budget process—if you look at it—we have done 35 budgets since the Budget Act; 29 of the 35 have been for budgets of 5 years or less. This is not a 5-year issue; this is a long-term issue. In the short term, we have had to take on more deficits and debt to prevent a global economic collapse. But now we must pivot and put in place a long-term plan to deal with the crisis confronting this Nation.

That crisis is a debt threat of unprecedented proportion. Never before in American history have we faced the prospect of a debt that would reach 400 percent of the gross domestic product of the country; increasingly, that debt is financed by borrowing from abroad. Last year, a substantial portion of the debt was financed by foreign entities.

This is the time. This is the moment. This is the chance for us to put in place a process to deal with the debt. I urge my colleagues to support it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana has 1 minute remaining.

Who yields time?

The Senator from Montana is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 3300

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I am happy to learn from the Senator from North Dakota he favors my amendment or at least he says it would not cause any injustice to his central mission.

My main point is, the regular order does work here. In 1990, 1993, 1997, Congress passed reconciliation budget resolutions that worked, and I believe, frankly, we have it within ourselves as Senators to do the same again, to pass a budget resolution through reconciliation to get the deficit under control, working with the President. I very much hope the President, in his State of the Union Message and his budget that is placed in the Congress, starts to get the budget under control. Very much of this depends upon the President and working with the Congress. It is not just Congress. I urge all of us to remember the regular order has worked in the past. It has worked several times.

The Andrews Air Force Base agreement was put through regular order. Regular order does work, and that is what we as Senators should do. We are not bureaucrats. We are Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the Baucus amendment No. 3300, as modified.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WEBB) are necessarily absent.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 97, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 4 Leg.]

YEAS—97

Akaka	Ensign	McCaskill
Alexander	Enzi	McConnell
Barrasso	Feingold	Menendez
Baucus	Feinstein	Merkley
Bayh	Franken	Mikulski
Begich	Gillibrand	Murray
Bennet	Graham	Nelson (NE)
Bennett	Grassley	Nelson (FL)
Bingaman	Gregg	Pryor
Bond	Hagan	Reed
Boxer	Harkin	Reid
Brown	Hatch	Risch
Brownback	Hutchison	Roberts
Bunning	Inhofe	Rockefeller
Burr	Inouye	Sanders
Burris	Isakson	Schumer
Byrd	Johanns	Sessions
Cantwell	Johnson	Shaheen
Cardin	Kaufman	Shelby
Carper	Kerry	Snowe
Casey	Kirk	Specter
Chambliss	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Coburn	Kohl	Tester
Cochran	Kyl	Thune
Collins	Landrieu	Udall (CO)
Conrad	Lautenberg	Udall (NM)
Corker	Leahy	Vitter
Cornyn	LeMieux	Voinovich
Crapo	Levin	Whitehouse
DeMint	Lieberman	Wicker
Dodd	Lincoln	Wyden
Dorgan	Lugar	
Durbin	McCain	

NOT VOTING—3

Murkowski Warner Webb

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 97, the nays are 0. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment, as modified, is agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3302

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 3302, offered by the Senator from North Dakota, Mr. CONRAD.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, how much time is available?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 1 minute on each side.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I will take 30 seconds.

I believe this is a defining moment for this Chamber and for this Congress. The question before the body is will we adopt a special process to face up to the debt threat looming over this Nation. We are headed, I say to my colleagues, for a debt 400 percent of the gross domestic product of this country.

Senator GREGG and I have proposed, in a bipartisan way, with bipartisan cosponsorship, a plan to look at spending and revenues. The revenues are the lowest they have been in 60 years. The spending is the highest it has been in 60 years. It is time for us to take on this challenge, to do it together, to strengthen our Nation.

I urge our colleagues to vote aye.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, there is no doubt that we have to get our fiscal house in order. That is not an issue before us right now. So let's take that off the table. All Senators agree we have to address our fiscal situation.

Second is the question of what is the best way to do it. I remind our colleagues that we have used the regular order to cut budget deficits in 1990, 1993, and 1997. The Andrews Air Force Base summit agreement was passed through regular order, through reconciliation. We have done it. We have used reconciliation, regular order to get budget deficits under control.

In addition, I have an alternative commission amendment. It is the same as the Conrad commission but with one exception, and that is it is amendable on the floor of the Senate. So if you want to have some sense of Senators—we are not going to be bureaucrats, we are going to be Senators—my amendment allows a commission where we as Senators can amend the commission's recommendations.

Regular order has worked in this body—new Members do not know that—in 1990, 1993, and 1997.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. CONRAD. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 3302.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 5 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Alexander
Bayh
Begich
Bennet
Bingaman
Bond
Boxer
Carper
Chambliss
Collins
Conrad
Corker
Cornyn
Dorgan
Durbin
Enzi
Feingold
Feinstein
Franken
Gillibrand
Graham
Gregg
Hagan
Isakson
Johanns
Johnson
Kaufman
Kerry
Klobuchar
Kohl
Landrieu
Leahy
LeMieux
Levin
Lieberman
Lincoln
Lugar
McCaskill
Menendez
Nelson (NE)
Nelson (FL)
Pryor
Reid
Schumer
Shaheen
Tester
Udall (CO)
Vitter
Voinovich
Warner
Webb
Wicker
Wyden

NAYS—46

Akaka
Barrasso
Baucus
Bennett
Brown
Brownback
Bunning
Burr
Burris
Byrd
Cantwell
Cardin
Casey
Coburn
Cochran
Crapo
DeMint
Dodd
Ensign
Grassley
Harkin
Hatch
Hutchison
Inhofe
Inouye
Kirk
Kyl
Lautenberg
McCain
McConnell
Merkley
Mikulski
Murray
Reed
Risch
Roberts
Rockefeller
Sanders
Sessions
Shelby
Snowe
Specter
Stabenow
Thune
Udall (NM)
Whitehouse

NOT VOTING—1

Murkowski

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 53, the nays are 46. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is withdrawn.

The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask Senator LEMIEUX be recognized to speak for 10 minutes, and immediately following his remarks the Senate stand in recess.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Mr. President, I rise again to talk about the unsustainable spending of this country and the debt that we cannot afford. Just a moment ago a proposal by Senator CONRAD and Senator GREGG to put together a commission to tackle the spending of this country was defeated in this Chamber. I supported the proposal. It was not a perfect proposal. It was a proposal that some Republicans did not like because of the opportunity it might promote to have a tax increase. It was a proposal some Democrats did not like because they thought the spending might be too tough on entitlement programs such as Social Security and Medicare. But it was a proposal that both Democrats and Republicans, I hoped, would like enough to move forward.

The spending problem we have is like a cancer. This Chamber refuses to seek any treatment. While I did not like the proposal completely, I at least supported it because I knew we needed to do something. Our spending is out of control. We have a $12 trillion debt. The deficit of last year was $1.4 trillion, more than the past 4 years in the Bush administration combined.

I am new to this Chamber so the bizarre still seems bizarre to me; and perhaps the longer you are here, bizarre starts to seem normal. But we cannot spend more than we take in. We cannot continue to amass debt for which our children will have to pay. Right now we have to borrow money from countries such as China because we can no longer raid Social Security and Medicare because those programs now need those dollars to be paid out.

At some point this country is going to have to pay the piper. At some point we are going to have to dramatically cut spending or dramatically increase taxes. At some point investors from around the world will not invest in this country anymore because we will not be a good investment. That is already starting to happen. We are already seeing folks from around the world investing in countries such as Brazil because they see it as a superior opportunity to this country.

At some point we will not be a first-rate economic power unless the people in this Chamber and the Chamber down the hall have the courage to do something about it.

What we should be doing is balancing the budget. We should be proposing a balanced budget amendment and a line-item veto for the President. I put forward this measure. The majority of the States do it, the majority of the Governors have that line-item veto, but it is tilting at windmills. I know it is unrealistic because this Chamber will not even do what Senator CONRAD and Senator GREGG tried to do just a few moments ago. I will continue to stand up and speak on this because if we do not sound the alarm, the future of this country is in peril.

Now we are about to embark upon raising the debt limit.

This time, $1.9 trillion. I have talked about this before, and for those who have heard it, it is going to seem like old news. But I feel as if I have to continue to stress how much money this is. If you take $1 million and lay it edge to edge, it will cover two football fields; $1 billion will cover the city of Key West, FL, 3.4 square miles; and $1 trillion will cover the State of Rhode Island twice. If you stack $1 trillion from the ground up to the sky, it would go more than 600 miles. This is an enormous amount of money. We throw these amounts around, trillions and billions. It is hard to grasp how much

it is. Now our interest payment has become one of the largest payments we make every year, nearly $200 billion alone on interest. We cannot put bandaids over this. We cannot say we are going to freeze spending; we have to cut spending.

In the State of the Union Address on Wednesday, apparently the President of the United States is going to offer the idea that we are going to cut spending in some discretionary spending items, about 17 percent of the budget. Leader BOEHNER over in the House said it is like going to a pie-eating contest and deciding you are going to go on a diet. It is like that family sitting around the table and trying to decide how they are going to cut their spending. Instead of making meaningful cuts, it is like saying: OK, we will cut our spending on beer and pizza. It is not enough. It is not enough. We are spending much more than we can afford to. And my three kids—soon to be four—are not going to want to live in this country because they are not going to have the same opportunities as they could in other places in the world. Shame on us if we fail our children in that way.

So I stand with my colleagues—Senator COBURN, Senator MCCAIN, and Senator ENZI—in support of amendment No. 3303, which is an alternative to increasing the debt ceiling. Instead of increasing the debt ceiling and borrowing more money when we cannot afford to, we are going to cut spending by $120 billion, which is a good start. How do we do it? We go across all of the agencies and say they have to cut 5 percent. Right now, American families are cutting more than 5 percent from their household budgets. Small businesses in places such as Florida and around the country have to cut more than 5 percent. These are difficult times. When is the last time a government agency cut anything? I bet you could cut 20 or 30 percent out of these agencies and not have a meaningful impact on the services they render. And this asks for 5 percent, a 5-percent cut across the board.

It also directs that agencies consolidate more than 640 duplicative programs that have been found. We know there are more than that. That is just the 640 that have been found. This requires the Government Accountability Office to identify other duplicative programs that can be cut and rescinds unobligated funds—the money sitting out there in the budget for these agencies that they have not spent. Let's take that money back and put that against the deficit. We are borrowing money now. We should not have money sitting around when we are borrowing money and paying interest on it.

So it is a good proposal, and I hope it passes. But the truth is, it probably will not because there are folks in this Chamber, Democrats and Republicans alike, who will not stand up and face the hard truth that we have to cut spending. If we do not make the hard choices and stand up as leaders in this country, our future is in peril. When we look back 10, 20 years from now and it is too far gone, the only folks whom we are going to have to blame are ourselves. This is not a Democratic problem, not a Republican program, it is a problem of this Congress.

Go back to March 2006. The President of the United States, then a Senator, said:

> The fact that we are here today to debate raising America's debt limit is a sign of leadership failure, is a sign that the U.S. Government cannot pay its own bills.

Do not take it from me, take it from the President of the United States. We have to do more. I am disappointed that Gregg-Conrad failed. It was not perfect, but it was something. I hope Senator COBURN's measure prevails, but I am skeptical.

The American people get it. The American people understand this is a problem, and that is why we have these big swings in these elections. The same passion that propelled President Obama into office is the same passion that propelled our new Senator from Massachusetts into office, from two opposite parties, because the American people are frustrated that this body does not work. And if we do not change the rules and start to get serious and if we keep muddling along the path of disaster, we are going to fail our country.

We may not get it done while I am here in the Senate. I only have this year. But I am going to keep coming to the floor and I am going to keep speaking out about it because somebody has to sound the alarm.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. BROWN. Tomorrow night, the President of the United States will come down the hall and speak in the House of Representatives, addressing a joint session of Congress, for the State of the Union, the address Presidents have been giving for decades in this country. He will speak directly to the American people, to people in this country who work so hard, play by the rules, but simply can't get ahead. They feel they can't get ahead, and in so many cases they can't get ahead no matter how hard they work. He will speak to Ohioans who understand that it takes more than 1 year to turn around 8 years of failed economic policy.

I listened with some amusement to some of the other speakers before me and am a bit incredulous about the hypocrisy, not of the Senator from Florida, who was not here during the first part of this last decade, but when, with such enthusiasm, so many of my colleagues here voted for a war that probably will cost $1 trillion before it is over but did not want to pay for it so didn't find a way to cut spending or raise taxes to pay for it, voted for a giveaway to the drug companies, the insurance companies, all in the name of privatizing Medicare—hundreds of billions of dollars that we are paying for, that our children and grandchildren are paying for. Again, though, they did not cut spending or raise taxes; they added it to the bill, to the debt for our children and grandchildren. And in 2001, 2003, 2005, they voted for tax cuts for the wealthy, who pay much less in taxes than they have historically in this country—again, no spending cuts, no comparable tax increases to make up for that. No wonder we went from a budget surplus a decade ago, when President Clinton took office, to huge budget deficits today.

President Obama made a decision, as he had to in January—a year ago, we lost 700,000 jobs, the month Barrack Obama became President. And you have to spend. You have to spend to stimulate the economy. All reputable economists—literally, all reputable economists say that if we had not given the tax cuts, done the help for the States that kept the States from laying off literally hundreds of thousands of police officers, firefighters, mental health counselors, librarians, teachers, people who serve us as a country, they would have lost their jobs. It would have been much worse. And the stimulus spending that is going to help companies such as BASF in Elyria, OH, where the President visited last Friday, that helped create jobs with new lithium battery technology.

The President, as I said, was in my home county, in Elyria, OH, Lorain County Community College, this past Friday. This was the first Presidential visit since 1948 when Harry Truman came to Lorain County, OH, and spoke about how Congress was not doing any of the things that mattered to fight the problems of that day. And the President was not partisan, but the President made it clear that Republicans' reluctance to help get this economy back on track, help with job creation, is really what set us back. That is why the President was in Lorain County to talk about job creation, talk about helping small businesses, talk about helping with exports, talk about helping unfreeze credit because so many companies cannot get credit.

The President also, though, has thrown his support behind what many of us in Ohio are seeing as our State becoming the Silicone Valley of alternative energy. Toledo, OH, has more solar energy manufacturing jobs than any city in America. I was in Cincinnati this week—just yesterday, in fact—and in Cincinnati there is a steel company that was making steel drums for oil fields, and it is now making steel components for wind turbines. I could take you around my State and show you what they are doing in Cleveland, in Mansfield, in Youngstown, and

in Akron and Dayton and Columbus, all kinds of job creation with alternative energy.

But we need a better national economy. That is why yesterday in Cincinnati the President and Chairman of the Export-Import Bank, Fred Hochberg, came to that city at my request and did a roundtable with community bankers on how we can help them help their customers to export more and met with a group of entrepreneurs, a group of businesspeople in Cincinnati who were there in order to learn how to get help so they can export.

The big companies, such as Procter & Gamble and GE, both major, important citizens in Cincinnati, don't need all that much help to figure out how they are going to export products, but smaller companies of 5, 10, 50, 100, and 200 employees need some assistance. When they try to export, when they are working in another country trying to find customers and trying to export their products, sell their products, so often other companies with which they are competing usually have their government standing right side by side with them in partnership.

That is what we need to do for our small businesses, especially our small manufacturers that are trying to sell more products abroad, creating jobs in this country. We know that for $1 billion we export, it creates—whether it is in Albuquerque or whether it is in Ashland, OH, whether it is in Santa Fe or whether it is in Sidney, OH, we know that $1 billion in exports creates about 15,000 jobs.

Right now, we have a huge trade deficit, hundreds of billions of dollars in trade deficit. We know that costs us jobs. That is why what happened in Cincinnati yesterday is so important, so the Export-Import Bank can help these smaller companies that want to export, help them find financing, help them figure out how you license products if you want to sell them in Hungary or you want to sell them in Bangladesh or Nigeria or France, help them figure out how to get through the rules and deal with language barriers and deal with all kinds of problems that larger companies have a staff to do. Smaller companies need some assistance, need a partnership with their government. That is what that meeting was all about yesterday. That is what the President understands.

We need to help small business, we need to unfreeze credit, we need to do direct spending for infrastructure to prepare for the future, and we need to export more. Those are some of the keys to job creation. The President, when he speaks down the hall in the joint session of Congress tomorrow night for the State of the Union, will address a lot of those issues. It is time that the obstruction in this Chamber stops, and we can move forward and begin to do those kind of things we need to do.

I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:43 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. BEGICH).

INCREASING THE STATUTORY LIMIT ON THE PUBLIC DEBT—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for 8 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. FRANKEN pertaining to the introduction of S. 2952 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. FRANKEN. I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3308 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3299

(Purpose: To reduce the deficit by establishing 5-year discretionary spending caps)

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

Mr. SESSIONS. The amendment is proposed by myself and Senators MCCASKILL and KYL.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SESSIONS], for himself, Mrs. MCCASKILL, and Mr. KYL, proposes an amendment numbered 3308 to amendment No. 3299.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Text of Amendments.'')

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, our fathers and forefathers made heroic sacrifices so that we one day might enjoy the blessings of liberty and prosperity. Indeed, we have had prosperity through much of our country's history. Their courage during World War II changed the world, making possible the greatest run of economic growth in history. The character and courage they displayed remains an inspiration to us. And there are important lessons to be learned from the way this ''greatest generation'' faced adversity.

We have recently been put to the test ourselves. We were—and in many ways continue to be—faced with a national crisis in the form of a historic and severe recession. So what did we do? We could have learned from President Reagan and Paul Volcker, a Democrat who was then Federal Reserve Chairman and is now working with President Obama. They took the political heat in the short run so the free market could correct itself and emerge stronger on the other side.

Instead, I think we flinched. We tried to limit the immediate pain by mortgaging our children's future. We borrowed hundreds of billions of dollars to finance our standard of living today. We took money from the future so we can spend it today. We tried desperately to mitigate the downturn of a huge economy, even when we know economies are cyclical and do have booms and busts.

Every penny we spent on the stimulus package—$800 billion—and other special spending was borrowed and must be paid back. In truth though, there is no plan to pay the debt back—only to pay the soaring interest for as far in the future as we can see. So this is not an academic problem, nor is it just a question of public financing and governmental roles.

As former Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan said about our debt in December—and I think it is a stunning statement—

> The challenge to contain this threat is more urgent than at any time in our history. Our Nation has never before had to confront so formidable a fiscal crisis as is now visible just over the horizon.

The policies adopted by Congress and the President have set the Nation now on a dangerous course of spending and borrowing. The budget crisis we face is so severe, the mountain of debt so high, that it threatens to undermine the foundation, as Mr. Greenspan said, of our economic strength and our prosperity. This is reality.

For the first time in our Nation's history, our generation stands to bequeath to our children a nation that is less economically sound, less fundamentally strong, and less secure than that which we inherited. And it is not necessary. We can do better if we act today.

It would be an unthinkable tragedy and really a moral failure for us to pass on a less strong country. We have responsibilities not just to our own people today but to those who will follow us in the years to come, and we would have no one else to blame but ourselves.

The numbers tell a grim story. In fiscal year 2009, our government spent $1.4 trillion more than it took in through revenues. That is the largest deficit in our Nation's history, dwarfing those of previous years. Scaled to the budget of a typical family, the government operated like a household making $50,000 but spending $83,000. That is how much more spending we carried out than we had revenues.

Common sense tells us this is unsustainable, and almost every expert you ask would use that very word:

''unsustainable.'' Yet we expect to run deficits over the next decade that average nearly $1 trillion annually—averaging that and not going down. According to the Congressional Budget Office, in the 8th, 9th, and 10th year, the deficit continues to increase.

By 2019, we will owe our creditors, including nations such as China and Japan, more than $15 trillion—three times the total debt of America that existed last year. In 2019, the interest payments we will make on the debt we owe outside the government—the public debt to foreign countries and individuals—will be $799 billion, almost $800 billion in one year. That will be up from $202 billion in interest payments last year. $800 billion is about $200 billion more than we spend on defense, and 20 times more than we spend on roads or education. We currently spend about $40 billion a year on roads, and this interest on the debt will cost us $800 billion a year in 10 years—a basis of a tripling of our debt.

That growing interest payment will crowd out our ability to fund other important government services, and it will crowd out private borrowers who will need to borrow to create jobs.

Given that we have embarked on such a spending spree, is it any surprise that the first item on the Senate agenda this year is the necessary bill, they say, to raise the debt limit to allow us to borrow more money? We have hit the limit. The government has a limit on the amount of debt it can hold by statute, such as a maximum amount on a credit card. America's credit card has a $12.4 trillion limit on internal and external debt and, incredibly we have maxed it out again. It should be a dramatic thing to boost that debt limit, but, interestingly, it has become routine.

This will be the seventh time we have done so in 5 years, and it is troubling Americans. The public is rightly angry with Washington's cavalier attitude toward spending. They know ''buy now; pay later'' catches up with you eventually. They know nothing comes from nothing. The American people know that what Stanford University economist Michael Boskin wrote in the Wall Street Journal is true. He said:

> The explosion of spending, deficits, and debt foreshadows even higher prospective taxes on work, savings, investment and employment. That not only will damage our economic future but is harming jobs and growth now.

The American people know that taxes are going to go up, a fact confirmed by David Walker, former Comptroller General and GAO head. He testified recently that taxes would need to double by 2040 to keep up with our current commitments.

The American people have made it clear they reject the philosophy of ever increasing debt. They reject taking on such a burden. Why? Because they know it threatens the strength of the American economy. They know it is a cloud over our efforts to rebound economically, and they want us to stop. They want us to stop.

To my colleagues, I ask: How much clearer does that message have to be? I do not think anyone doubts it. The good news is, many Senators are worried on both sides of the aisle. They are concerned about what we are doing, and they know we need to do better, and they are listening to their constituents. They will have an opportunity this week to do that by supporting this bipartisan legislation I have offered.

I see my colleague Senator CLAIRE MCCASKILL from Missouri in the Chamber, who is a cosponsor of this legislation that will limit the growth of spending. So it is a simple amendment. There are no strings attached. It as a rare opportunity to impose budget discipline on a Congress that is notorious for not having any.

That is what makes people angry. Politicians talk a good game but nothing seems to change. But when it comes down to it, the politicians always seem to find a way to spend more, and the taxpayers end up holding the bill. So this amendment would help change that. It would impose, first, binding limits on the 40 percent of Federal spending we control each year, discretionary spending. The amendment would put into law the spending levels approved in the fiscal year 2010 congressional budget, which a majority of the Senate supported. It is basically the Democratic Congress's budget. It had certain limits over 5 years.

What we are saying is if you exceed those limits, then you would be violating this amendment, which seeks to control and avoid that. Those spending levels include only our budget increases that are averaging about 2 percent a year annually over 5 years. Contrast that with the 12-percent increases we saw last year in nondefense discretionary appropriations, and the 10 percent the year before.

Factoring in the stimulus, government spending on nondefense accounts actually soared by 57 percent, while State and local governments were tightening their belts, some cutting expenses.

Each year we increase spending it gets built into the baseline of our budget for the next year, and when we have an increase in the next year, it is an increase on a higher baseline, and it goes up exponentially.

For example, last year, on one bill, the defense bill, there was tacked on an $18 billion expenditure for various projects that were not paid for within the budget. It was added, paid for with debt—money we had to borrow. If we do that each year, if we add another $18 billion through that kind of budget-busting activity, it would cost the taxpayers an extra $1 trillion over a decade. It is hard to believe, but that is true. Mr. President, $18 billion one year goes into the baseline; the next year you add another $18 billion, and it is not $18 billion, it is $36 billion more than you would have spent had the first one not been spent.

I am convinced we can do better. This amendment is an important step.

Second, the amendment would require 67 votes—two-thirds of the Senate—to waive the binding caps. In other words, if we set these caps, we can waive them if there is an emergency. But it takes two-thirds to do so. Two-thirds of the Senate is a strong threshold that will keep these caps in place except in times of true emergency.

Finally, this amendment complements efforts to rein in mandatory spending programs that are expected to be insolvent in coming years. Social Security runs a surplus now. Medicare did so until the last few years. Those surpluses are being spent in our discretionary accounts. So these programs have little to do with our record deficits. It is discretionary spending, up until recently, that has driven the entirety of our debt.

Deficits for the most part come from discretionary spending, and this statutory caps idea I have proposed is tested and proven. The Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 included similar provisions that kept the growth of Federal spending low for 12 years. Its provisions were extended in 1997 because people found they were working. Congress felt they were working.

All in all, these budget rules helped to achieve four balanced budgets for 4 consecutive years, from 1998 to 2001. The key component of that, I truly believe, was these statutory caps on spending that were passed during that period.

Many currently serving Senators were in this Chamber in the 1990s and recognized the necessity. In 1997, 28 currently serving Democrats, for example, voted for these provisions, including many of the Democratic leaders in the Senate today. I submit that those budget rules are even more needed today.

As Mr. Greenspan said, we have never faced such a fiscal crisis looming just over the horizon.

I am pleased a number of organizations known for their knowledge and concern about deficits have recognized the merit of this proposal, including the National Taxpayers Union, Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget, the Heritage Foundation, and the Concord Coalition.

Budget experts Douglas Holtz-Eakin, who served under a Republican administration; Alice Rivlin, who served under the Clinton administration at CBO; and Alan Viard also back the plan. President Obama, we learned today is now talking about a 3-year freeze on some discretionary spending. This legislation would only help him achieve that goal because he can make a speech and he can propose it to Congress, but it doesn't necessarily become law. If he supports this and works to support the statement that we understand he will make in the State of the

Union Address, this legislation would be a firewall to make sure his promise isn't broken.

I say this to my colleagues: We have a budget crisis. It is a calamity so profound that it threatens our economic security. Americans across the country—in red States and blue States—get it. They are deeply concerned about the direction in which we are headed. They know the crushing debt we are incurring will weaken our country, and it will restrict the opportunities our children will have. They are making their voices heard.

A vote against this amendment would be a suggestion that a Senator is not serious about maintaining our budget caps but is looking for ways to bust the budget, get around the budget, and spend more.

I urge my colleagues to support the legislation as a strong act of fiscal responsibility that will have a good impact. In fact, I am confident it would send a message to the financial community that we are beginning to get our house in order.

While I would like to go further and be more frugal in some of our behavior around here—and I do believe we are going to have to go further than this—this amendment will ensure that the limits on spending made last year in the budget passed by this Congress will not be exceeded. It will be a firewall that will save us from our excesses. It will begin to restore financial responsibility to our Nation, a commodity of which we are in desperately short supply.

I see Senator MCCASKILL. She has cast a number of tough votes to question reckless spending since I have observed her in the Senate. I appreciate her leadership and courage in speaking out on this issue. If we do this, it will not solve all our problems, but I think it will make a positive difference for us. It will allow increases as the budget allows for some increases before the firewall kicks in. But it also would make it very difficult to break the budget in any significant way, unless we face a true emergency.

I yield the floor and I thank my colleague for her leadership on this legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mrs. MCCASKILL. Mr. President, I acknowledge my colleague, Senator SESSIONS from Alabama, and welcome the opportunity to join him in an attempt to restore some sanity in Congress about spending.

I come from a State where there is a requirement of a balanced budget, although, over the last couple years, I am not sure how they would have done that without incredible pain if it hadn't been for the help the Federal Government sent them. There is no question that the fact that we don't have to balance the budget in Washington has led to some very bad habits.

I was thinking about spending over the weekend, as this week there are a number of provisions we will debate that I have sponsored or am a big supporter of, including the fiscal task force amendment which went down this morning by a narrow vote, and obviously pay-go, which I have been the lead Senate sponsor on over the last several months. These are all things with which we are trying to fight something that you encounter all the time as a parent. How much easier it is to say yes than no. My kids hate when I give them that lecture because they are always wanting me to say yes. I always say the easiest thing to do is to say yes—yes, you can have that outfit; yes, you can take my car; yes, you can go see your friends, even though I am not sure you finished whatever chores you had around the house. It is always easier to say I will go along with it, it is a good cause.

That is what happens around here. It is not like we are spending on evil stuff. We are spending on stuff we believe in—education, highways, our parks, our military—and we are spending on things that make it even harder to say no.

The time has come that we all have to feel the pain of saying no. We all have to be willing to suffer the political consequences of saying no. That is why this amendment is such an important step in the right direction.

I want to be honest about this because we have a tendency to make things bigger than they are. This isn't going to make a dramatic change in the deficit or the debt. I am not sure how many Americans have focused on the difference between the two, but they are two different things, and it will not make a huge difference. People need to remember that if we took out all discretionary spending and decided we were not going to spend another dime on education, highways or any of the things we decide on spending every year, we will still have a massive deficit problem. We don't fix the deficit by passing this amendment. We don't fix the deficit by saying we are not going to even do discretionary domestic spending anymore. So this is not a fix-all. Do you know what it does? It begins to get us well. It is a little like earmarking. Is earmarking the huge problem? No. But it is similar to a fever; it is a symptom of a disease. This will help us get well.

It will be a step toward recovery if we can pass this amendment to freeze our discretionary spending. I am so pleased the White House has called for a freeze. I think this is a wonderful bipartisan moment. I think we are all hankering for a good bipartisan moment right now. I hope we are all hankering for a good bipartisan moment. I got worried this morning on the vote on the fiscal task force because it seemed like there might have been some political games being played. I don't know about anybody else, but I am hankering for a good bipartisan moment. This ought to be one, where Republicans and Democrats set aside who looks good and who looks bad, who gets credit and who gets the blame, and do something we need to do.

We used to have a freeze and we used to have pay-go. They were both allowed to expire in 2002. I wasn't here. I am not sure why they were allowed to expire. Did Congress all of a sudden think we don't need pay-go anymore or we don't need limits on discretionary spending anymore because we are out of the woods when it comes to the deficit or debt? I am not sure why that happened. I know most of the folks who let those things expire wish they could take it back. I bet most of the folks who did voting for major entitlement programs without paying for them during that time—I bet they wish they could take it back because now we are in a real mess.

The first and most important step to get out of this mess is to vote to control our spending. I am hopeful this will be passed by a wide margin. Some of my friends on the left have said the last thing in the world we should do now is limit spending, that government is the answer in this difficult recession. I voted for the stimulus, and I think the tax cuts in the stimulus, which don't get talked about enough, and the help to the States, which doesn't get talked about enough, and the jobs that will be created this year are very important to the progress we have made in terms of climbing out of the economic hole we found ourselves in a year ago.

But we will not get out of this recession on the back of government spending. If we decide it is just about government spending during this recession, we are dealing a very bad hand to our grandchildren.

I hope this amendment passes. I hope it is not even controversial. I am so pleased the President is on board, and I am pleased that so many members of the Republican party are on board. Let's take this important step, and then let's live up to it during the appropriations process. Let's realize that pet project at home that we know we can get because we can get an earmark—maybe this is the year to say no and push back from the table and say all those pet projects, those earmarks, are not the right signal we need to send to the American people this year.

I thank my colleague from Alabama and Senator KYL, who were cosponsors on this. I look forward to wide bipartisan support. I look forward to enthusiastic applause tomorrow night in the President's State of the Union Address, when he lays out his freeze on spending. We are all on board now. Let's make it happen.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator JUDD GREGG, former chairman of the Budget Committee and ranking member, be added as a cosponsor to this legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank my colleague for her fine remarks.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3303 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3299

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amended be set aside and I send up amendment No. 3303.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. COBURN] proposes an amendment numbered 3303 to Amendment No. 3299.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of Monday, January 25, 2010, under ''Text of Amendments.'')

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be divided in the form which I now send to the desk.

I ask at this time that division I of the original amendment be made the pending amendment.

Mrs. MCCASKILL. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. COBURN. I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. GILLIBRAND). The Senator from Oklahoma still has the floor.

Mr. COBURN. Madam President, while the Parliamentarian is doing the work that is necessary at this time, I thought I would spend a few minutes talking about this amendment in the interest of saving some time.

We have a significant problem in front of us as a Nation. We have before us an underlying bill that raises the debt that nobody in this room, save the pages, will ever pay a penny toward reducing—nobody except the pages and their generation will pay a penny toward reducing.

This request for increasing the debt limit of $1.9 trillion, I remind my colleagues, is $200 billion more than the entire Federal Government spent in the year 1999, 10 years ago. So we, in one fell swoop, in 1 year, we are going to increase the debt by $200 billion more than what the entire Federal Government spent 10 years ago.

The whole purpose behind this amendment is a wake-up call to say: Wait a minute, the Congress, in the last 2 years, under its leadership, has increased spending 11.4 percent in 2009 and 11.4 percent this year, not counting a stimulus bill and not counting omnibus bills that were not paid for because they were declared an emergency.

If we add all that up, excluding the stimulus bill, we had a 28-percent increase in the size of the Federal Government in the last 2 years—just in the last 2 years. At that rate, the size of the Federal Government doubles over a 5-year period.

What these amendments are designed to do is to get us doing what every American family is doing today; that is, starting to make some of the hard choices about where we have excess, where we have inefficiency, where we have duplication, and eliminate it because we should not ask the American people to take on more debt when we know we have at least $387 billion worth of waste, fraud, and duplication every year in the Federal Government. Yet that is exactly what we are doing with the underlying bill. We are taking on more debt and not doing anything about the excessive spending or the waste, fraud, or duplication.

The whole purpose behind coming to the floor is to say: Can we not, in light of a 28-percent increase, cut 5 percent in terms of discretionary spending that we just jacked up five times that amount over the last 2 years? Can we not find 5 percent worth of waste? We have identified specifically 640 programs that are duplicative of one another in the Federal Government. We have identified waste. When we go to find out, when we ask the GAO or the Congressional Research Service to help us with this, do you know what they tell us? We cannot; it is too big. We cannot tell you where all the duplication is. That is our own research bodies saying they cannot tell us where it is too big.

This amendment puts a stop to that. It mandates that we in the future, every year, will get a report from the GAO on every program within the Federal Government that duplicates another program and what their recommendations are to streamline or change it.

The reason it is easy to borrow or easy to raise taxes is because we fail to do the hard work of eliminating the spending waste. We just had the Senator from Alabama wanting to put on some caps. That is not going to be adopted. We know it.

The reason I divided this amendment is because my colleagues will take one segment of it and say: Oh, I was for cutting 5 percent out of the Federal budget, but I just did not agree with this one segment, whether it be education or somewhere else, that we should not cut, and, therefore, I voted against the whole amendment.

This puts the American people in the driver's seat, as far as their Senators are concerned. We are going to get to see whether they agree that we ought to continue to waste money; that we ought to steal it from these pages and their generation and not do the hard work of making a choice and putting things in terms of priority like every American family is doing.

Every American family is doing that right now. They do not have an unlimited credit card. They do not have the privilege of going to the bank when they are tapped out and say: Just give me more money, like we are getting ready to do on extending the debt limit.

The other thing that is in this is leading by example. The Senators increased their budget by 5.8 percent this year. We reverse that. Most of us can easily live within the budget we had last year—easily. So we reverse the increase for the Senate back down to what it was last year.

We should not ask the rest of this government to make a sacrifice that we are not willing to demonstrate by leading on the same issue.

This bill can be the first step in a reality check of getting the Congress back aligned with where the American people are, as far as spending.

Just a year ago, in January of 2009, the national debt was $10.6 trillion. Today the national debt is $12.2994 trillion. Forty-three cents of every dollar we spent last year we borrowed, and we are going to do exactly that or worse this next year unless we wake up, unless we come to our senses.

You can have all the arguments you want, but nobody in America believes the Federal Government is not wasteful. Nobody believes it is good enough to just freeze a small portion of discretionary spending. What Americans believe is we need to cut spending. We need to cut out the waste, cut out the duplication, and cut out the fraud. We need efficiency where we can generate efficiency. We need to eliminate duplication where there is duplication.

My friend, President Obama, when he was campaigning said: I promise to spend taxpayer money wisely and to eliminate wasteful redundancy. We are going to help him with that. That is what this amendment does. In 640 programs where there is duplication, we are going to allow an incentive for each department to get rid of it. We are not mandating they have to get rid of it. We are saying: You should do the review. You should take this money, and you should eliminate the duplications. What you need from us to do that, we will give you. But we are giving you the authority to do that with these amendments.

Let me quote from President Obama:

> Too often Federal departments take on functions or services that are already being done or could be done elsewhere within the Federal Government more effectively. The result is unnecessary redundancy and the inability of the Federal Government to benefit from economies of scale and integrated streamlined operations.

He is right. So now we are going to give the Senators a chance to support his statement and his position.

Nothing has been done in the last year to accomplish that. As a matter of fact, the President sent program after program that he wanted to get rid of. He said they are not effective, they do not work, they are duplicative, and they are not efficient. What did we do?

We did not eliminate a one of them. We just kept funding them. So we cannot claim that the problems lie with the President. The problems do not lie with the President. The problems lie with the elected body of Congress in not making the hard, difficult choices of putting a priority on what is most important and taking the time to do the oversight and explain to the American people why we ought to have the programs consolidated. We may have a goal we want to accomplish and help the American people with, but we certainly ought to do it in the most efficient and effective manner we can.

The other reason to consider this amendment is to think about what is getting ready to happen to us. What is getting ready to happen to us over the next 10 years is we are going to accrue another $9 trillion in debt if we do not start this process with this amendment today. We are going to accrue another $9 trillion. Of that $9 trillion, $4.8 trillion of it is going to be interest. It is going to be interest costs on the debt. We are going to borrow money to pay the interest on the money that we borrow. It does not have to be that way.

My colleagues will come down and say: The big problem is the entitlement programs. There is no question that is two-thirds of our problem. But the easy thing to fix now and saves billions, if not trillions, of dollars on is the discretionary portion of the budget that we do have control over.

We always hear the excuse: That is not the big problem. The reason it is not the big problem is because politicians enamor themselves with people at home by spending money we do not have on things we do not need that are not truly a legitimate role of the Federal Government.

The family budget is getting smaller, and the Federal Government is getting bigger. That is just exactly the opposite of what ought to be happening in this country today. Inflation is near zero, but yet we are increasing spending, like I said, 11.7 percent last year. That does not include the supplemental emergency spending and does not have any connection at all with the stimulus bill. That is what we did with the individual budgets across the Federal Government.

When I come down and make the case for cutting back 5 percent of that, which ends up being $120 billion, nobody should be opining: My goodness, we are going to tear things up. But we are going to hear that. We are going to hear all the reasons we cannot do what I am proposing to do.

America is not going to buy that anymore. They are not buying it anymore, and they should not buy it.

The other thing this amendment will do is it will give us 30 days to come back and assess other areas where we can cut more spending. People in this body think that is hard. It is not hard. Let me give an example of where we can save $80 billion a year in one program.

At a minimum, there is $100 billion of fraud in Medicare a year. We do not have an effective strategy, like any other organization outside of government, to limit the defrauding that goes on in Medicare. We pay, and then we try to chase people we should not have paid.

Senator LEMIEUX from Florida and others have multiple ideas on how we could take that $100 billion and over the next 6 months save $30 billion or $40 billion of that. That is $30 billion or $40 billion each year over the next 10 years. That comes out to $½ trillion, which cuts down that $9 trillion in additional debt we are going to be encumbering upon our children. Last year, this country's debt grew $4.2 billion a day. We didn't do anything about that except spend more money, so this year it is going to accrue at $4.3 billion a day. That is how much we are going to spend that we don't have.

Isn't it time that we start facing the situation as it is rather than the way we would like it to be? The cold hard facts are that we have a short timeframe—4 to 5 years at most—to get our house back in order. Now is the time to start. It is not next year, it is not next month; it is right now—right now, when the American people may or may not be focused on the fact that we are going to authorize an additional $1.9 trillion worth of borrowing. You can't even write that many zeros down and have a comprehension of how much it is. At the same time, we don't do anything about solving the problem.

Quite frankly, Congress has a dependency issue. We are addicted. We are addicted to spending. We are addicted to the age-old adage that if I spend enough money, I can go home and tell people how great I am, not ever telling them I am spending their money and their kids' money but claiming I am looking out for them.

The only way you really look out for America is to secure America into the future, and we have not been doing that. It hasn't been done under the Republican watch, hasn't been done under the Democratic watch. What has happened is the same old same old of continuing to ignore the problem and not taking the heat for making the tough choices that will put our country back on the track on which it belongs—a track that will secure a future for our children and grandchildren, that will embrace the heritage that made this country great. What was that heritage? That heritage was sacrifice. In this country, all of us—many—are sacrificing now, and many in the future are going to have to sacrifice.

Others will come down to the floor and they will say: Well, COBURN, all you want to do is cut spending; you don't really want to solve the problem. Well, the first part of solving the problem is cutting the spending and recognizing that the walls don't fall down if you cut 5 percent out of the discretionary spending in our budget. As a matter of fact, very few people will ever notice $120 billion coming out of the Federal Government on these discretionary programs because they will just go to a different grant program that does the same thing and get it there.

Let me go into some of the facts because many of us don't understand. Here are some examples:

There are 14 programs administered by the U.S. Department of Education related to foreign exchanges and designed to increase opportunity for students to study abroad. There is nothing wrong inherently with wanting our students to study abroad, to gain that perspective and to gain that education, but why 14 different programs? Why not one? Why not 1 program and save all the administrative costs of the other 13? Why not do that? Because somebody may not have their name on a program? The fact is, nobody knew that until we discovered it in the last 4 weeks.

There are more than 44 job-training programs administered by 9 different Federal agencies across the bureaucracy, costing $30 billion a year. Forty-four Federal job-training programs? Tell me why we need 44. Maybe 4 to hit different areas in different situations but not 44 and not through 9 different Federal agencies that are all trying to do the same thing and competing to throw out money.

What about 69 early education programs administered by 9 different Federal agencies. Sixty-nine, why would we tolerate that? Why would we continue with the status quo? Now is the time to make changes.

One of my favorites is that we have 105 Federal programs supporting science, technology, engineering, and math—105 different programs where we support that—funding over $3 billion a year. I agree we ought to encourage it, we ought to stimulate it, we ought to support it because we know we have to be competitive in the future, but do we really need 105 different Federal Government programs? The answer is, absolutely not. We don't. But because we don't know what is there, we continue to do the same.

As a matter of fact, there is going to be a Judiciary markup on Thursday that has a new program in it—supposedly new—and the authors of the bill have no idea that we already have a Federal program that does the same thing. That is why the important key component of this global amendment is to make sure the GAO tells us what is out there, what we need to do, and how we need to go about it. We may need some redundancy, but we don't need 105 times redundancy, we don't need 30 times redundancy, we don't need 44 times redundancy, and we don't need 69 times redundancy. As a matter of fact, when we have all these programs, the States have to hire all these different people to understand all the different programs so they can make sure they get their fair share. We could actually save the States a ton of money if they

only had one-stop shopping—if, in fact, it is a truly legitimate government function.

The amendment also rescinds unobligated discretionary funds that have been available for more than 2 consecutive fiscal years. So it doesn't hurt the agencies if the money has been there and they haven't spent it. As a matter of fact, we are giving them so much money, they can't spend it all. We have seen unobligated balances go up because they can't get it out the door. And when we are pushing them to get it out the door, guess what happens to efficiency and accuracy and effectiveness of those programs. It goes way down.

According to the Office of Management and Budget, at year end 2009, that is, September 30, there was $657 billion sitting in unobligated funds. Some of that is military, some of that is war funds, some of that is VA. We exempt war funds and we exempt VA. We exempt DOD, but we shouldn't because there is $50 billion a year in waste in the Pentagon that can easily be demonstrated.

So we direct the GAO to identify those duplicative programs and report to Congress on the findings.

Madam President, may I make an inquiry of the Chair? Has the status of our division been decided?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's amendment is not divisible as a matter of right because the Senate has entered into a unanimous consent agreement limiting the universe of amendments on this measure.

Mr. COBURN. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, the Senators from Alabama and Oklahoma have offered that amendment to the debt limit resolution. As these amendments address matters primarily for the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Committee, I will defer to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee to address those amendments momentarily.

NOMINATION OF BEN BERNANKE

Madam President, in the meantime, on another matter, I wish to say I strongly support the nomination of Chairman Ben Bernanke to his second term as Chairman of the Federal Reserve.

Last August, President Obama announced his intention to renominate Chairman Bernanke for a second term. There is little debate that our financial system has been through one of the most tumultuous times since the Great Depression. I strongly support President Obama's decision to renominate Ben Bernanke and believe he has the expertise to continue to lead this country out of one of the worst economic downturns in history.

Chairman Bernanke graduated summa cum laude from Harvard University, earning a bachelor's degree in economics. He continued his studies at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, where he received a Ph.D. in economics. He then had the good sense to head to Stanford, my alma mater, where he taught economics for several years at the Graduate School of Business. After heading back to Princeton University, he quickly rose through the academic ranks to become chairman of the Princeton Economics Department. His groundbreaking economic work on the Great Depression helped increase our understanding of that calamity and prepared him well to tackle our recent disaster. He has a strong record of public service, including work as a visiting scholar at several Federal Reserve banks.

In 2002, President George W. Bush appointed him to serve on the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. In 2005, President Bush appointed him Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. In 2006, President Bush appointed him Chairman of the Federal Reserve. The Senate confirmed his nomination by voice vote. After his appointment to three posts by President Bush, Ben Bernanke was renominated as Federal Reserve Chairman in 2009 by President Obama.

At this point, I might point out that if any Senator had any problems with the reappointment of Chairman Bernanke, they certainly knew when his term expired and they should have conveyed those views to President Obama, and conveyed them strongly if that was their view, so that President Obama would have had an opportunity to appoint somebody else if that was his choice. It is my understanding that virtually no Senator complained to President Obama about the renomination of Chairman Bernanke before the nomination was sent to the Senate.

In his nearly 4 years as Federal Reserve Chairman, Ben Bernanke has demonstrated he is worthy of another term. Facing the worst financial calamity in nearly 70 years and relying on his keen insight into the origins of financial panics, he successfully worked with the previous and current administrations to ensure that the economy of the United States and the world survived the crisis of 2008.

Again, his dissertation was on the Great Depression. This is a man who understands the Great Depression and probably had some pretty good ideas of how to prevent that from occurring. Averting disaster is not something that usually earns you accolades or parades. ''It could have been worse'' is not your typical commendation. But there is no doubt that without Chairman Bernanke's leadership, our economy would have been much worse off.

Time will tell how the history of this crisis is written, but economists and experts believed then and still today that the Federal Government could not stand by and let the financial system collapse. Liquidity in the markets evaporated. Small businesses could not obtain the day-to-day cash to buy inventory or make payroll. Foreclosures increased from hundreds to hundreds of thousands. Americans across the country witnessed their retirement savings dwindling before their eyes. Confidence in the system as a whole vanished.

Beginning in 2008, Chairman Bernanke began to take a series of steps to walk us back from the brink of disaster. The Federal Reserve cut interest rates early and aggressively in an attempt to inject liquidity into the markets. I might point out that there were some who counseled the opposite action; that is, those most concerned about inflation. Perhaps Bernanke went too far in trying to inject liquidity back into the markets, but that is what he believed was necessary in order to get the economy back on track. The Fed established lending facilities to provide much needed funding. Last year, the Fed, in conjunction with the Department of Treasury, established the Term Asset-Backed Securities Loan Facility, TALF, to finance more than 4 million consumer and small business loans. That is sometimes forgotten, but that is something he did. At a time when conditions were changing daily and sometimes hourly, Chairman Bernanke did not hesitate to take bold and necessary steps to avoid total collapse of our economy.

Madam President, 20/20 hindsight will always reveal things we would have done differently. With such aggressive and unprecedented action comes criticism and judgment.

Without a doubt, the Federal Reserve System deserves a share of the blame for fostering the conditions that led us to the precipice, but as this crisis was systemic, so, too, were its flaws.

On that point, I might say there are a lot of agencies that probably should be blamed or held accountable for some of the missteps or failure to foresee the crisis occurring. One that comes to my mind is the Securities and Exchange Commission. The Securities and Exchange Commission either did not have jurisdiction or didn't ask for jurisdiction or did not exercise jurisdiction over a lot of the nonbanks that were creating a lot of these fancy derivatives and other instruments. I can name many of them. I think we all know who they are. It was a lack of effort by the SEC. I think the SEC was derelict in not being much more aggressive at that time.

There are a lot of areas where fingers can be pointed. One can be the Congress. Where were the oversight committees at that time? What were the questions they were asking? What were they doing?

I think, frankly, that mistakes were made, many of them, beginning with the subprime mortgage crisis and working all the way up to mortgage

brokers packaging and reselling loans and securitizing those loans and then all the other instruments that were developed at the time, and very high leverage. That was a big mistake made before Ben Bernanke was head of the Fed.

It is more apparent than ever that we must pass strong and comprehensive regulatory reform, to crack down on risky financial derivatives, properly regulate the shadow banking system, and ensure consumers are adequately protected. In his confirmation hearing, Chairman Bernanke stated that such a crisis ''must prompt financial institutions and regulators alike to undertake unsparing self-assessments of their past performance.''

Chairman Bernanke is doing just that. The Federal Reserve has already undergone significant regulatory changes, and he is committed to working with me and my colleagues in Congress to put in place proper oversight and transparency to see that we are never again faced with the peril we have witnessed over the past 2 years.

But as Emerson once said, ''[b]lame is safer than praise.'' I commend Chairman Bernanke and his team at the Federal Reserve for acting in a time of such uncertainty. There is still much that must be done to get our economy back on track and Americans back to work. I believe that Chairman Bernanke and the Federal Reserve will continue efforts to create jobs and help middle class families. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting Chairman Bernanke's nomination for his second term, as he works to restore confidence and prosperity in our economy.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KAUFMAN.) Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3303

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of the Coburn amendment to eliminate wasteful and duplicative spending. Before my colleague from Oklahoma leaves the floor, I know he has to go, but I have to pose a question for the Senator from Oklahoma. We have a listing in the Senator's amendment of the many duplicative programs.

Have we had a study that would indicate how many government employees are engaged in administering these duplicative programs?

Mr. COBURN. No. To answer the Senator's question, we do not even know how many duplicative programs there are out there. These are the 640 we found looking over a 4-week period.

But when we asked GAO or the Congressional Research Service about this, what they say is the task is too big. They do not even know if they can accomplish the task, which goes to the enormity of the problem we face.

I mentioned on the Senate floor earlier, we have a markup tomorrow in the Judiciary Committee for a new program, and it is duplicative of an existing program. But those offering the amendment do not even know it. So it shows we have to stop and reassess. Part of this amendment is creating a mandate that the GAO has to advise us on that.

Mr. McCAIN. I do believe that at least we ought to, over time, make an attempt to ascertain the numbers of employees who are in these duplicative government programs. It is really startling—if the American people knew of the fact that there are so many duplicative efforts and different agencies of the government trying to accomplish the same mission.

Before I go much further, I would like to mention, I have the information that tomorrow night the President will propose a spending freeze for discretionary spending with the exception of defense, veterans affairs, and homeland security. I applaud that move on the part of the President.

I think, from the conclusions I have reached so far, it would save some $15 billion next year and perhaps $200 billion over time. We are trying to ascertain exactly what that is.

But I do not see how the President, at the same time that he is recommending a spending freeze that would save some $12 or $15 or $20 billion next year, at the same time to be proposing a stimulus package, another one, that could be $80 or $100 billion. That is not fiscal discipline.

The House, the other body, passed, before we went out of session, a jobs bill that was somewhere around $100 billion, as I understand it. I understand the other side of the aisle is working on a package of about $80 billion. Well, look, let's stop the spending now. Let's stop the spending now.

So if we want to be sincere about stopping the spending that is unnecessary and unneeded, then we certainly should discard the idea that we need another massive stimulus, particularly in light of the fact that by any estimation, including the prediction of the President's economic advisers that if we passed the last stimulus package, unemployment would be at 8 percent.

So this proposal about a spending freeze would have a lot more credibility with me if we said we are going to stop additional spending this year that would also add to the burgeoning national debt.

The Coburn amendment is an important one. The Coburn amendment is best appreciated by the fiscal situation in which we find ourselves. In a recent editorial in the Houston Chronicle, they noted:

> Our spending excesses, as most every American knows, are increasingly financed by foreign sources led by China. In all, about $4.5 trillion in U.S. debt is held by foreigners and nearly $800 billion of that is held by the Beijing government.

So we will increase the debt limit, and who is going to buy that debt? Apparently, the Chinese are buying a lot of it since they own, according to the Houston Chronicle, about $800 billion, and foreign countries own about $3.5 trillion.

On December 16, the Wall Street Journal wrote:

> Our view is there is good and bad public borrowing. In the 1980s, Federal deficits financed a military build-up that ended the Cold War leading to an actual peace dividend in the 1990s of 3 percent of GDP, as well as tax cuts that ended the stagflation of the 1970s, and began 25 years of prosperity. Those were high-return investments. Today's debt is financing what exactly? The TARP money did undergird the financial system for a time, and is now being repaid. But most of the rest has been spent on a political wish list of public programs ranging from unemployment insurance to wind turbines to tax credits for golf carts. Borrowing for such low-return purposes makes America poor in the long run.

So if we are increasing the debt limit, and the Chinese and other countries are going to buy that debt, and we are spending money in the stimulus package that has shown very little return on the massive $787 billion investment, then should we not try Dr. COBURN's method and support his amendment which would basically prevent us from having to increase the debt limit?

This amendment of Dr. COBURN's would rescind $120 billion in spending, 5 percent from each agency of government, other than the Department of Defense and Veterans Affairs; directing the agencies to consolidate more than 650 duplicative government programs; rescind unobligated discretionary funds available for more than 2 consecutive fiscal years. Most Americans would be astonished to know that there are still tax dollars sitting out there which have been appropriated and not been spent for more than 2 years, sometimes several years.

Directing GAO to identify duplicative government programs and report the findings to Congress would render the debt limit increase in the underlying bill null and void. It is $1.9 trillion.

Let's just look at a few of the duplicative Federal programs that are out there. A 2004 report by a nonprofit research group listed 21 Federal programs across multiple agencies, many at Health and Human Services that funded childhood obesity programs either as the main focus or as one component of the Federal program.

Child obesity is a serious issue in America. Do we need 21 separate programs to address the issue? Would not we be more efficient if we had a single program instead of spreading them out amongst different Federal agencies?

There are 14 programs administered by the U.S. Department of Education related to foreign exchanges and designed to increase the opportunities for

study abroad, 14 programs. According to a 2003 GAO report, the Federal Government funds more than 44 job training programs administered by nine different Federal agencies across the Federal bureaucracy at a cost of $30 billion.

According to data from the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance, 14 departments within the Federal Government and 49 independent agencies operate exchanges and study abroad programs.

A 2009 GAO report found 69 early education programs administered by nine different agencies. There are over 30 Federal programs that provide financial assistance to students to support postsecondary education at a cost to the taxpayer of over $30 billion every year.

According to a May 2007 report in the Academic Competitiveness Council, there are 105 Federal programs supporting STEM education with aggregate funding of $3.2 billion in 2006. You will note that I am not even talking about millions or hundreds of millions; we are talking about billions.

Here is one. There are at least 17 offender reentry programs across five Federal agencies, different Federal agencies, costing the taxpayers over $250 million annually.

A 2005 GAO study found there are a total of 23 Federal housing programs targeted or have special features for the elderly, 23 Federal housing programs that target or have special features for the elderly.

There are at least nine programs at the USDA tasked with researching and developing biofuels, costing taxpayers nearly $300 million annually. Over $800 million was included in the stimulus bill for these initiatives.

The Federal Government oversees at least 15 different preservation programs costing taxpayers nearly $100 million annually.

There are at least 28 Federal programs totaling over $5 billion that support job training and employment.

Here we are, with an outstanding public debt well over $12.3 trillion. The estimate for this year is the largest in history. The estimated population of the United States is over 307.6 million people. Therefore, each U.S. citizen's share of this debt is approximately $40,100. That is $40,000 for every man, woman, and child in this country. That is shameful, shameful spending that has laid this debt on future generations of Americans. The greatness of America is based on the tradition that one generation has passed off to the next generation a nation that is better off than the one they inherited. What kind of a nation are we going to hand off to the next generation of Americans with a debt to the Chinese of $800 billion, a debt of over $3.5 trillion held by foreigners, and the debt goes on and on and on with no end in sight.

Why should we not try Dr. COBURN's method? Why should we not attempt to do something different rather than raising the debt limit every time we have spent so much we have to raise it again?

Let's look at what we spent last year alone: $787 billion on the so-called stimulus bill which amounts to $1.1 trillion, if you calculate the interest; $700 billion in TARP to bail out the banks and other ailing financial institutions; $410 billion for the Omnibus appropriations bill, a package of 9 appropriations bills rolled together, which contained over 9,000 unrequested, unnecessary, run-of-the-mill pork-barrel earmarks; $450 billion for the 2010 Omnibus appropriations bill, a package of 6 bills rolled together, containing 5,000 unrequested earmarks. Let's put them together. In two bills last year, one for 2009, the other for 2010, were at least 14,000 earmarks. The Democratic leadership worked with the President to ram through a $3.5 trillion budget resolution. We have spent $83 billion to bail out the auto companies. There is still a chance that a $2.5 trillion health reform bill may be passed by the other side.

Overall, domestic spending has increased by 14 percent over the last fiscal year. Inflation has been practically zero for all intents and purposes. But the spending has increased by 14 percent. Don't we get it? Don't we see what we are doing to future generations of Americans? Don't we see that a debt for $40,100 for every man, woman, and child in America is unconscionable? Why don't we try the Coburn amendment before we willy-nilly increase the debt limit by another $1.4 trillion? Why? Why can't we at least make an effort?

One thing I know about Dr. COBURN, he researches his information carefully. He has shown us we don't need to raise the debt limit and give ourselves a green light to spend even more. We have before us an opportunity. We can turn things around today. We can pass this amendment and begin the hard work and make the tough decisions necessary to put us on the path to fiscal solvency and national prosperity.

Here we are with a bill before us to increase the debt limit which would increase, then, the debt that every man, woman, and child in America has, as we continue this almost unrestrained spending spree.

I have said to my colleagues for a long time—and I think it was authenticated in Massachusetts recently—the American people are mad. They are angry at the spending. They do not want to lay a huge debt on future generations of Americans. They do not believe there is a shred of fiscal responsibility in the Congress or the administration. I will fairly note that this out-of-control spending was not invented with this administration. Republicans, when they were in charge, let spending get completely out of control. We betrayed our fiscal base. We paid a heavy price for it, but we deserved to pay that price. Now is the time to say stop, stop borrowing against our children and grandchildren's futures. Stop putting ourselves in a precarious situation, where the Chinese own so much of our national debt that they have their hand on the throttle of the American economy.

I hasten to add, it is not in China's interest to hurt the American economy. But it certainly can't be in our interest, in any way, to be in that kind of fiscal jeopardy. We cannot do that—not to mention the $3.5 trillion in debt held by foreigners.

I say to my colleagues, let's look at the Coburn amendment. It is well thought out, well researched. Let's put the brakes on the mortgaging of America's future.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. ENSIGN. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CHRISTMAS DAY TERRORIST ATTACK

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, I had the benefit last week of attending two different hearings on the attempted terrorist attack that took place on Christmas Day. The first was in the Homeland Security Committee and the second was in the Commerce Committee. One thing became clear: There is a definite disconnect in this administration about how to handle terrorists once they are captured. Over this last weekend, Osama bin Laden claimed responsibility for the foiled Christmas Day bomber terror attack. He has, once again, inserted himself into the national security dialog in the United States.

I fear al-Qaida will have another opportunity to attack the United States because of the fumbling of intelligence information that could have been gathered on the Christmas Day bomber before his attempted attack and subsequently from this terrorist after he was captured. But this administration clearly dropped the ball. We know the Director of National Intelligence, Dennis Blair; FBI Director Mueller; National Counterterrorism Center Director Michael Leiter; and the Homeland Security Secretary, Janet Napolitano, were not consulted about the decision to read Abdulmutallab his Miranda rights and try him in civilian courts. We know that as soon as this terrorist was told of his right to remain silent, that is what he did. He stopped talking.

It is unfathomable that these individuals were not even consulted before this hugely important decision was made. After the hearings conducted last week and interviews over the weekend, it appears it was ultimately the Attorney General who made the decision to read the Miranda rights and place Abdulmutallab in the civilian court system. However, there is a lot of ambiguity to show how this decision came to be made. Were there any deliberations or meetings that occurred prior to this decision? Was the President brought into this discussion? All

these ambiguities need to be cleared up so we do not make the same mistakes again.

As a member of one of the committees charged with oversight of homeland security, I will be asking for a written response from the administration on this issue.

Additionally, because the heads of government agencies charged with making the decisions do not seem to be talking, I have joined with several of my Senate colleagues to cosponsor legislation authored by Senator COLLINS and Senator LIEBERMAN, the distinguished ranking member and chairman of the Homeland Security Committee. This legislation would require the Attorney General to consult with the Director of National Intelligence, the Director of the National Counterterrorism Center, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Secretary of Defense prior to the initiation of giving any terrorist Miranda rights or the initiation of civilian criminal charges against a foreign person detained by the U.S. Government on suspicion of any terrorist activities. The legislation would also require, in the event of a disagreement amongst these folks on whether such action should be initiated in civilian criminal court, that the Attorney General not initiate such action unless specifically directed by the President. I ask my other Senate colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this vital legislation.

A second thing we learned from last week's hearings was there is confusion about when the high-value interrogation group or the HIG should be convened to decide on whether to interrogate terrorists such as Abdulmutallab or to interview them with their lawyers present. Director of National Intelligence Dennis Blair told the Homeland Security Committee:

> This unit was created exactly for this purpose—to make a decision on whether a certain person who is detained should be treated as a case for Federal prosecution or for some other means.

The intelligence chief said the interrogation group was created by the White House last year to handle overseas cases but will now be expanded for domestic cases.

He said:

> We did not invoke the HIG in this case. We should have.

Subsequently, we heard from the administration that this HIG unit isn't even up and running yet.

My question is, How does the individual who is in charge of our intelligence infrastructure not know the policy and procedures for interrogating terrorists? Based on the testimony given last week, it would seem we do not have a fully integrated and comprehensive method for interrogating terrorists, whether they are captured abroad or here at home. The capture and subsequent handling of terrorist Abdulmutallab was bungled from the get-go. It is continuing to be bungled.

A week ago, I signed a letter to President Obama with a number of my colleagues indicating that the decision to prosecute this terrorist in civilian court has resulted in a missed opportunity to collect timely intelligence. In order for the U.S. Government to fully understand where we failed on Christmas Day, it is imperative we examine the methods and means Abdulmutallab used to avoid detection.

As many of my colleagues have pointed out, our ability to gather this information has been severely hampered by the decision to put this terrorist almost immediately into the civilian court system. He now has all the rights, protections, and privileges of American citizens. Make no mistake about it, this decision to try Abdulmutallab as a U.S. citizen, which he is not, as opposed to an enemy combatant will be a detrimental impact on our ability to learn more about this failed terrorist attack. Taking it a step further, this decision may very well weaken our national security. Last week, the Republican leader mentioned that a year ago the President, immediately after taking office, decided to revise the Nation's interrogation policies and to restrict the CIA's ability to question terrorists.

This was done by Executive order. While questioning the Director of National Intelligence, I specifically asked if the Director believed the classified interrogation methods used previously by our own government were more effective than the current methods found in the Army Field Manual that is publicly available for the terrorist to train to.

One statement the DNI, the Director of National Intelligence, made during the Q-and-A portion of the hearing particularly caught my attention. In response to a question from Senator BURRIS regarding al-Qaida's ability to exploit open source intelligence, Admiral Blair stated this—I am quoting, once again:

> [T]he public discussion of the specifics of the defensive measures we take are making it that much easier for people to evade our defenses and come in . . . I think they are just making the job of those who are working hard to try to defend us that much harder. It costs the taxpayer that much more money. And I wish people would just shut the hell up.

That is what he said.

So if keeping some of our airport security measures a secret makes it harder for terrorists to evade them, shouldn't that same logic also hold that keeping some of our interrogation measures classified also makes it harder for the terrorists to beat those interrogation techniques? But this administration does not seem to be on the same page.

As I am sure you can imagine, those who wish to do us harm can simply train to the methods that are publicized in this public document. By limiting our intelligence community to only those techniques in the Army Field Manual, we have removed one important tool the intelligence community has to use against al-Qaida; that is, fear of the unknown.

Terrorists now know exactly what our interrogation methods and limitations are, and based on that knowledge they can train and prepare themselves to successfully resist our interrogation efforts.

I am also concerned that the administration may begin to bargain or propose a plea deal to this terrorist, Abdulmutallab, in order to obtain additional information. I believe this would set a very dangerous precedent for would-be terrorists in order to potentially have their jail time reduced. It is my understanding the policy of the United States is not to negotiate with terrorists.

We should comprehensively and effectively interrogate terrorists to gain the information we need, not to negotiate with them for it. The only true way to gather this information is through an extensive interrogation of the terrorist by highly trained intelligence personnel. The definition of an ''extensive and comprehensive interrogation'' is not a 50-minute questioning while the terrorist is being prepped for surgery, as was the case with Abdulmutallab.

Extensive interrogations are conducted over a sustained amount of time, with members of various government agencies included. They incorporate individuals from defense intelligence and have elements of uncertainty and surprise. This means those conducting the interrogations are not limited to a set of interrogations which the terrorist has trained against. In short, a proper and extensive interrogation should not solely consist of the interrogation methods listed in the Army Field Manual.

We have in our custody an individual who has been trained by al-Qaida. He has met with some of its most senior leaders and has not been properly and comprehensively interrogated. How is this possible? He could give us information on the al-Qaida command-and-control structure. It is possible he could give us information on funding mechanisms, ongoing operations, safe houses, personnel and leadership profiles, al-Qaida's governmental connections in Yemen and maybe other Middle East nations, and what the enemy views as weaknesses in our airport security.

What happens if, say, new information comes to light; say, Osama bin Laden releases a new tape like he just did, or if we intercept some communication coming out of Yemen? As it stands now, we have lost the ability to interrogate Abdulmutallab on those issues.

Over the weekend, we heard a preposterous statement from the President's spokesman when he said the FBI got all the information they could get out of him. That is a preposterous statement. I do not believe that to be the case, and I do not believe most Nevadans or other Americans believe it either.

It is for these reasons we must transfer Umar Farouk Abdulmutallab to the

military and remove the Executive order restrictions that requires our intelligence community to follow only the Army Field Manual when interrogating a terrorist. It is in the best interests of the security of the United States to do so.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

AMENDMENT NO. 3303

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I rise to speak in opposition to an amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma. Once again, we find ourselves debating an amendment that at first blush sounds like a good thing. But when Members take the time to actually read the amendment and understand the programs it impacts, they will discover this amendment causes harm to our national and international security and to our economy.

Let me begin by discussing the last section of the amendment, section 16. Section 16 of the Coburn amendment is based on assumptions that reflect a lack of understanding about both what constitutes discretionary unobligated balances as well as about Federal funding and oversight for certain critical procurement programs.

The Senator from Oklahoma claims that $100 billion would be rescinded from an estimated $657 billion in unobligated balances. First, this amendment assumes a rescission amount based on erroneous assumptions. Specifically, the majority of the $657 billion in unobligated balances would not be eligible for rescission under criteria outlined in the amendment because they are either mandatory funds or they are not older than 2 years.

Second, because of the small amount of unobligated funding eligible for rescission, this amendment indiscriminately rescinds prior year unobligated funding from certain critical programs, jeopardizing our national defense, our homeland security, our economy, and the well-being of our citizens.

For example, we require the Department of Defense to budget up front for all the costs required to procure military equipment, such as ships or aircraft. But I think all of us are aware it takes several years to complete construction.

For shipbuilding specifically, funds provided to the Department of Defense are available for obligation for 5 years. Rescinding unobligated funds would now require the Navy to cancel contracts for ships under construction and lay off thousands of workers across the Nation's shipyards.

In terms of our veterans who have returned from war or have fought bravely in past wars, section 16 also severely impacts the construction of new hospitals by the Veterans' Administration.

Like for defense procurement, the VA requests full funding for the construction project in the first year. As a result, the Veterans' Administration has 43 active major construction projects at various stages of completion, totaling over $1.6 billion in unobligated balances. Over 49,000 construction jobs would be terminated with the loss of this funding, further delaying critical services to our brave men and women who have served us.

Rescinding unobligated balances in the Department of Homeland Security would stop the construction of the Coast Guard National Security Cutter and would rescind funding for the purchase of explosive detection systems.

Rescinding unobligated balances in NOAA would create a minimum 6-month gap in coverage for the geostationary weather satellite system, which focuses directly over the United States, and constantly and accurately monitors storm conditions. Over 200 employees would lose their jobs.

The reasoning for the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma is a catch-22 for those of us on the Appropriations Committee with responsibility for overseeing our taxpayers' dollars. We are criticized for having funding that is unobligated for more than 1 year. Well, a ship is not built in a year, a hospital is not built and equipped in a year, and the next generation satellite is not built in 1 year.

The Coburn amendment proposes to rescind an additional $20 billion from programs he perceives to be redundant. We can go around and around about what is redundant and what is not because one's perception of what is or is not a duplicative program is based on subjectivity. It is that simple, and this amendment reflects what the Senator from Oklahoma alone believes is redundant. But what is clear is that this amendment proposes to cut $20 billion in funding that the Congress voted on and agreed to provide just months ago.

The impact of these cuts has significant consequences for many critical services. For example, the Senator's amendment proposes that the intent is to consolidate duplicative programs serving the homeless. However, in reality, this language simply calls on the Department of Housing and Urban Development to implement a 5-percent reduction across the Department's programs. The bulk of the funding increase recently provided by Congress to HUD covers the increasing cost of providing affordable housing to our Nation's low-income citizens. According to HUD's Annual Homeless Assessment Report, on any given night there are over 650,000 people who are homeless. However, HUD's resources fund 183,000 beds. During this difficult economic time, it is not the time to cut housing for the Nation's poorest individuals.

This amendment also takes aim at nursing education programs, claiming they are duplicative, when in fact they are not. While there are several programs that promote nursing education, each of these programs addresses different needs in our Nation's effort to address a profound nursing shortage. We have a loan repayment program to get nurses to rural areas, a program to incentivize nurses to teach, and a program to expand nurse training in geriatric care.

The amendment instructs the Secretary of the Interior to consolidate programs for dealing with the impacts of climate change. The truth is, each of the three agencies named by the Senator deal with a different aspect of climate change, and each brings a special expertise to the problem. They are not duplicative; they are complementary based on specific expertise.

For the Department of Energy, the Building Technologies Program is not a grant program to weatherize existing residential and commercial buildings in the same fashion as the weatherization program does for residential homes. There is a difference between a residence and a building. It is a research and development program aimed at new technologies. There is simply not overlap or duplication in these programs.

The amendment proposes to rescind funding for the 2010 census. Any reduction in funding for the constitutionally mandated 2010 census at this critical time would jeopardize the completion of a timely and accurate count, which is necessary, sir.

The amendment proposes to cut $2.2 billion from critical Department of Homeland Security programs.

The attempted destruction last month of Northwest flight 253 near Detroit is our most recent reminder that terrorists continue to threaten our homeland and the security of all Americans. This amendment would reduce funding for the purchase of explosive detection equipment at the very time the Department of Homeland Security Secretary has asked us to address the need for further increases in airport security.

In closing, the author of this amendment arbitrarily rescinds funding with no true justification. The rescission of $100 billion from the $657 billion in unobligated balances, as we know, would wreak havoc on ongoing procurement. The rescission of $20 billion is based on the claim of redundancy in programs where no redundancy exists.

This is a bad amendment with bad consequences. It is time for Members to act responsibly. We have a well-established process for funding the Federal Government. It involves a Budget Committee that sets our allocations and involves the consideration and approval by the Senate of every appropriations bill. It is not passed in the dark of night.

I can assure my colleagues in this Chamber that the Appropriations Committee takes its responsibilities seriously, and every agency budget is reviewed and oversight is provided throughout the year. Each year, the Appropriations Committee recommends rescissions of funds that are not needed. But those rescissions are based on detailed oversight and understanding of the programs, not indiscriminate action.

This amendment is not based on careful review and would harm many

worthwhile programs, and it fails to meet the test of proper oversight. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 3308

I will also speak on another amendment. I will speak in opposition to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama, Senator SESSIONS.

We are all concerned with the growth of the deficit and the need to control the debt of the United States. I support that goal, as I imagine all of us in this Chamber support the goal. None of us disputes the ultimate threat to the standard of living of our citizens posed by long-term deficit spending.

However, the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama is not the appropriate way to attack the issue, for several reasons. As I understand the amendment, it would have the effect of freezing any increases in nondefense discretionary spending for the next 5 years.

In addition, the amendment would impose caps on emergency spending that could potentially cripple our ability to respond to emergencies, such as hurricanes, earthquakes, or terrorist attacks.

The amendment also contains unrealistic spending caps that would restrict funding needed to support our forces in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Let's start with the facts. For fiscal year 2010, the government spent $2.9 trillion, of which about $1.2 trillion was discretionary. The remaining $1.7 trillion we declare as being mandatory. Of the $1.2 trillion that was discretionary, approximately $526 billion, or less than half, was for nondefense purposes. Therefore, this amendment attempts to reduce the deficit of the United States by constraining 18 percent of total government spending. If the goal is to reduce government spending, I am unclear on how constraining growth on just 18 percent of that spending will be at all effective.

In addition, if we examine the actual numbers involved here, it becomes even clearer that this amendment will simply not achieve its stated goal. From fiscal years 2006 to 2009, the Federal debt was increased by approximately $4.4 trillion. During that time, the total increase in nondefense discretionary spending was approximately $93 billion, as compared to $4.4 trillion.

Doing the math, for the past 4 years, the increase in nondefense discretionary spending has accounted for 2 percent of the increase in the national debt—just 2 percent.

What do we get for this 2-percent savings? Aside from the obvious challenge of funding vital government programs without even an adjustment for inflation, we also put our country and our citizens at risk.

Arbitrary spending caps would impede the delivery of resources needed to keep Americans safe from terrorist attacks and violent crime. Such subjective across-the-board restrictions would hinder our ability to protect our homeland and secure our borders. As more and more of our service men and women are returning from the battlefield, this measure would restrict our ability to provide our military personnel and veterans with the medical care and support they need.

These are only a few examples of the damage that would be done to vital programs, all for a projected savings of 2 percent.

Even more troubling, this amendment would impose a roughly $10 billion annual cap on emergency spending. Emergency spending is, by its very nature and definition, impossible to predict. To deliberately impede the government's ability to respond to natural disaster or major terrorist attack I say is deeply irresponsible.

Recent history clearly demonstrates the folly of attempting to affix a set price to future emergencies. More than 4 years later, the gulf coast is still recovering from destruction wrought by Hurricane Katrina. Over $100 billion in Federal resources has been needed to respond to this one disaster alone.

We have all seen the horrible suffering that has resulted from the devastating earthquake in Haiti. What if a city in California were to experience a similar disaster? This reckless amendment could delay or block the timely delivery of resources needed for an appropriate Federal response.

The recent Christmas Eve airline bombing attempt serves as a stark reminder of the grave threats that continue to face our Nation. In the event of a major terrorist attack on our soil, the Federal Government must not be constrained by an emergency spending cap.

Remarkably, this amendment would also restrict funding needed to support our men and women in uniform fighting overseas. Based on earlier budget projections that no longer reflect fiscal reality, this amendment provides $130 billion for the current fiscal year and $50 billion per year thereafter for ''overseas deployments and other contingencies.'' The President's recent decision to increase troop levels in Afghanistan will almost certainly require additional resources from Congress.

I find it very difficult to imagine that the Senator from Alabama genuinely believes that $50 billion would suffice to cover the cost of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

If this amendment were adopted, with defense and overseas caps, in statute, are we expecting Congress to cut defense to pay for these operations? That is what this amendment authorizes.

Spending restraints that would deny funding needed to support our troops are not fiscally prudent; they are deeply irresponsible.

Finally, I remind my colleagues that we already have a 60-vote threshold to overcome budget points of order to appropriations bills. As we all know, 60 votes is not a minor hurdle to overcome. By increasing that threshold to 67 votes, we turn over decisionmaking to a small portion of the Senate. We should not let those who represent only one third of this body exercise control over bona fide emergency spending.

This country must face the challenge of reducing our deficit. We all agree to that. But we must do so in a meaningful and effective way. I do not believe this amendment does either.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against the Sessions amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 15 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UGANDA

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, a lot of times attention is drawn to terrible things going on around the world. We hear a lot about Sudan, and we hear about Zimbabwe, with a president who has taken that country from the breadbasket of the world to one of the most impoverished nations around.

But there is one area nobody talks about. I have been trying for quite some time to get attention drawn to this area. We have a bill that is introduced by Senator FEINGOLD, myself, and others, which is called the LRA Disarmament in Northern Uganda Recovery Act. This essentially does one thing. It directs the administration to develop a research strategy to apprehend a guy named Joseph Kony and the top LRA commanders throughout the country and protect the civilians.

The reason this is important—and I have been dealing with this issue for 10 years, or perhaps more. I have had occasion to spend time with President Museveni of Uganda, President Kagame of Rwanda, and President Kabila of Congo, and others in that area. Twenty-five years ago, Joseph Kony—he is kind of a spiritual leader in that eastern African area. He is a deranged person. He decided to start a thing that some people have heard of, called the ''child's military'' or the ''children's army,'' where he goes out and abducts little kids. For more than 20 years, he has led this Lord's Resistance Army. He has done it primarily in the area of northern Uganda.

I have been there several times to Gulu, which is the headquarters area. Many of the kids who have survived him are up there now in hospitals. His way of doing things is to go into villages and abduct children, young children—I am talking about 11, 12, 13-year-old children—and teach them to be soldiers, with AK–47s, the whole thing. Then they have to go back to their villages and murder their parents and all their siblings. If they do not do that, they cut their ears off and cut their noses off and cut their lips off, as we can see in this picture. Here are these young, little guys. That little boy is about 10 years old with an AK–47.

The tribes in that part of Africa, Hutus and Tutsis, have been fighting forever. We are all familiar with the genocide that took place in Rwanda and the millions of people who lost their lives and the torturing that went on. The things that have happened are just mind-boggling. Yet all the time that was happening, nobody realized what was going on in that area.

Millions of people have fled their homes over time and have been in displacement camps in the areas I just described. A vast nation in the heart of Africa, the DRC—the Democratic Republic of Congo—has strived to recover from lengthy civil wars. It goes back to many years ago, back when Congo got its independence from King Leopold II. Anyone with an interest in Africa at all should read a book. It is called ''King Leopold's Ghost.'' When you read this book, you will find out what really happened, what the true story is not just of the Congo but all of Africa.

This area was in the Congo. The wars started back in 1960 and then the most recent started in 1990. Joseph Kony would go into these areas of displaced people and capture the young people. We made an effort, as we tracked him from one area to another just about 6 months ago, to Goma—that is a fairly large city in Eastern Congo. That is where he was last seen. He left before we got there. As he went north up toward the Sudan, he mutilated 900 people, most of them young people, on that route.

One might ask the question, Why is it these countries are not able to eradicate this person, to do something about him? The problem is that we have a very fine President in Uganda, President Museveni. Museveni used to be a warrior. I think there is a reluctance of the warriors who become Presidents of African nations to want to say: We cannot handle the security ourselves; we are going to have to depend on other countries, the United States or other countries, to do it for us. He has been somewhat resistant.

President Kagame from Rwanda is—I think everyone agrees—one of the greatest leaders in Africa. He is the one, in the genocide of 1994 that wiped out most of his population, who was able to go back. As you go down from the airport to the capital area of Rwanda, you would think you are in an American city. In fact, it is much cleaner than many American cities. He has been able to bring it back up. He also came from the bush as a warrior. Again, he is a great person. As I said the same thing about President Museveni, there is a reluctance to admit they cannot handle these problems themselves.

President Kabila is President of Congo. Congo used to be called Zaire. It is a gigantic area. We remember the stories of explorers who went over there and were able to get all the way across the Congo, taking months and months to do so, many of them losing their lives. Back when the Congo was having serious problems, President Kabila, Sr., was there. He was actually killed, and his son Joe Kabila took the reins of the country. Joe Kabila also has a military background.

So we have three Presidents. They respect each other. They are not at war with each other. They all have one thing in common; that is, they want to eradicate this monster called Joseph Kony. They have not been able to successfully get that done.

What we are doing with this legislation is recognizing, because we never hear anyone talking about it, that there is this serious problem that is taking place. We all want to do things to help people who are downtrodden, but this is one that has been overlooked.

Finally, this bill would give everybody throughout the world an understanding that this is now a U.S. priority and that we are going to finally do something to get rid of this Joseph Kony.

It is easy to say that is another part of the world until you get over there and see. These are kids from 10 to 12 years old being forced to murder people in their own village. They brutally torture these children and maim them for life. That is what this guy has been doing for 25 years.

We have an opportunity to do something. We never had an opportunity before. We tried to introduce it. This bill is one that is out of the Foreign Relations Committee now. It is sponsored primarily by Senator FEINGOLD. I did not support it at first because it does require about $30 million to $35 million. He had it offset by taking money out of the Air Force. I did not like that. I think this President is going to go down as the most anti-defense, anti-military President in history. We punished the military enough, and I am not going to take any more money out of that budget. They agreed to pull that out in committee. The money should come from USAID, from existing State Department funds. We do not know that yet, but we do know this is going to come to the floor. We want it to come to the floor. There is a hold on it now. In fact, the hold is by my junior Senator. I hope we are able to get this bill.

When we look at how many years something like this has been going on, this unspeakable type of behavior—we don't know of anyplace else in the world. It is a very small price to pay, a small effort to let us take the lead with other nations. I can assure my colleagues that other nations will follow. I have given talks in Canada and some of the other places about the problems we have with Joseph Kony.

People say we just need to have somebody come in and say: If you can get together the Presidents of these countries of Rwanda, Uganda, Congo, Sudan, and the Central African Republic, these five countries, then we will come in if you lead the way. That is what we want to do.

There are so many things going on right now. We have people who, when we had the PEPFAR bill—that was a bill to send money to countries, primarily African countries. That bill was on the floor of the Senate. It had been funded previously at $15 billion. Just 6 months ago, that bill was down here. They raised it from $15 billion to $50 billion. They raised it $35 billion. That is going to go to Africa with very few controls on it. We do not know where the money is going to go. This is less than one-thousandth of that amount to defend these kids.

There is a group I ran into up in Gulu in northern Uganda. It was about 3 years ago. I wish I could remember their names. Young college kids recognized this was going on. They went up there with camera crews and took pictures. They have been here and rallied the support of literally thousands of college kids who have become familiar with these atrocities that are taking place. I applaud them for doing it. They wonder why we cannot do something.

If you can increase your PEPFAR funding for Africa by $35 billion and you don't want to spend one-thousandth of that amount, $35 million, to save those kids—30,000 kids over the years have been mutilated like this—then there is something wrong with this country.

We are going to make every effort—Senator FEINGOLD is one of the more liberal Democrats, and I am one of the most conservative Republicans. This crosses all these concepts.

I know my time has expired, but I only want to say I want to do everything I can to get this legislation through. I am going to ask our conservative friends to listen and do something that is right on this legislation. I believe, with the 51 cosponsors we have right now, we ought to be able to get the bill passed if we can get it to the floor.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HAGAN). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BURRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UDALL of Colorado). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BURRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. BURRIS. Mr. President, a little over a year ago this country stood on the brink of economic disaster. Banks and financial institutions wavered on the verge of collapse. The foundation of our economy was shaken to its core. But that is when this Congress took bold action. In the face of public discontent, many of my colleagues summoned the courage to cast a difficult

vote—a vote that set aside hundreds of billions of dollars to prop up our failing financial institutions, a vote that was not popular with the American people but that I feel history will judge as the right thing to have done.

These are the moments that define us—as individuals, as public servants, and as a nation. The American people called upon their representatives to make tough choices, to exercise their best judgment, and rise to every occasion that may impact the quality of life of the people of this country.

I applaud my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who lived up to these expectations and made the decision to do what was right, not what was popular. As a result of their courage and their ability to reach for something larger than the small politics of the moment, our economic foundation has been stabilized. That vote brought us back from the brink of disaster and restored confidence in the financial institutions that threatened to undermine our entire system. It did what was necessary to prevent a complete economic meltdown.

But make no mistake, this emergency legislation did not solve every problem. It was not a cure-all. And as many hard-working Americans will tell you, we are not out of the woods yet. There are still miles to go. Our country remains on the road to recovery. If we want to continue down this road, this Congress needs to take the next step. So at this point, we must turn our attention to the ordinary Americans who are still suffering. It is time to help Main Street. It is time to take bold action to create jobs, help small businesses, and stabilize community banks. It is time to shift our focus to the innovators, entrepreneurs, and local institutions that drive our economy on a daily basis. In some places, things have already started to turn around and we need to continue that progress, but especially among poor and minority communities, these groups are falling further and further behind. As a former banker, I understand the vital roles these institutions play in local communities and our economy as a whole, and I understand the challenges they face in tough times such as these.

That is why we need to embrace a new economic program which will encourage banks to start lending, make capital available for small businesses, and mitigate the foreclosures. Let's stop shutting down people's homes and putting them out in the streets. If we work together to tackle these priorities, we can have regular Americans get back on their feet without spending another dime on Wall Street.

Let us come together right now to send a strong message to Main Street: Help is on the way. The cavalry is coming to help them. We can do this right now. We can do it without passing a new round of emergency appropriations. We can do it without increasing the deficit or the national debt and without writing another 100-page bill.

When the original economic stimulus was passed more than a year ago, this Chamber set aside roughly $700 billion to aid in the recovery effort. These efforts have been effective and, as we speak, there is still $320 billion that has not been spent. So rather than begin the process again, as some have suggested, let us simply change the focus of the existing program. Let us draw from the money we have already set aside to help small businesses, local banks, and ordinary folks. At the moment, we don't have the resources or the time to start over with a new round of stimulus legislation, so let us seize this opportunity to direct funds we have already designated for this purpose.

Every Member of this body has seen the devastating effects of the economic crisis in their home States. Everyone in this Chamber knows we need to act with urgency. We can't wait another moment. Thankfully, if we decide to embrace these priorities, there is no reason to wait. We can restore hope and optimism to Main Street, we can help the minority communities, small businesses, and local banks that are still in grave need of our assistance. We can do this, and I believe we must do it. The resources, the funds are there, and the commitment should be there. Let us use those resources now to put them into Main Street and help ordinary folks. Constituents come up to me all the time wondering: Where is my piece of the stimulus package? Well, it could be in Main Street. It could be in our local banks. So let's do it.

I call upon my colleagues to use those dollars that are now in the stimulus package to put them into Main Street, into the local banks, and start helping the local communities.

Thank you. I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3308

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I want to share some thoughts on an amendment that Senator MCCASKILL and I offered earlier today. I note that a number of people are anxious to vote and finish up. If and when that time comes, I will be pleased to yield the floor. The amendment we offered, which would place statutory caps on spending—and that cap level that we picked was in our budget. It is what the Senate passed in the budget last year. It represents an increase each year, which is 1 to 2 percent annually. This is a budget number basically passed by our Democratic colleagues.

So what we are saying is, let's adhere to that. If we adhere to that level of spending, then we can begin to make progress.

A similar type of statutory cap was placed in 1990, renewed in 1997, helped lead us to the only 4 years of budget surpluses in recent memory, from 1998 through 2001. After that, the statutory caps were allowed to expire. We find this was something that actually worked to help us contain excessive spending. This amendment would say that number that is in the budget for the next 5 years would be firm. We would put it in statutory language, but, of course, it can be exceeded by a two-thirds vote of the Senate, and the statute itself can be reversed by 60 votes of the Senate. It is not something that constitutionally would be firm over managing our system. It is consistent with previous actions of the Congress. It worked, and I believe it will work again.

It has been contended today, I understand, that these caps would impose limits on emergency spending that could potentially cripple our ability to respond to emergencies, such as hurricanes, earthquakes, and terrorist attacks.

Well, I just want to say that hurricanes and earthquakes and things of that nature have had huge bipartisan votes for emergency spending. For example, after Katrina, there were two supplemental emergency bills passed. The first was passed by unanimous consent. Nobody objected to it. It was unanimous. The second was passed on a rollcall vote, 97 to 0. There is no doubt in my mind that if we have a serious emergency, we will have a lot of support for responding to that emergency.

Also, one week after September 11, the Senate unanimously passed supplemental appropriations in response to that terrorist attack. So the allegation that somehow this would cripple the ability of Congress to respond to emergencies is inaccurate.

Second, it was contended earlier today that the amendment contains unrealistic spending caps that would restrict funding needed to support our forces in Iraq and Afghanistan.

That is not accurate. The amendment includes specific provisions that prevent the caps from restricting funding for our troops in a time of war. It would not block us from doing that. We are in a time of war. It just would not apply in a time of war.

We hear it said that everybody is concerned with the growth of the deficit and the need to control debt in the United States, but this amendment—the McCaskill-Sessions amendment—is not the appropriate way to attack this issue.

Let me respond to that. For fiscal year 2010, the government spent $2.9 trillion, of which about $1.2 trillion was for discretionary spending. The remaining $1.7 trillion was mandatory spending. That is what we call entitlements. That is when you get 65 and you are entitled to Medicare, and the government has to pay it whether it has any money or not. You are entitled to Social Security payments, and the government has to come up with the

money. We don't vote on it again. We already voted on Social Security to set up how much money you are entitled to get. We have to have that money. That is why it is called an entitlement.

Now entitlements—Medicare and Social Security—exceed the discretionary account, which includes defense. So of the $1.2 trillion that is in the discretionary account that we actually vote on each year, approximately $526 billion, or a little less than half, is for nondefense purposes.

This amendment attempts to reduce the deficit by constraining just 18 percent of total government spending. It can make a much larger difference than many people realize. Five-year discretionary spending caps were passed—what we are proposing today—in 1990 and 1997 with strong bipartisan support. In 1997, 44 currently serving Senators supported the caps, and 26 of them were Democrats. It made a difference. We balanced the budget in 1998 through 2001—4 years. The current majority leader and chairman of the Appropriations Committee both voted, in 1990 and in 1997, for the 5-year caps, which restricted annual discretionary spending to approximately 1 to 2 percent increases. That is basically what our legislation would do. It would contain this discretionary spending to 1 to 2 percent.

We know we are out of control. We know that last year discretionary spending increased by 10 percent, and this year it will increase by 12 percent. That is unsustainable. At 7 percent growth, your money will double in 10 years. At 12 percent growth, the amount of money we would be spending in our discretionary account would double in 6 years—double. We are on an unsustainable growth here. Some say: Where do you come up with this money, SESSIONS? This limit of 1 to 2 percent is too tough.

It is not too tough. It is the budget we voted on. Actually, I didn't vote for it, our Democratic colleagues voted for it. It was their budget, and it passed with almost unanimous Democratic support. It calls for a 1- to 2-percent increase in spending over the next 5 years. That is all Senator MCCASKILL and I are suggesting we should do. We would make that harder to bust, harder to break it. We put in a firmer cap. If we stay on that level, and if we have an emergency, we will have to meet it. But if we stay at that level, we could end up surprising ourselves how much good we can do in the years to come.

From fiscal year 2006 to 2009, the Federal debt was increased by approximately $4.4 trillion. That is a lot. That is almost the total debt of America. We had about $4 trillion in debt in 2006, and we added, in those 3 years, $4.4 trillion. During that time, the total increase in nondefense discretionary spending was approximately $93 billion. This means the increase in nondefense discretionary spending has accounted for 2 percent of the increase in the national debt, our critics say. So it doesn't make much difference, they would say. They are correct about the surging debt, but not that this would make no difference. If it made little difference, then why are they worrying about passing it?

Restraining discretionary spending, like we did in the nineties, is the bear minimum Congress can do to be fiscally responsible, in my view. For fiscal year 2010, nondefense, nonveteran discretionary spending increased by 12 percent and in 2009 by 10 percent. Those are huge increases, not including the stimulus package. If we included the stimulus package, nondefense discretionary spending has increased 57 percent since 2008, in 2 years.

That is a stunning number. We actually increased discretionary spending by 57 percent in 2 years. The Sessions-McCaskill amendment is similar to the proposal offered by President Obama or what we are hearing he is going to offer—to freeze nondefense discretionary spending for 3 years. This would place a cap on excess. If we break through the President's suggestion and don't freeze and go above that, we hit this cap, and it would take a two-thirds vote to go above that.

Apparently, President Obama's suggestion is less spending than this bill would cap. But that is fine, we can always do less. The danger, from my experience, is that we get carried away and do more.

Some have said the arbitrary spending caps would impede the delivery of resources needed to keep Americans safe from terrorist attacks and violent crime. Such subjective across-the-board restrictions would hinder our ability to protect our homeland and secure our borders.

Well, it does allow for an increase, first and foremost. Second, our congressional process and appropriations process and authorization process should have helped us set priorities within that. It would be unthinkable if this Congress were to somehow take all that money that we need from areas to keep us safe from attack. Surely, we can make judgment decisions about that.

Another allegation is that more and more of our service men and women are returning from the battlefield, and this would restrict our ability to provide them the medical care and support they need.

This measure provides all the funding in the 2010 budget resolution. It would allow that. If additional resources are needed to care for our returning service men and women, and that has bipartisan support, and certainly if we need to be able to take care of injured and wounded, we could get 67 votes. We can do like most people do when they have a necessary expense. They trim spending somewhere else and fund the more necessary item.

Some have said it would impose a roughly $10 billion annual cap on emergency spending. Emergency spending is, by its very nature, impossible to predict. The critics say, to deliberately impede the government's ability to respond to a natural disaster or major terrorist attack is deeply irresponsible. But that is not what we do. In the legislation we proposed as an amendment, Senator MCCASKILL and I set up a $10 billion a year emergency fund—every year. That would be incorporated in the budget resolution, it would be contained in our amendment, and it would be restricted only by the normal 60-vote requirement on a budget point of order for emergency spending. That money would not be subject to a higher point of order, and it would not change up to the first $10 billion—which is a lot of money.

Alabama's budget, including education, is about $7 billion. So we are setting aside $10 billion for emergency funds every year, and if we went above that, we would have to have a supermajority for the kind of emergency that would justify that.

I do not think that criticism is valid. Also, some have said that recent history clearly demonstrates the folly of attempting to fix a set price for future emergencies.

More than 4 years later, the Gulf Coast is still recovering from Hurricane Katrina. Over $100 billion in Federal resources has been needed to respond to this disaster alone.

Our amendment would have no effect on Hurricane Katrina. The fact is, as I have said before, we have had virtually unanimous votes supporting funding for Katrina. I do not think that is a valid criticism. If we have an emergency, I am confident this Congress will meet it.

The recent Christmas Day airline bombing—I see my friend, Senator LEAHY. Is he seeking the floor to speak? If so, I will try to wrap up.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am going to speak for just 3 or 4 minutes, but I do not want to interrupt my friend from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. I will wrap up. I do not want to delay the vote. It will be perfectly appropriate for him to make his remarks at this time.

But first, I will point out this chart. Why do we need to contain the reckless growth in spending? This chart shows how much interest we pay on the debt. When we passed a stimulus package of almost $800 billion, we did not have that money. Where did we get it? We borrowed it, and we have to pay interest on it.

When we have an emergency, such as Hurricane Katrina—by definition, an emergency is an expenditure for which we do not have the money and it is above our budget. Our budget puts us in deficit. Emergency spending is always deficit funded, funded with borrowed money.

In 2009, the interest we paid on our debt was $200 billion. That is the public debt. We have more debt than that. We have internal debt. Under the 10-year proposal President Obama gave us early last year, the Congressional

Budget Office concludes that our deficits will surge and that in 10 years, the interest for 1 year would be $799 billion. That is why everybody says we are on an unsustainable path. How do we get off it? Basically, we have to contain our spending. We cannot have $800 billion stimulus packages every year or two. We cannot have spending increases of 10 percent and 12 percent in basic discretionary accounts.

If we start taking firm action now, this will not happen. The debt tends to compound. Our deficits tend to compound. They go into the baseline, and then we have an increase over that the next year and the next year, and it compounds a lot more than some of our Members realize. That is why we are getting into the area that threatens the very financial viability of this Nation, as Mr. Greenspan said in December with a statement so strong about the danger we face that it would curl your hair.

That is why Senator MCCASKILL and I think we need to take some action. This is a proven way to do so with statutory caps. I encourage my colleagues to see it for what it is: a bipartisan attempt to be sure we do not rise above the budgetary caps that are in our budget. This amendment would make it hard to go above those levels in our spending.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, first, I thank my friend from Alabama for yielding time.

AMENDMENT NO. 3303

Among the $120 billion in funding cuts that would be required by the Coburn amendment is a $1.3 billion rescission from the State Department. Section 13 of the amendment specifically directs the Secretary of State to eliminate two programs—the East-West Center and the Asia Foundation—saying this would produce savings.

Even if it made sense to eliminate these programs which have a long history of achievement for our Nation and strong bipartisan, bicameral support, to do so would produce savings of only $42 million—a long way from the $120 billion about which he spoke. The Senator's amendment does not say where the balance of the $1.3 billion cut would come from.

The Senator's Web site mentions two other small programs within the State and Foreign Operations budget that he believes should be cut which total $25 million, and $20 million of that, incidentally, is for the Tropical Forest Conservation Act, something that gets us praise around the world and actually protects the well-being of everybody in this country. It has long been supported by the senior Republican on the Foreign Relations Committee.

The explanation of the Senator from Oklahoma for eliminating these funds is that other nations should be responsible for the conservation of their own tropical forests. Would that it were so. But when they get cut down, they affect those of us in Vermont, Colorado, Oklahoma, or anywhere else. In fact, it is like saying to other nations, no matter how impoverished—for example, Haiti—that they should take care of their own health needs. That ignores the fact that deadly viruses, such as HIV and TB, are as oblivious to national boundaries as are carbon emissions from the destruction of tropical forests. It is a shortsighted and unworkable approach to global problems that affect the American people directly.

In defense of his proposal to rescind $1.3 billion from the State Department, Senator COBURN cites more than $13 billion in funding for Iraq reconstruction that has been wasted, stolen, or lost. I see my good friend from Oklahoma on the floor. I say in that regard, there is no doubt there was deplorable waste, fraud, and abuse of U.S. taxpayer funds by contractors, such as Halliburton, that received no-bid, sweetheart contracts under the last Republican administration. It was probably the most poorly implemented nation-building program in history. At that time, the Republican Congress rubber-stamped those funds that were wasted—probably not wasted if you were a shareholder of Halliburton; you thought it was a good idea because they walked off with so much of it. The White House even opposed efforts by some of us, including Republicans, to create the Office of the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction that discovered the misuse of funds.

I also remind everybody that it was the Republican Congress, with a Republican President, that inherited the largest surplus in America's history, created by a Democratic administration, that of President Clinton's, that left a surplus that was paying down the national debt, left a huge surplus to the incoming Republican President. The Republican Congress not only voted to use that surplus to pay for an unnecessary war in Iraq but even cut taxes when we were fighting what ended up being two wars. It is the only time in our Nation's history we have done that—spend the surplus, cut taxes, and somehow these wars that have been going on now for 8 years would pay for themselves.

I think to use the last Republican administration's waste of taxpayer dollars in Iraq as a rationale to rescind funds today that have bipartisan support for the security of our embassies and our diplomats overseas and for programs in Afghanistan, Pakistan, Yemen, the Middle East, Indonesia, Mexico, Central Asia, Israel, and Egypt, where the threats to U.S. national security interests are beyond dispute, would be foolhardy.

Every one of us should agree that not every Federal program deserves to be funded and certainly not because it was funded in the past. I have voted to cut programs in the Appropriations Committee and on this floor because they have gone beyond their useful life span or were ineffective. Some programs are effective. Those that are not should be eliminated.

But the Appropriations Subcommittee on State and Foreign Operations, with leadership between myself and the senior Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. GREGG—we spent the better part of last year making difficult choices of what to fund and what to cut. The Appropriations Committee approved those choices, Republicans and Democrats, all 29 members, with one dissenting vote, and that was on another issue involving abortion. This amendment would cut funding to combat HIV, TB. Countries receive help from us, from Colombia, to Israel, to Egypt, to Mexico. The Senator from Oklahoma, with one strike of the pen, would arbitrarily slash 5 percent of that funding. Should we look for places where we can save money, where programs are not meeting their goals? Of course. But to do it this way, willy-nilly, picking a percentage out of the air with no concern for the consequences, does not protect the security of the American people.

There is another section of the amendment about which I would like to speak. Section 5 of the amendment directs the Secretary of Education to work with the Secretaries of other relevant agencies to consolidate and reduce the cost of administering the student foreign exchange and international education programs. These exchanges are some of the most strongly supported programs by both Democrats and Republicans in the foreign aid budget.

This amendment takes aim at the Benjamin Gilman International Scholarship Program, as well as several Department of Education international education and research programs, some of which are administered by the State Department, and a National Science Foundation program.

The Benjamin Gilman Program, created by Congress, provides scholarships to American undergraduates to study abroad, including students in nontraditional destinations, or to study critical languages, such as Arabic, Persian, and Chinese. Our military, and our intelligence agencies, say there is an unmet need for Americans who can speak these languages. Senator COBURN would cut funding for it.

The Department of Education's Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowship Program provides funding for foreign language study at U.S. universities, and several of these programs focus on strengthening study in international business and education, at a time when we are becoming more and more aware we cannot compete just within our borders. Our businesses have to be able to compete with other countries around the world or we lose jobs in America. We should be strengthening our study of international business and education, not cutting these programs.

The amendment would cut other successful exchanges, such as the Fulbright-Hayes programs for teachers, high school students, graduate students, and business professionals. These exchanges bring foreigners with a range of economic, cultural, and ethnic backgrounds to the United States and they send Americans overseas. At a time when America should be reaching out around the world for our security, for our businesses, we should not be cutting these programs which have been woefully underfunded as both Republicans and Democrats have pointed out.

The Institute for International Education is one example of an organization that effectively administers these programs. It provides citizens of other countries with a chance to learn firsthand about American culture, our values, our government, and our way of life. These are among the most effective ways of countering the misrepresentation and false stereotypes about the United States that we see perpetrated by extremists. Some of these programs and their predecessors I saw during the Cold War period. I remember one of the early meetings I had, along with several others, with President Ronald Reagan. He had spoken about the evil empire, and he said: What would you suggest we do? Of the suggestions that several of us made, I said this: Why don't you visit the Soviet Union and invite their leader to come to the United States next year and visit here?

He said: Why?

I said: Because you really don't know much about them. I pressed him a little on that, but he heard me out, and I said: But they do not know much about you either, and it would force them to learn about you and your staff, and it would force us to learn about them and their staff.

Later, in his second term, President Reagan told me that was some of the best advice he ever got. We know how triumphant his visit was to the Soviet Union and how triumphant it was when Mr. Gorbachev came here, and the two of them learned about each other and worked together to lower the threat of nuclear war.

That is just one example.

Mr. COBURN. Would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LEAHY. Without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. COBURN. No problem there.

Is the Senator aware that the foreign ops appropriation increased by 11 percent in 2009 and 33 percent last year? Yet the Senator is saying we can't trim 5 percent from that budget? Am I hearing the Senator correctly? We increased it 46 percent in 2 years, and we can't cut 5 percent?

Mr. LEAHY. I would tell the Senator from Oklahoma that if you look over the last 10 years, there have been significant shortfalls in many of these programs, and in personnel. The increases began first at the request of former President George W. Bush, and then followed by President Obama because they realized the need for us to have these programs for our own security.

My response would be: Where do we make cuts? Your amendment does not say. Do we start with individual countries—Israel, Egypt, and so on? Do we start with programs to combat HIV, or malaria, or programs to eliminate childhood diseases in Africa? These exchanges enable Americans and foreigners to conduct scientific research to increase understanding and cooperation.

Rather than cut funding, Senators on both sides of the aisle have consistently urged the Appropriations Committee to increase funding to expand our efforts to promote better understanding of the United States. If we had funded all the requests for increases, it would be considerably more than it was. Senator GREGG and I stayed within our allocation. Also, I think it was the only appropriations subcommittee that reported a bill with no earmarks.

If there are ways of consolidating to reduce some administrative costs without harming the effectiveness or reducing opportunities to participate in these exchange programs, I am for it. But rather than by amendment to the debt ceiling bill, rather than giving carte blanche to the administration—or any administration—let's consider this in the normal appropriations process in a deliberative way.

Mr. President, we actually work hard on these bills. We make difficult choices. Some things get funded, others do not. We vote up or down. We have to stay within our budget, and we did, and we did it without earmarks. So I believe the amendment should be rejected.

It sounds nice we should just eliminate $2 billion in waste. Who would not want that? Let us be specific. Let us make the hard choices and say where the cuts are going to come from. The Senator's amendment does not do that. I recall a Republican President who gave great speeches about a constitutional amendment to balance the budget, and then during his administration tripled the national debt. I have heard great speeches by people who have voted to cut taxes during two wars, by people who instead of using the surplus left by the last Democratic President squandered it in a year's time.

Mr. President, I see the distinguished majority leader on the Senate floor, so I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. I thank the Senator from Vermont, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for the Coburn amendment, No. 3303, to be divided into four divisions, as follows, and modified to strike sections 17 and 18: section 1, division I; section 2, division II; sections 3 to 5, division III; and section 16, division IV; further, that once the Republican leader or his designee has offered his amendment, a copy of which is at the desk, no further amendments or motions be in order; that Senator COBURN be recognized for up to 15 minutes; that upon the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate proceed to vote with respect to the following amendments in the following order; and that prior to each vote, there be 6 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled in the usual form—that is, there be 3 minutes on each side: Coburn division I, Coburn division II, Coburn division III, Coburn division IV; that on Thursday, January 28, after any leader time, the Senate then resume consideration of H.J. Res. 45; that no further debate be in order except as provided for in this agreement; that prior to each of the following votes with respect to H.J. Res. 45, there be 4 minutes of debate, equally divided and controlled in the usual form: Brownback amendment regarding commissions, which is at the desk; Sessions-McCaskill amendment No. 3308; Reid amendment No. 3305; Baucus, for Reid, substitute amendment No. 3299; passage, H.J. Res. 45; further, that the cloture motions filed with respect to H.J. Res. 45 be withdrawn; with the vote threshold requirement still in effect as provided in the order of December 22, and that the Baucus amendment No. 3306 be withdrawn; further, that upon disposition of H.J. Res. 45, the Senate then proceed to executive session, and there be 60 minutes of debate prior to the cloture vote on Executive Calendar No. 641, the nomination of Ben Bernanke to be Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, with the time equally divided and controlled between the leaders or their designees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I wish to modify my consent request. I said sections 3 to 5, but it is sections 3 to 15 be division III.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, but I want to convey my appreciation to the leader and his staff for allowing division in the four areas on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 3303), as modified, is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE ____—ELIMINATION OF DUPLICATIVE AND WASTEFUL SPENDING

SEC. 1. IDENTIFICATION, CONSOLIDATION, AND ELIMINATION OF DUPLICATIVE GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS.

The Comptroller General of the Government Accountability Office shall conduct routine investigations to identify programs, agencies, offices, and initiatives with duplicative goals and activities within Departments and governmentwide and report annually to Congress on the findings, including

the cost of such duplication and with recommendations for consolidation and elimination to reduce duplication identifying specific rescissions.

SEC. 2. REPEAL OF INCREASE OF THE OFFICE BUDGETS OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.

Of the funds made available under Public Law 111–68 for the legislative branch, $245,000,000 in unobligated balances are permanently rescinded: *Provided*, That none of the funding available for the Legislative Branch be available for any pilot program for mailings of postal patron postcards by Senators for the purpose of providing notice of a town meeting by a Senator in a county (or equivalent unit of local government) at which the Senator will personally attend.

SEC. 3. REPEAL OF EXCESSIVE OVERHEAD, ELIMINATION OF WASTEFUL SPENDING, AND CONSOLIDATION OF DUPLICATIVE PROGRAMS AT THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

Of the funds made available under Public Law 111-80 for the Department of Agriculture, $1,342,800,000 in unobligated balances are permanently rescinded: *Provided*, That as proposed by the President's FY 2010 budget, no funding may be available for the Economic Action Program, which is duplicative of USDA's Urban and Community Forestry program, has been poorly managed, and has funded questionable initiatives such as music festivals: *Provided further*, That no funding may be available for the High Energy Cost grant program, which is duplicative of the $6,000,000,000 in low interest loan programs offered by the UDSA's Rural Utilities Service: *Provided further*, That as included in the Congressional Budget Office's August 2009 Budget Options document, which states that the program ''merely replaces private spending with public spending'', no funding may be available for the Foreign Market Development Program, which also duplicates the Foreign Agricultures Service's Market Access Program: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall consolidate and reduce the cost of administering the numerous programs administered by the Department relating to encouraging conservation, including the Conservation Stewardship Program, which the Government Accountability Office revealed in 2006 is duplicative of other USDA conservations efforts, including the Conservation Reserve Program, the Wetlands Reserve Program, the Farmland Protection Program, the Wildlife Habitat Program, and the Grassland Reserve Program: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall work with the Secretary of Energy to consolidate and reduce the cost of administering the numerous programs administered by both Departments relating to bioenergy promotion, including the Department of Energy's Biomass Program, the Department of Agriculture's Biomass Crop Assistance Program, the Biorefinery Program for Advanced Fuels Program, and the Biobased Products and Bioenergy Program, the Biorefinery Repowering Assistance Program, the New Era Rural Technology Competitive Grants Program, and the Feedstock Flexibility Program: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall work with the Secretary of Energy to consolidate and reduce the cost of administering the numerous programs administered by both Departments relating to alternative energy, including the Department of Energy's Geothermal Technology Program, Wind Energy Program, and the Solar Energy Technologies Program, and the Department of Agriculture's Rural Energy for America Program: the Secretary shall consolidate and reduce the cost of administering the numerous programs administered by the Department that provide food assistance to foreign countries, including the USAD Foreign Agricultural Service, the food for Progress Program, the McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program, the food for Peace programs, the Bill Emerson Humanitarian Trust, and the Local and Regional Procurement Projects ; *Provided further*, That for any program for which funding is prohibited in this section, any activities under that program that are deemed by the Secretary to be necessary or essential, the Secretary shall assign to an existing program for which funding is not prohibited in this section.

SEC. 4. REPEAL OF EXCESSIVE OVERHEAD, ELIMINATION OF WASTEFUL SPENDING, AND CONSOLIDATION OF DUPLICATIVE PROGRAMS AT THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE.

Of the funds made available under Public Law 111–117 for the Department of Commerce, $697,850,000 in unobligated balances are permanently rescinded: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall work with the Secretary of Agriculture to consolidate and reduce the cost of administering the programs administered by both Departments that provide rural public telecom grants, including eliminating USDA's grants to rural public broadcasting stations, as proposed by the President's FY 2010 budget, which duplicates the Department of Commerce's Public Telecommunications Facilities Program, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, which also receives Federal funding: *Provided further*, That no funding may be made available for the Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership Program, which duplicates the Small Business Administration's Small Business Development Centers and which has been found by the Office of Management and Budget to ''only serve a small percentage of small manufactures each year'': *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall work with the Secretaries of Housing and Rural Development and Agriculture to consolidate and reduce the cost of administering the programs administered by these Departments relating to Economic Development, including the following programs, the Economic Development Administration, the Community Development Block Grants, Rural Development Administration grants, the National Community Development Initiative, the Brownfields Economic Development Initiative, the Rural Housing and Economic Development grants, the Community Service Block Grants, the Delta Regional Authority, the Community Economic Development grants, and the Historically Underutilized Business Zone program: *Provided further*, That for any program for which funding is prohibited in this section, any activities under that program that are deemed by the Secretary to be necessary or essential, the Secretary shall assign to an existing program for which funding is not prohibited in this section.

SEC. 5. REPEAL OF EXCESSIVE OVERHEAD, ELIMINATION OF WASTEFUL SPENDING, AND CONSOLIDATION OF DUPLICATIVE PROGRAMS AT THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.

Of the funds made available under Public Law 111–117 for the Department of Education, $3,213,800,000 in unobligated balances are permanently rescinded: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall work with Secretaries from other Federal Departments to consolidate and reduce the cost of administering the at least 30 Federal programs that provide financial assistance to students to support postsecondary education in the forms of grants, scholarships, fellowships, and other types of stipends, including the 15 such programs at the Department of Education, such as the Academic Competitiveness Grants, the TEACH grants, the Federal Supplemental Education Opportunity Grants, the Leveraging Educational Assistance Program, the Javits Fellowships Program, Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need program, as well as the three similar programs administered by the National Science Foundation, such as the Robert Noyce Teacher Scholarship program, as well as a program at the Department of Justice and one at the Health Resources Administration: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall work with Secretaries from other Federal Departments to consolidate and reduce the cost of administering the at least 69 Federal programs dedicated in full or in part to supporting early childhood education and child care, as outlined by the Government Accountability Office, which found that these 69 education programs are spread across 10 different agencies: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall work with Secretaries from other Federal Departments to consolidate and reduce the cost of administering the at least 105 Federal science, technology, math, and engineering education programs, as outlined by the Academic Competitiveness Council, which found that these 105 education programs are spread across numerous Federal agencies: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall work with Secretaries from other Federal Departments to consolidate and reduce the cost of administering the numerous student foreign exchange and international education programs, including the at least 14 programs at the Department, including the American Overseas Research Centers, Business and International Education, Centers for International Business Education, the Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowships, the Institute for International Public Policy, the International Research and Studies, the Language Resource Centers, the National Resource Centers, the Technological Innovation and Cooperation for Foreign Information Access, and the Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign Language Program, the State Department's Benjamin A. Gilman International Scholarship Program, the Boren National Security Education Trust Fund, and exchange programs administered by the National Science Foundation's Office of International Science and Engineering.

SEC. 6. REPEAL OF EXCESSIVE OVERHEAD, ELIMINATION OF WASTEFUL SPENDING, AND CONSOLIDATION OF DUPLICATIVE PROGRAMS AT THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY.

Of the funds made available under Public Law 111-85 for the Department of Energy, $1,321,800,000 in unobligated balances are permanently rescinded: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall work with Secretaries from other Federal Departments to consolidate and reduce the cost of administering the various Federal weatherization efforts, including Federal funding for State-run weatherization projects, the Department of Energy's Energy Conservation and Weatherization grants, as well as the Department of Energy's building Technologies Program, the LIHEAP weatherization efforts, the National Park Service's Weatherization and Improving the Energy Efficiency of Historic Buildings program, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development's Energy Innovation Fund: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall consolidate and reduce the cost of administering the various energy grant programs, including the Tribal Energy grant program, which overlaps with the Department's Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grants, and the Energy Start Energy Efficient appliance Rebate Program: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall consolidate and reduce the cost of administering the various vehicle technology programs at the Department, including the Vehicle Technologies program, the Advanced Battery

Manufacturing grants, the Advanced Technology Vehicles Manufacturing Loans Program, and the Innovative Technology Loan Guarantee Program.

SEC. 7. REPEAL OF EXCESSIVE OVERHEAD, ELIMINATION OF WASTEFUL SPENDING, AND CONSOLIDATION OF DUPLICATIVE PROGRAMS AT THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.

Of the funds made available under Public Law 111–117 for the Department of Health and Human Services, $4,116,950,000 in unobligated balances are permanently rescinded: *Provided,* That the Secretary, in coordination with the heads of other Departments and agencies, shall consolidate the programs that support nonresidential buildings and facilities construction, including the 29 programs across 8 Federal agencies identified by the Government Accountability Office. The Secretary, in coordination with the Secretary of HUD and USDA and other appropriate departments and agencies, shall consolidate duplicative programs intended to reduce poverty and revitalize low-income communities, including the HHS Community Services Block Grant, the HUD Community Development Block Grant, and USDA Rural Development program: *Provided further,* That the Secretary shall work with Secretaries from other Federal Departments to consolidate and reduce the cost of administering the dozens of Federal programs, across multiple agencies, that funded childhood obesity programs, either as the main focus or as one component of the Federal program.

SEC. 8. REPEAL OF EXCESSIVE OVERHEAD, ELIMINATION OF WASTEFUL SPENDING, AND CONSOLIDATION OF DUPLICATIVE PROGRAMS AT THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

Of the funds made available under Public Law 111–83 for the Department of Homeland Security, $2,205,000,000 in unobligated balances are permanently rescinded: *Provided,* That the Secretary shall work with Secretaries from other Federal Departments to consolidate and reduce the cost of administering the dozens of Federal homeland security programs, as identified by the Office of Management and Budget, which states that ''a total of 31 agency budgets include Federal homeland security funding in 2010''.

SEC. 9. REPEAL OF EXCESSIVE OVERHEAD, ELIMINATION OF WASTEFUL SPENDING, AND CONSOLIDATION OF DUPLICATIVE PROGRAMS AT THE DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT.

Of the funds made available under Public Law 111–117 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, $2,302,450,000 in unobligated balances are permanently rescinded: *Provided,* That the Secretary shall work with Secretaries from other Federal Departments to consolidate and reduce the cost of administering the various Federal programs aimed at addressing homelessness, including the Supportive Housing Program, the Shelter Plus Care Program, the Single Room Occupancy Program, the Emergency Shelter Grant Program, programs at Health and Human Services such as the Basic Center Program, Projects for Assistance in Transition from Homelessness, and the Street Outreach Program, and also including the more than 23 housing programs identified by the Government Accounting Office that target or have special features for the elderly.

SEC. 10. REPEAL OF EXCESSIVE OVERHEAD, ELIMINATION OF WASTEFUL SPENDING, AND CONSOLIDATION OF DUPLICATIVE PROGRAMS AT THE DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR.

Of the funds made available under Public Law 111–88 for the Department of Interior, $606,200,000 in unobligated balances are permanently rescinded: *Provided,* That the Secretary shall consolidate and reduce the cost of administering the at least 11 historic preservation programs at the Department, including the 9 preservation programs at the Heritage Preservation Services, such as the Federal Agency Preservation Assistance Program, the Historic Preservation Planning Program, the Technical Preservation Services for Historic Buildings, as well as the Save America's Treasures Grant Program, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the Preserve America program: *Provided further,* That the Secretary shall consolidate and reduce the cost of administering the various climate change impact programs at the Department, including the Bureau of Indian Affairs office Tackling Climate Impacts Initiative, the U.S. Geological Survey's National Climate Change and Wildlife Science Center, the US Fish and Wildlife Service climate change initiatives, and the state and tribal wildlife conservation grants which are being provided to entities to adapt and mitigate the impacts of climate change on wildlife: *Provided further,* That the Secretary shall consolidate and reduce the cost of administering the dozens of invasive species research, monitoring, and eradication programs at the Department, including the eight programs administered by the US Fish and Wildlife Services, the similar programs administered by the Bureau of Land Management, the National Park Service, and the 4 Federal councils created to coordinate Federal invasive species efforts, the National Invasive Species Council, the National Invasive Species Information Center, the Federal Interagency Committee for the Management of Noxious and Exotic Weeds, and the Aquatic Nuisance Species Task Force.

SEC. 11. REPEAL OF EXCESSIVE OVERHEAD, ELIMINATION OF WASTEFUL SPENDING, AND CONSOLIDATION OF DUPLICATIVE PROGRAMS AT THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.

Of the funds made available under Public Law 111–117 for the Department of Justice, $1,385,100,000 in unobligated balances are permanently rescinded: *Provided,* That the Attorney General in coordination with the heads of other Departments and agencies, shall consolidate Federal offender reentry programs, including those authorized by the Second Chance Act, the DOJ Office of Justice Programs Bureau of Justice Assistance Prisoner Reentry Initiative, the Department of Labor Reintegration of Ex-Offenders program, the Department of Education Lifeskills for State and Local Inmates Programs, and the HHS Young Offender Reentry Program: *Provided further,* That the Attorney General shall consolidate the four duplicative grant programs, including the State Formula Grant program, the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Block Grant program, the Challenge/Demonstration Grant program, and the Title V grant program, administered under the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act and reduce the cost of administering such programs: *Provided further,* That the Attorney General, in coordination with the Secretary of Health and Human Services (HHS) and the Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP), shall consolidate Federal programs that assist state drug courts, including substance abuse treatment services for offenders, such as the HHS Adult, Juvenile, and Family Drug Court program, the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration Drug Court Treatment Program, the DOJ Drug Court Program, the ONDCP National Drug Court Institute: *Provided further,*That the Attorney General shall eliminate the National Drug Intelligence Center (NDIC) which duplicates the activities of 19 other drug intelligence centers and reassign any essential duties performed by NDIC.

SEC. 12. REPEAL OF EXCESSIVE OVERHEAD, ELIMINATION OF WASTEFUL SPENDING, AND CONSOLIDATION OF DUPLICATIVE PROGRAMS AT THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR.

Of the funds made available under Public Law 111–117 for the Department of Labor, $679,100,000 in unobligated balances are permanently rescinded: *Provided,* That the Secretary, in coordination with the heads of other Departments and agencies, shall consolidate the 18 programs administered by the Department and ten programs administered by other agencies that support job training and employment, such as the Adult Employment and Training Activities program, Dislocated Worked Employment and Training Activities, Youth Activities, YouthBuild, and the Migrant and Seasonal Farmers program and reduce the cost of administering such programs.

SEC. 13. REPEAL OF EXCESSIVE OVERHEAD, ELIMINATION OF WASTEFUL SPENDING, AND CONSOLIDATION OF DUPLICATIVE PROGRAMS AT THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

Of the funds made available under Public Law 111–117 for the Department of State, $1,318,550,000 in unobligated balances are permanently rescinded: *Provided,* That in accordance with the President's FY 2010 budget, no funding may be made available for the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West, which duplicates the State Departments cultural exchanges: *Provided further,* That no funding may be made available for the Asia Foundation, which duplicates efforts at USAID and the National Endowment for Democracy: *Provided further*, That for any program for which funding is prohibited in this section, any activities under that program that are deemed by the Secretary to be necessary or essential, the Secretary shall assign to an existing program for which funding is not prohibited in this section.

SEC. 14. REPEAL OF EXCESSIVE OVERHEAD, ELIMINATION OF WASTEFUL SPENDING, AND CONSOLIDATION OF DUPLICATIVE PROGRAMS AT THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION.

Of the funds made available under Public Law 111–117 for the Department of Transportation, $1,090,500,000 in unobligated balances are permanently rescinded: *Provided,* That the Secretary shall consolidate and reduce the costs of various duplicative highway programs, including the regionally specific development programs, the Federal-Aid Highway Programs under chapter I of title 23, United States Code, the Research programs authorized under title V of Public Law 109–59: *Provided further,* That the Secretary shall consolidate and reduce the costs of various rail-line relocation grant programs, including the Rail-Line Relocation and Improvement Capital Program, and the Highway-Rail Crossings Program, the Railroad Rehabilitation and Improvement Financing program.

SEC. 15. REPEAL OF EXCESSIVE OVERHEAD, ELIMINATION OF WASTEFUL SPENDING, AND CONSOLIDATION OF DUPLICATIVE PROGRAMS AT THE DEPARTMENT OF TREASURY.

Of the funds made available under Public Law 111–117 for the Department of Treasury, $677,650,000 in unobligated balances are permanently rescinded.

SEC. 16. RESCISSION OF UNSPENT AND UNCOMMITTED FUNDS FEDERAL FUNDS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the $657,000,000,000 in Federal funds unobligated at the end of fiscal year 2009, the discretionary, unexpired funds available for more than 2 consecutive fiscal years, as of the date of enactment of this Act, are permanently rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, we just heard the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, who is also chairman of the appropriations subcommittee, give the typical Washington talk on why we can't cut spending. In light of the fact there has been a 45-percent increase in his area of appropriations, we now can't come back and give 5 percent of that back to the American people.

Forty-five percent growth in 2 years, and we are picking winners and losers? We are not picking winners. The only winners we are picking are the American people.

The fact is, there hasn't been a major program eliminated by the appropriations subcommittee in 5 years. What they do is, once they are there, they are there forever, and nobody is willing to make the hard choices. That is typical of all the talk we will hear about why we can't cut $120 billion from the expenditures for this year—$120 billion out of $3.4 trillion, and we can't come up with 5 percent. We can't find it.

We are giving you a way to do that. Everybody is going to get to vote, and we are going to send a message to the American people. At the rate we are growing the government, it will double in the next 5 years, and we can't find 5 percent, when they are having to make 10, 15, 20, and 25 percent cuts in their own budgets.

What we heard was the typical appropriations response: We work hard, let's save this for appropriations. The problem is it never happens because every bill, somewhere, has a small constituency—every program. We listed 640 programs that have duplication, redundancy, and inefficiency. Yet we hear an appropriations subcommittee chairman say: Oh, no, we can't.

Well, the American people don't get that. We ought to be about trimming the waste out of this government, and at a conservative estimate there is at least $387 billion in waste, fraud, or duplication this year.

So we have the tremendous opportunity to come down here and deny the truth the American people know: This government is wasteful, it is not efficient, and most of the time it is not effective. When we try to make a commonsense, small cut after a tremendous growth over the last 2 years, we hear: No, we can't. No, we can't. We hear a sob story. We can't do it.

The fact is, we don't have a future unless we start cutting spending. The President even asked his staff to give him an option on the budget of a 5-percent across-the-board cut. We will hear tomorrow night about freezing discretionary spending. It is easy to freeze discretionary spending. We have just jumped it 27 percent across the board. But the freezing doesn't start until 2011. We are not going to freeze it until 2011. Our problem is today. The problem that our children are going to face is being manifested and made significantly harder because we are fearful to make commonsense cuts.

Mr. President, $100 billion out of this $120 billion comes from $660 billion that is sitting in agencies that haven't expended it over the last 2 years—the $660-some billion. We are saying, of those that haven't been spent, that hasn't been rolled out over the last 2 years, send $100 billion back. It is easy. We are spending money so fast that the agencies can't even get it out the door. When they do get it out the door, it is ineffective and highly inefficient and loaded with fraud.

Why in the world would we reject making commonsense efforts just like everybody else in this country is having to make today? Why would we put in the perspective: Oh, we can't do these little things, from the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, when in fact our country is drowning in debt and the future for our children is in doubt? We cry crocodile tears over some little program somewhere that in the whole realm of things is either duplicated or highly ineffective. We want to keep every last one of them.

We just heard the chairman of the foreign ops subcommittee say we can't do any of this. They are way too valuable; we can't do it.

Well, what is more valuable, taking care of the next generation, embracing our heritage of sacrifice to create opportunity or satisfying a small interest group that is dependent on a government program that is both ineffective and inefficient and also has three or four other programs that do exactly the same thing?

The first component that we are going to vote on is a mandatory request of the GAO to tell us the duplication; tell us across agency lines where we are failing. What do we need to know? Nobody can tell us that today. When we asked the GAO—personally asked the GAO—they said the task is too big. Well, that ought to be our first signal that something is really wrong, when the Government Accounting Agency says the government is so big and convoluted that they can't tell us where we have duplication. They cannot give us recommendations on what to eliminate.

That ought to be our first signal to say time out, stop, cut some spending and let's see who squeals, and we will put back if we have made a mistake.

The American people understand, more than we do, what is at risk in the future. They want a secure future. They want the ability to plan for their children and their grandchildren. They do not want a fiat currency, which is what is coming if we do not rein in spending.

Most of my colleagues know that is the problem before us. The question is, will we have the courage to go after it. It would be different had we not had significant increases over the last 4 or 5 years in this country, in terms of the budget of the Federal Government. But it has doubled. We are going to have an increase in the debt limit for 1 year that is $200 billion more than the entire government spent in 1999. In 10 years we are going to borrow $200 billion more than we spent—just to operate 1 year—than we spent in the entire budget in fiscal year 1999. Of every penny we spend this next year, 44 cents of it is going to be borrowed—$4.4 billion a day.

What this amendment says is let's not make that so. It does not have to be so. Let's cut it to $3 billion or $3.3 billion of that. Let's save the future for our children.

I am reminded that hard things are hard. Habits are hard to break. The habit of Washington is to never have to make a hard choice. We heard a stellar representation by the Senator from Vermont about why things cannot change here—because everybody has a special little project, they want to protect. While they are protecting their special little project, they are forgetting about the country as a whole. That should not be the legacy we want to embrace. The legacy we ought to embrace is that we had the courage to make the hard, tough decisions at a time when it was called for. Now is that time. It is not 2011, it is not next month, it is not when the appropriations bills come, it is now.

Just think what would happen to the dollar tomorrow if the Senate cuts $120 billion of discretionary spending that is wasteful and duplicated and is not going to make a difference in nary an American life. The signal it will send to the world is we are back on track. The value of the dollar will rise, the cost of oil will go down, the standard of living of consumers will go up, and every family this year will benefit to the tune of $794, if we agree to this amendment.

I think the citizens of America are worth that. I know their children and grandchildren are worth it. The question is, will we curry up the courage? Will we meet the challenge that faces this country or will we continue the status quo because we have always done it this way? Doing it this way is exactly what put us $12.4 trillion in debt; by this time next year $14.2 trillion in debt. It is mortgaging and stealing the future of our children.

I look forward to seeing the outcome of the votes, and I know the American people do. This is the first time in a long time we have had a true vote on the floor to make a difference in what is going to happen in the finances of this country. My hope is we will not disappoint, again, the American people.

I yield the floor.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Oklahoma that there is waste within government, that there is duplication or overlap of programs across some government agencies, and that the amount of spending approved for fiscal year 2010 was higher than it should have been given our Nation's fiscal situation. That is part of the reason why I opposed the fiscal year 2010 budget resolution.

But, I am not enamored of the approach that Senator COBURN has taken

in this amendment. It is an abdication of our constitutional duties as elected Members of Congress to cede such vast decisionmaking power to the executive branch. If there is $120 billion to be cut from the budget, we should identify those cuts and vote on them. We should not let the President, a commission, or some other entity make those decisions for us.

Throughout the past year the Senator from Oklahoma and other Members offered amendments to cut spending from the budget resolution, appropriations bills, and other measures. Some of these amendments were adopted and some were not. I supported some of the amendments and opposed others. In each case, however, Senators knew what they were voting on and had some idea what the effect of the amendment would be. With this amendment we have no idea what its effect will be. The sponsor of the amendment says the impacts will be negligible but offers virtually no specifics. Perhaps he is correct. It is also possible that the President—whose priorities in many respects differ significantly from most Senators on my side of the aisle—will take the reductions mandated by this amendment from programs that my colleagues and I feel to be high priorities. It is possible that the President will fail to take the reductions from those programs we feel are most duplicative or wasteful.

We will likely never know the answers to these questions. This amendment will not be enacted. I agree that Federal spending must be constrained. As we go forward, however, I hope the Senate will take a more transparent approach to deficit reduction so that Senators, consistent with their constitutional responsibilities, can make informed decisions about the operations of the Federal Government.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COBURN. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the Coburn amendment, Division I.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WEBB) are necessarily absent.

Mr. KYL. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 94, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 6 Leg.]

YEAS—94

Akaka	Ensign	McCain
Alexander	Enzi	McCaskill
Barrasso	Feingold	McConnell
Baucus	Feinstein	Menendez
Bayh	Franken	Merkley
Begich	Gillibrand	Murkowski
Bennet	Graham	Murray
Bennett	Grassley	Nelson (NE)
Bingaman	Gregg	Nelson (FL)
Bond	Hagan	Pryor
Boxer	Harkin	Reed
Brown	Hatch	Reid
Brownback	Hutchison	Risch
Bunning	Inhofe	Rockefeller
Burr	Inouye	Sanders
Burris	Isakson	Schumer
Cantwell	Johanns	Sessions
Cardin	Johnson	Shaheen
Carper	Kaufman	Shelby
Casey	Kerry	Snowe
Chambliss	Kirk	Specter
Coburn	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cochran	Kohl	Tester
Collins	Kyl	Thune
Conrad	Landrieu	Udall (CO)
Corker	Lautenberg	Udall (NM)
Cornyn	Leahy	Vitter
Crapo	LeMieux	Whitehouse
DeMint	Levin	Wicker
Dodd	Lieberman	Wyden
Dorgan	Lincoln	
Durbin	Lugar	

NOT VOTING—6

Byrd	Roberts	Warner
Mikulski	Voinovich	Webb

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 94, the nays are 0. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this division, the division is agreed to.

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent that the next three votes be 10-minute rollcalls.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3303, DIVISION II

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 6 minutes of debate, equally divided, on Coburn division No. II. Who yields time?

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, this amendment rescinds our increase for our operations. We increased our budget 5.8 percent at a time when there was no inflation last year, zero. The year before that, we had increased our budget in excess of 10.9 percent, which means we effectively increased our own budgets to run our own operations 17 percent in the last 2 years, with less than 1 percent inflation over that period. If, in fact, we can't lead by example to cut our own budgets to help the country move out of the problem it is having, it is probably because we are not very good managers of our own budgets, which belies the problem we now face. I appreciate support on this amendment. The American people would sincerely appreciate support on this amendment.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, the amendment being offered by the Senator from Oklahoma affects the legislative branch. It is true it affects Members of Congress in their offices, but it affects much more. We just had an overwhelming vote to give new responsibilities to the Government Accountability Office. The next amendment up calls for cutting their budget. I would say to the Senator from Oklahoma, you can't have it both ways. You give new responsibilities to these agencies and then say: We will give you less money to do it.

Let me suggest something else. When you start to leave this evening to go home and you drive by the gate out here and you see, in the dark, men and women in uniform risking their lives for us and for the visitors to the Capitol, remember this vote. This vote cuts funds for the Capitol Police and security in the Capitol. When the Senator from Oklahoma was asked earlier, are you asking for too much in cuts, he said: I want to keep cutting until they squeal. What will be the squeal we hear when it comes to security from the Capitol? I am sorry to say it might be an incident that none of us wants to see.

We want this to be a safe place. The Capitol Visitor Center has more and more people coming in. Cutting security for the Capitol at this point in time with the threats facing our Nation and the fact that we work in one of the biggest targets in America is very shortsighted. That is what happens when you cut across the board and you don't take a look at the individual agencies involved. Please, for the security of the Capitol and for the security of the people who visit it, vote no on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, it is remarkable what length we will go to defend our budgets. The fact is, the assumption Senator DURBIN made is that we are efficient. The fact is, we are not. Everybody in here could turn back at least 10 percent of their budget if they ran their office efficiently. We know that. Nothing in Washington is run efficiently. So to say we can't do it without putting ourselves at risk is poppycock. It is time for us to lead. Now is the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. DURBIN. One thing I forgot to mention. Members of Congress voluntarily forgo every cost-of-living adjustment each year. We decided not to ask for a cost-of-living adjustment because we are in hard times. To suggest that sacrifices are not being made is not accurate. I urge my colleagues, vote against this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

If not, the question is on agreeing to the Coburn Amendment, Division No. II.

Mr. COBURN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WEBB) are necessarily absent.

Mr. KYL. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 7 Leg.]

YEAS—46

Alexander	Ensign	Lincoln
Barrasso	Enzi	Lugar
Bayh	Feingold	McCain
Bennet	Graham	McCaskill
Bennett	Grassley	McConnell
Brownback	Gregg	Murkowski
Bunning	Hagan	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Sessions
Chambliss	Hutchison	Shelby
Coburn	Inhofe	Snowe
Cochran	Isakson	Thune
Collins	Johanns	Udall (CO)
Corker	Klobuchar	Vitter
Cornyn	Kohl	Wicker
Crapo	Kyl	
DeMint	LeMieux	

NAYS—48

Akaka	Feinstein	Murray
Baucus	Franken	Nelson (NE)
Begich	Gillibrand	Nelson (FL)
Bingaman	Harkin	Pryor
Bond	Inouye	Reed
Boxer	Johnson	Reid
Brown	Kaufman	Rockefeller
Burris	Kerry	Sanders
Cantwell	Kirk	Schumer
Cardin	Landrieu	Shaheen
Carper	Lautenberg	Specter
Casey	Leahy	Stabenow
Conrad	Levin	Tester
Dodd	Lieberman	Udall (NM)
Dorgan	Menendez	Whitehouse
Durbin	Merkley	Wyden

NOT VOTING—6

Byrd	Roberts	Warner
Mikulski	Voinovich	Webb

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 46, the nays are 48. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this division, the division is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 3303, DIVISION III

There will now be 6 minutes of debate equally divided on Coburn division III.

Who yields time?

The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, we are going to hear why we cannot do this, kind of along with the debate we just heard from the majority whip. But here are some examples for you. This is what the GAO found.

In 2005, 13 different Federal agencies spent $3 billion to fund 207 programs to encourage students to enter the field of math and science. Mr. President, 207 different programs, and we are going to vote against eliminating them here in just a minute.

In 2003, $30 billion was spent on 44 job-training programs administered by 9 different Federal agencies. Fourteen departments within the Federal Government, 49 independent agencies operate exchange and study abroad programs. So 14 departments, 49 independent agencies operate exchange and study abroad programs; 69 early education programs administered by 9 different agencies; 23 Federal housing programs that target or have special features for the elderly operated by 6 different agencies.

That is just a minimal number.

We are going to hear why we cannot do this. The American people are wanting to know when we are going to do what is right, what is possible, and what is best for the long term, not the short term.

With that, Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Hawaii is recognized.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma proposes to cut $20 billion from programs which he describes as being redundant. Well, take, for example, nursing. There are three different programs. They are not redundant. One is for education; another is to train women and men to go to rural areas, rural America, to serve; and the third is for research. Yes, three different agencies handle that. It is for three different purposes.

Then you have HUD. One of the sad facts of life is that tonight 658,000 American men, women, and children are going to go to bed homeless, some of them with empty stomachs, some without blankets, and we are going to cut 5 percent from housing for the homeless? This amendment does that.

Then you have cuts for foreign operations. Senator LEAHY spent some time this afternoon explaining why this is foolish. We had an accounting change because now we cover State Department activities in Afghanistan and Iraq.

I think it is ill-advised to do what the Senator proposes because these are not redundant. These are not wasteful. I think we could be spending more for the homeless, but yet we are cutting this by this amendment. I hope we reject this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, what the American people are asking is, Why aren't the three nursing programs combined so you have one set of overhead to administer all three programs? That is what they are asking. This does not cut any money for the homeless. What it says is, put all the homeless programs under one set of administration where we save money and are much more effective at what we are doing because we are concentrating it within one area. We can have all sorts of reasons why we cannot do it. Let's find the courage to do it for the American people and the kids who follow.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

If not, the question is on agreeing to the Coburn amendment, Division III.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WEBB) are necessarily absent.

Mr. KYL. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 61, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 8 Leg.]

YEAS—33

Alexander	Crapo	Kyl
Barrasso	DeMint	LeMieux
Bayh	Ensign	McCain
Bennett	Enzi	McCaskill
Brownback	Graham	McConnell
Bunning	Gregg	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Sessions
Chambliss	Hutchison	Shelby
Coburn	Inhofe	Thune
Corker	Isakson	Vitter
Cornyn	Johanns	Wicker

NAYS—61

Akaka	Franken	Murkowski
Baucus	Gillibrand	Murray
Begich	Grassley	Nelson (NE)
Bennet	Hagan	Nelson (FL)
Bingaman	Harkin	Pryor
Bond	Inouye	Reed
Boxer	Johnson	Reid
Brown	Kaufman	Rockefeller
Burris	Kerry	Sanders
Cantwell	Kirk	Schumer
Cardin	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Carper	Kohl	Snowe
Casey	Landrieu	Specter
Cochran	Lautenberg	Stabenow
Collins	Leahy	Tester
Conrad	Levin	Udall (CO)
Dodd	Lieberman	Udall (NM)
Dorgan	Lincoln	Whitehouse
Durbin	Lugar	Wyden
Feingold	Menendez	
Feinstein	Merkley	

NOT VOTING—6

Byrd	Roberts	Warner
Mikulski	Voinovich	Webb

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 33, the nays are 61. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this division, the division is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 3303, DIVISION IV

There will now be 6 minutes for debate equally divided on Coburn Division No. IV.

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, last year Federal agencies ended the fiscal year with $657 billion in unobligated balances. There is no question a great deal of that is associated with the war efforts and other things, but according

to OMB and CBO, approximately $100 billion of that has been sitting for 2 years or longer, never having been obligated for what we have directed it to. So we have $100 billion sitting out there that the agencies have not been able to spend. Obviously, if they haven't been able to spend it in the last 2 years, it is not a priority. If, in fact, we rescind that money to the Treasury, we will cut our deficit $100 billion, and then we can reappropriate what is necessary for this year. The rule in the Federal Government is after 2 years it is supposed to go back to the Treasury anyway, which is not being enforced for everybody except the Treasury Department. They are under that obligation.

So here is an opportunity—it doesn't affect anything because the money hasn't been obligated—to put it back in and start over and reprioritize. That is all it is about. It will actually move $100 billion back and then our appropriators can decide whether they want to put that back this year.

I appreciate your consideration on this amendment, and I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields?

The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, this is a very serious amendment. Potentially it could be damaging. It says, very simply, if the funds are not obligated for 2 years, then it is rescinded. It sounds reasonable, but I think it is no secret it takes longer than 2 years to build a battleship. It takes more than 2 years to build an aircraft carrier. It takes more than 2 years to build a hospital. Right now, there are 43 VA hospitals being built. Are we going to cut them out? What about the shipbuilding industry? Are we going to rescind that?

This amendment has potentially very dangerous consequences. I hope my colleagues will vote against it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, the dangerous consequences facing this Nation aren't as outlined by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. The dangerous consequences facing this Nation are continued spending and borrowing from the next generation and a creditworthiness that is not going to even be BBB. There is no question there is danger before us. It is not this amendment. It is the continuing efforts on the part of those who are in Washington to not recognize the fact that we are wasting money hand over fist and, in fact, we appropriate yearly on many of these projects. So it will not eliminate any as outlined by the chairman. It will give us a chance to reprioritize, which every family in America is doing today.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is such a second.

All time is yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the Coburn amendment, Division IV.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WEBB) are necessarily absent.

Mr. KYL. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 57, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 9 Leg.]

YEAS—37

Alexander	Ensign	Lugar
Barrasso	Enzi	McCain
Bayh	Feingold	McConnell
Bennett	Graham	Murkowski
Brownback	Grassley	Risch
Bunning	Gregg	Sessions
Burr	Hatch	Shelby
Chambliss	Hutchison	Snowe
Coburn	Inhofe	Thune
Corker	Isakson	Vitter
Cornyn	Johanns	Wicker
Crapo	Kyl	
DeMint	LeMieux	

NAYS—57

Akaka	Feinstein	Menendez
Baucus	Franken	Merkley
Begich	Gillibrand	Murray
Bennet	Hagan	Nelson (NE)
Bingaman	Harkin	Nelson (FL)
Bond	Inouye	Pryor
Boxer	Johnson	Reed
Brown	Kaufman	Reid
Burris	Kerry	Rockefeller
Cantwell	Kirk	Sanders
Cardin	Klobuchar	Schumer
Carper	Kohl	Shaheen
Casey	Landrieu	Specter
Cochran	Lautenberg	Stabenow
Collins	Leahy	Tester
Conrad	Levin	Udall (CO)
Dodd	Lieberman	Udall (NM)
Dorgan	Lincoln	Whitehouse
Durbin	McCaskill	Wyden

NOT VOTING—6

Byrd	Roberts	Warner
Mikulski	Voinovich	Webb

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 37, the nays are 57. Under the previous order, requiring 60 votes for the adoption of the division, the division is withdrawn.

The Senator from Kansas is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 3309 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3299

Mr. BROWNBACK. I think under a previous agreement I was to call up an amendment. I ask that my amendment be callled up, No. 3309, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending amendments are set aside and the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK] proposes an amendment numbered 3309 to amendment No. 3299.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Text of Amendments.'')

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to add the following members as cosponsors to the amendment: Senators CHAMBLISS, ENSIGN, and VITTER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, as I understand, there are no further votes this evening, and there will not be votes tomorrow. We will have this up Thursday, and we will debate it then and vote on it. I will put in somewhat of a statement tonight and then talk about it further on Thursday.

This is a commission that has been in front of this body several times. We voted on it. It passed this body twice before in the budget debates. It is CARFA, the Commission on the Accountability and Review of Federal Agencies.

It is modeled exactly after the Base Realignment and Closure Commission, the BRAC, that has been so successful on closing military bases and consolidating assets and put the military in a better position. This is the same thing. It is to all of government. It has been voted on by this body twice before. It has passed this body. It is done in the budget agreement. It is time it became the law of the land.

That is the process whereby we can actually cut government spending. It is a simple process—eight members on the Commission, four appointed by this body, four appointed by the House. For any recommendation to move forward, it has to pass by six of eight members, so either party cannot dominate or determine it. It has to be six of eight. It will take one-fourth of the government each year for 4 years and review that fourth of the Federal Government and make recommendations for closure during that year's period of time.

The report for that year then is submitted to the appropriate committees of jurisdiction for a period of 30 days. They can review the report. They can hold hearings on the CARFA commission recommendations for a period of 30 days. They can look it over and see which ones they like, which ones they do not like, but they cannot amend it.

At the end of that 30 days, it is then subject to a privileged motion to come in front of this body so it has to be voted on by this body with a limit of 10 hours of debate prior to going to the motion, 10 hours of debate on the bill itself. It cannot be amended. Then it is an up-or-down vote, with a 50-vote threshold of passage. It is a privileged motion that comes in front of this body, with a majority vote for it to pass through this body.

This is the way we will get spending under control and done. This is an agreeable way. It is a way that has proven itself in the past. Now is the time we have to do this.

I wish to show one chart that is new out today. It is no new news, unfortunately. This one is new out today. This

is the projection of our Federal debt as a percentage of GDP. That is the one to watch, the projection of the Federal debt as a percentage of GDP.

We can see what the January 2008 estimate of the Federal debt as a percentage of our economy was supposed to be. Here is the percent of the economy. We are pushing up 38 percent or so at this point in time. In January 2008, this starts bending back down and moves to 20 percent by 2020. Then we had the January 2009 estimate come in. We see there we were getting up to mid-50 percent, and then it was going to bow back down to 41 percent. That was last year's 2009 estimate.

This year, just out today—this is the estimate—2010 as a percent of the economy, we are looking at our Federal debt as being midsixties, 67 percent, and staying at that level for the debt as a percentage of the economy. These are terrible numbers. They are way too high. They are stifling the economy. It is a nonsustainable position, and it is something we have to fix.

Earlier today, we considered a commission that had both spending and taxes in it. The American public is not for more taxes. They think they are taxed out, and I believe they are too taxed. They should not be taxed more. They do want us to cut spending. There is no question about that. They want us to cut it prudently. They want us to cut in wasteful, duplicative areas. That is what they want to get at. They want core programs clearly taken care of. That is why we put it to a bipartisan commission of individuals to look at. The recommendation has to clear six of eight members so no party can control—four appointed by Republicans, four appointed by Democrats—examined by the committees and then put forward for a vote. This can work. This is what the public wants us to do. It is time to do it.

We have to start bending this down, the debt to GDP. This is dangerously high. It has not been this high since World War II. We cannot sustain it. We have to pull it back down. I would love us to start to cut spending and go through the committees and say we are going to cut here, we are going to cut there. We have not been able to do that under Republican or Democratic control of either branch of government. We have not been able to go at that on an individual basis.

This is a system that has worked in the past. This is a system that this body has approved in the past. It has been in budget agreements. We have not made it all the way through in the budget agreement, but Members in this body have voted on this system for controlling spending.

If people want to come back later and say: We want to look at other provisions or we want to add something back, they can do that in future conferences. But this gets that culling process going.

I wish to point out one issue to my colleagues about the problem of running high debt and its impact on the economy. If the Federal Government runs a high debt level, it has a drag on the economy. There is a recent study just released at an American Economics Association meeting. The title of the study is ''Growth in a Time of Debt.'' It said, according to the study, that the sharp runup in public sector debt will likely prove one of the endearing legacies of the 2009 financial crisis in the United States and elsewhere. The study looked at debt levels of 44 countries and included data over the last 200 years in order to get the most comprehensive picture possible, the picture of debt on economic growth.

What does this big lug do to the overall economy? Does it have an impact? They said, clearly, yes.

The conclusion is clear: Very high government debt, classified as 90 percent or more of gross domestic product, results in average growth rates a full 4 percent below countries with lower debt levels. Since annual growth rate and GDP is averaged considerably less than 4 percent over the last 10 years in the United States, carrying high national debt can mean the difference between a growing economy and a contracting economy.

After the recent binge of Federal spending, our Nation's gross debt could well surpass the 90 percent of GDP mark and go even above that, to the point that could be the lug on the economy that keeps us from growing and actually puts us in a contracting economy.

I urge my colleagues or members of the Senate staff to look at these studies and look at the impact of debt on economic growth. This could end up being the real lug of what happens during this period of time.

CARFA is a bipartisan mechanism that can work us out of this situation. It pushes at the places we actually can cut and need to cut. Everybody in this body believes, and I believe, there are clear places in the Federal Government we can cut. For one reason or another, they have become sacred cows and we have not been able to cut them. This is a process that has worked on military bases before.

I will talk more about this amendment when we vote on it on Thursday. I ask my colleagues, in the interim day, when we have a chance to look at some of these things, to examine this process. It is one they have seen before. I have proposed this bill for 10 years. They voted on it before, as I stated earlier. I urge them to look at this and think: Now is the time to do this. Maybe they had reservations about it in the past or thought: I don't think we want to go into that sort of mechanism now. But there is not another mechanism that works. This changes the mechanism for spending in a way that has worked in the past and, clearly, with these sort of debt numbers, the time has come to do it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, we are now debating a resolution that would raise the Federal debt ceiling, allowing the Federal Government to borrow enough money to meet its obligations. I doubt anyone in this Chamber is happy at the prospect of approving another such increase. I know I am not. Yet we must approve it. Failure to pass this resolution would do incalculable harm to our government's standing with financial markets and endanger nearly every activity the government undertakes. It would throttle the faint, fragile signs of recovery from the deepest financial crisis in 75 years. Refusal to pass this resolution is not an option. It would be irresponsible and dangerous to the jobs and income of every American.

Yet the magnitude of this action is staggering. If successful in this necessary endeavor, we will authorize the Treasury to carry more than $13 trillion dollars in debt. That is more than $42,000 for every man, woman, and child in the United States.

While the debt itself is enormous, the rate to which we have been adding to it in recent years is equally staggering. The year President Clinton left office, the government ran a $236 billion surplus. Yet, after 8 years of Republican leadership, that surplus evaporated into a mind-boggling $1.3 trillion deficit the day President Obama took office.

The message of these numbers is simple: We cannot go on as we are. If we do not change our budget policies, and change them a great deal, we will plunge our economy into deep depression.

Discretionary spending and nondiscretionary spending alike must be addressed. While some have successfully politicized earmark spending and discretionary spending programs, good and bad alike, the simple fact is that merely addressing these issues will not balance our budgets.

In addition to meaningful spending reforms, we must also engage in meaningful revenue reforms. The Bush-era tax cuts have already added trillions to our debt. Most should not be renewed. We also should end loopholes that allow corporations to hide income in offshore entities and people to hide their assets and income overseas.

But the fact is that most of our budget choices are not easy. And it is precisely because these choices are so difficult that we find ourselves where we are now. So it is worth considering how we got into this situation and how we might get out of it and whether the amendment to this resolution to be offered by Senators CONRAD and GREGG presents a possible solution.

First, let me respond to those who seem to have just recently discovered the importance of the Federal debt. Many of the people bemoaning budget deficits today are the same people who advocated a series of policies under the previous administration that added

greatly to our deficits, including enormous tax cuts mainly for the wealthiest. No effort was made to pay for that policy or the two wars. They were financed by debt.

In fact, to the extent that our budget outlook is significantly worse at the end of this decade than it was in the beginning, decisions by the previous administration are by far the biggest contributor to the problem. In parceling out the blame for our massive deficit, one expert said, the Obama administration ''is like a relief pitcher who enters a game in the fourth inning trailing 19–0 and allows another run to score. The extra run is nothing to cheer about, of course, but fans should be far angrier with the starting pitcher.''

However we reached this point, it is our responsibility now to address the consequences of failing to act. That is why I believe the amendment offered by Senators CONRAD and GREGG is worthy of consideration.

Briefly, they propose to establish a task force to recommend changes to our budget policies to address our long-term fiscal crisis. The task force would consist of 18 members: 16 Members of Congress, equally divided between House and Senate and majority and minority, and 2 administration officials, the Treasury Secretary and another Presidential appointee. Recommendations would require approval of 14 of the commission's 18 members. Those recommendations would be referred to the Budget Committee and other committees of jurisdiction in each Chamber and then move automatically to floor votes in each Chamber, where passage would require a three-fifths vote.

There is much to recommend this approach. Our fiscal problem is so large partly because it is so politically difficult to address. Repairing our finances will require some combination of spending cuts and tax increases, and spending cuts and tax increases are rarely politically popular. The use of a task force to recommend difficult but necessary choices for the common good has been successful in the past, in several rounds of military base closings and with the Greenspan Commission on Social Security reform in 1983.

But this approach is not without flaw. One is the structure of the task force, which would include two executive branch appointees.

Some have argued that the legislative commission must include members from the executive branch to achieve Presidential buy-in on the commission's proposal. And I agree that gaining the support of the administration is vital in this effort. But in seeking that buy-in, I do not believe it is either necessary or proper to give executive branch officials votes, which are potentially decisive votes, on recommendations that would bypass the Senate's rules and procedures. The proper way to achieve Presidential buy-in is through Presidential communication and consultation and the threat of an actual Presidential veto of a task force proposal, if passed by the Congress, if it is objectionable to the President. The appropriate buy-in before Congress acts could also be advanced with ex officio membership for the two executive appointees.

I was pleased that the task force proposal we are voting on today no longer gives the task force power to recommend changes to the Standing Rules of the Senate. That is a welcome change from its prior iterations. Successfully tackling our fiscal crisis will require far-reaching legislation, and procedural hurdles in both chambers make passing any far-reaching legislation extraordinarily difficult. But any permanent procedural changes in our rules should be made by the Members themselves in each Chamber and not through this process.

Despite my reservations, particularly about voting membership for executive branch officials on a congressional commission that has the power to bypass the normal rules of our body for consideration of its recommendations, I believe Senators CONRAD and GREGG have offered a way forward. Their 60-vote requirement for positive congressional approval of the task force's recommendations does significantly protect congressional prerogatives. It also is clear that our current political climate and ways of doing business have been unequal to the task. Addressing our deficit requires bold action. The consequences of failure to act are too severe for us to miss this chance to act. I will vote for the Conrad-Gregg proposal.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to executive session to consider Executive Calendar No. 641, the nomination of Ben Bernanke.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF BEN S. BERNANKE TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Ben S. Bernanke, of New Jersey, to be Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of 4 years.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Ben S. Bernanke, of New Jersey, to be Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

Christopher J. Dodd, Tom Udall, Edward E. Kaufman, Mark R. Warner, Patty Murray, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Paul G. Kirk, Jr., Daniel K. Inouye, Robert Menendez, Tim Johnson, Jack Reed, Debbie Stabenow, Tom Harkin, Max Baucus, Jon Tester, Joseph I. Lieberman, John D. Rockefeller IV.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING DELIA MARTINEZ

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to honor Ms. Delia Martinez of Henderson, NV, who on January 19, 2010, passed away at the age of 61. Ms. Martinez was a dedicated public servant who volunteered countless hours of service to communities around the State of Nevada.

Ms. Martinez was born in Mexico City to U.S. Foreign Service officer Charles Coop and his wife Concepcion Martinez. When Delia was 7 years old her family moved to Nevada, where she would spend the rest of her life. After graduating with honors from Rancho High School in Las Vegas, Ms. Martinez went on to receive a degree in business management from the University of Nevada Reno in 1972.

From an early age, Delia was attracted to the ideals of justice and equality for all. As a high school student, she became actively involved in the civil rights movement, and worked diligently to this end all throughout her life. Ms. Martinez later enjoyed the opportunity to act on the passion for equality she had obtained earlier in life, when she became the first Hispanic female executive director of the Nevada Equal Rights Commission. In

this position, which she held for over 10 years, Ms. Martinez honorably served the citizens of Nevada by overseeing the State's pursuit to ensure equal employment opportunities.

After her retirement from the professional world Ms. Martinez began serving in several organizations including the Henderson Democratic Club, Sí Se Puede, the Clark County Hispanic Democratic Caucus, Clark County By-Laws Committee and the Clark County Democratic Black Caucus. Ms. Martinez understood the necessity of improving her community through public service and advocacy. For this reason, it is no surprise that she went on to serve in various leadership positions in many community-based groups. At the time of her passing, Ms. Martinez was serving as the president of the Henderson Democratic Club, treasurer of the Clark County Democratic Hispanic Caucus, and corresponding secretary for Sí Se Puede.

Along with her dedication to serving her community, Ms. Martinez will also be remembered for the overwhelming love she had for her family. Ms. Martinez was married to Glenn Phillips with whom she raised their beloved son Benjamin. Prior to the birth of her child, she mentored four nieces and nephews, inspiring them to become active community leaders in Nevada. Ms. Martinez is preceded in death by her parents and is survived by her husband, son, sister, and a large extended family throughout southern Nevada and across several States.

I am humbled today to offer my profound gratitude to Ms. Martinez for her life of service to the citizens of the great State of Nevada, and with equal humility offer my deepest condolences to Ms. Martinez's family.

RECOGNIZING THE EFFORTS OF PROJECT C.U.R.E.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, today I wish to speak in recognition of PROJECT C.U.R.E. and its efforts to improve health care infrastructure in developing countries. PROJECT C.U.R.E. has been bringing customized medical relief to those in the developing world since its inception in 1987. In 2008 alone, PROJECT C.U.R.E. delivered nearly $40 million worth of supplies to more than 100 health care facilities throughout the world.

PROJECT C.U.R.E. representatives conduct needs assessments at prospective sites to determine unique, appropriate medical supply and equipment needs. Follow-up accountability assessments provide necessary training and ensure that donated medical supplies and equipment are operating and being used properly. The organization focuses more than 98 percent of funds on program delivery. For every nickel given to PROJECT C.U.R.E., they provide a dollar's worth of services; that is an impressive 20-to-1 return on investment.

PROJECT C.U.R.E. would not be successful if it were not for the grassroots efforts of volunteers throughout the United States, including participants in my home State of South Dakota. Doctors, medical professionals, housewives, businessmen, and average citizens in the Black Hills have come together to donate supplies and used medical equipment to be reprocessed, re-sterilized, and sent to where there is the greatest need. The local Wal-Mart facilitated these efforts by donating the transportation of the goods from Rapid City, SD, to the PROJECT C.U.R.E. warehouse in Centennial, CO.

In 2004, the Rapid City Regional Hospital had an ultrasound machine that was 1 year past meeting U.S. standards but was still perfectly functioning. The hospital was weeks away from sending it to the landfill when they heard about PROJECT C.U.R.E. Rather than waste away in the landfill, this $75,000 machine was sent to Malawi where it is still being used today. There are many similar success stories and countless individuals that have benefited from these efforts.

Once again, I commend the volunteers and staff of PROJECT C.U.R.E. for their generosity, dedication, and hard work. I wish them well as they continue their mission ''to identify, solicit, collect, sort and deliver medical supplies and services according to the imperative needs of the world.''

VISION REHABILITATION

Mr. BROWN. I rise today to recognize the importance of vision rehabilitation services for vision-impaired Americans.

There are more than 25 million Americans who have trouble seeing—even when aided by glasses or contact lenses. Over 1 million are legally blind and over 3 million have low vision or partial sight.

This disability strikes Americans from all walks of life: the young and old, the poor and rich, urbanites and rural-dwellers.

Among Ohioans over the age of 40, there are more than 40,000 blind people, more than 90,000 suffering from age-related macular degeneration, more than 170,000 suffering from diabetic retinopathy, and nearly 100,000 with glaucoma.

Vision rehabilitation services help vision-impaired Americans restore function and live independent lives.

Whether it is learning to read Braille or use assistive computer technology, travel safely or take care of the home, meet career objectives or enjoy leisure activities, vision rehabilitation services help vision-impaired people cope with and overcome their disability.

These critical services are provided by occupational therapists—who can earn a specialty certificate in low vision—and vision rehabilitation professionals—who include low vision therapists, orientation and mobility specialists, and vision rehabilitation therapists.

These health care providers are uniquely qualified to serve the vision-impaired and have made a profound difference in millions of lives.

Take, for example, Laurine, an 84-year-old from the Cleveland area in my State of Ohio.

Laurine went blind 5 years ago due to macular degeneration. After decades of living independently, Laurine suddenly needed help with basic activities of daily living and had to go into an assisted living facility.

Laurine wanted to regain her independence, so she took advantage of services from the Cleveland Sight Center, a nonprofit organization providing vision rehabilitation.

She had orientation and mobility training, and relied on Susie Meles, a vision rehabilitation specialist, to learn how to cook her own meals, do her laundry, and even sew.

Today, Laurine is living happily and independently in Strongsville, OH.

There is also the story of Nicole, a 32-year-old from Ohio.

Nicole has been totally blind since she was 2 years old.

Like Laurine, she came to rely on the orientation and mobility specialists and vision rehabilitation therapists at the Cleveland Sight Center for help learning how to travel to school and later to work, how to read Braille, and how to use special computer software and adaptive aids.

Today, Nicole is a self-employed music therapist living with her husband in South Euclid, OH.

These are two of the many success stories produced every year at the Cleveland Sight Center.

However, the work of the Cleveland Sight Center and other vision rehabilitation organizations across the country is hindered by a lack of reliable funding.

Clients are often unable to pay for the services themselves. And while some disability and workers' compensation insurance policies cover the costs, very few health insurance policies do.

Public insurers like Medicare and Medicaid do not reimburse for vision rehabilitation services when they are performed by a vision rehabilitation specialist, despite the fact that they are accredited by the Academy for Certification of Vision Rehabilitation and Education Professionals, a national body.

Medicare is currently testing a low-vision demonstration project in four States and two cities that allows vision rehabilitation professionals to be reimbursed for their services when supervised by a physician.

I am hopeful that this demo will illuminate the importance of making vision rehabilitation services—and the diagnostic evaluations by optometrists and ophthalmologists that prompt it—a guaranteed Medicare benefit.

I am also supportive of including vision rehabilitation services in the health plans that will be offered in the new exchange set up by the health reform bill.

These are long-term goals. As an original member of the Congressional

Vision Caucus, I realize that we will not achieve all of these objectives overnight. But I know supporting the work of vision rehabilitation practitioners and providers like the Cleveland Sight Center is the right thing to do. And I am confident that we will succeed.

NEGRO LEAGUES BASEBALL MUSEUM'S 20TH ANNIVERSARY

Mrs. McCASKILL. Mr. President, I ask the Senate to join me in honoring the 20th anniversary of the Negro Leagues Baseball Museum in Kansas City, MO.

This Friday's Legacy Awards, honoring Major League Baseball's brightest stars, kicks off what promises to be a season's worth of events marking the 90th year of the establishment of the Negro Leagues, and the 20th anniversary of the Negro Leagues Baseball Museum. As a Missourian, I am proud that Kansas City is home to what is not only a local jewel but a National treasure which honors the Negro Leagues, its legendary players, and its place in the American civil rights movement.

In 1920, Andrew ''Rube'' Foster established the Negro Leagues at the Paseo YMCA in Kansas City. The Leagues flourished from 1920 through well into the 1950s. Once forward-thinking baseball executives signed such standout African-American players as Jackie Robinson and Roy Campanella, interest in the Negro Leagues began to wane. By 1960, as the civil rights movement gained momentum and the best players found their rightful place in the Major Leagues, the Negro Leagues finally folded.

In its heyday, the Negro Leagues was a firmly entrenched and beloved part of African-American culture in Kansas City and throughout the upper Midwest, Northeast, and Southern regions of the United States. The museum's Bob Kendrick tells us that many ministers would start church services early on Sundays when the Kansas City Monarchs had a home game on the calendar. Men, women, and children would leave right after church just in time to get to the ballpark, dressed in their Sunday finest, to watch the game. It was the highest level of competition, and players like ''Cool Papa'' Bell, ''Satchel'' Paige, and Josh Gibson always made the game exciting.

Kansas City's beloved Buck O'Neil, a former Negro Leagues player, Monarchs' manager and Major League Baseball's first African-American coach, helped establish the Negro Leagues Baseball Museum in 1990. Back then it was a tiny one-room office in the historic 18th & Vine District in Kansas City. Its mission—the same as it is today—was to preserve and celebrate the history of African-American baseball.

As chairman of the board, Buck O'Neil and his crew took the job seriously, working hard to raise money, acquire what curator Dr. Raymond Doswell has turned into an amazing collection of original memorabilia, and bring worldwide attention to the museum. By 1997, the museum was robust enough to move into its current 10,000 square foot home at 18th & Vine, where today the story of the Negro Leagues comes to life through its exhibits.

Over time, the museum has had the privilege of welcoming visitors from around the world, and such dignitaries as U.S. Presidents Bill Clinton and George W. Bush. The museum's National Advisory Board is flush with prominent individuals from the worlds of sports, politics, and the media, all of whom have come to recognize the important role the Museum plays in telling the story of civil rights, sports, and culture in 20th century America. George Will, Ernie Banks, Colin Powell, Lou Brock, former U.S. Senator Alan Simpson, and noted documentary producer Ken Burns are all members of this amazing group of supporters.

In many ways this museum is Buck O'Neil's legacy. Buck, 94 years young at the time of his death in 2006, left a permanent inspirational mark on the game of baseball and all who were fortunate enough to have crossed his trailblazing path. Kansas City—and America—are fortunate to call him our own.

On this the 20th anniversary of the Negro Leagues Baseball Museum, I ask that we pause for a moment to pay tribute not only to Buck O'Neil, but to the many unsung African-American baseball heroes who helped the Negro Leagues flourish until the better instincts of baseball executives ultimately made the need for such a league obsolete. This remarkable chapter of American history will be preserved forever thanks to the Negro Leagues Baseball Museum.

Mr. President, I ask that the Senate join me in recognizing the 20th anniversary of the Negro Leagues Baseball Museum, a truly American treasure.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 4:26 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 2949. An act to amend section 1113 of the Social Security Act to provide authority for increased fiscal year 2010 payments for temporary assistance to United States citizens returned from foreign countries, to provide necessary funding to avoid shortfalls in the Medicare cost-sharing program for low-income qualifying individuals, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–4430. A communication from the Administrator, Risk Management Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''General Administrative Regulations; Subpart X—Interpretations of Statutory and Regulatory Provisions'' (7 CFR Part 400) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 4, 2010; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–4431. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Review Group, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Daily Economic Loss Assistance Payment Program'' (RIN0560–AI07) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 4, 2010; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–4432. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an Executive Order issued on January 16, 2010 relative to the augmentation of the active Armed Forces for the effective conduct of operational missions, including those involving humanitarian assistance, related to relief efforts in Haiti necessitated by the earthquake on January 12, 2010; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–4433. A communication from the Assistant to the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Home Mortgage Disclosure'' (Docket No. 1379) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 23, 2009; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4434. A communication from the Deputy Secretary, Division of Investment Management, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Custody of Funds or Securities of Clients by Investment Advisers'' (RIN3235–AK32) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 4, 2010; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4435. A communication from the Secretary, Division of Investment Management, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Temporary Rule Regarding Principal Trades with Certain Advisory Clients'' (RIN3235–AJ96) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 4, 2010; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4436. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 12947 with respect to terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4437. A communication from the General Counsel of the National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''National Credit Union Share Insurance Fund Premium and One Percent Deposit'' (RIN3133–AD63) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2010; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4438. A communication from the General Counsel of the National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Organization and Operations of Federal Credit Unions; Underserved Areas (IRPS 08–2)'' (RIN3133–AD48) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2010; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4439. A communication from the General Counsel of the National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Prompt Corrective Action; Amended Definition of Post-Merger Net Worth'' (RIN3133–AD43) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2010; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4440. A communication from the Assistant to the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Risk-Based Capital Guidelines; Capital Adequacy Guidelines; Capital Maintenance: Regulatory Capital; Impact of Modifications to Generally Accepted Accounting Principles; Consolidation of Asset-Backed Commercial Paper Programs; and Other Related Issues'' (Docket No. R–1368) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 12, 2010; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4441. A communication from the Deputy Secretary, Division of Corporation Finance, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Shareholder Approval of Executive Compensation of TARP Recipients'' (RIN3235–AK31) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 12, 2010; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4442. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Housing—Federal Housing Commissioner, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''HOPE for Homeowners Program; Statutory Transfer of Program Authority to HUD and Conforming Amendments to Adopt Recently Enacted Statutory Charges'' (RIN2502–AI76) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 21, 2010; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4443. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Suspension of Community Eligibility'' ((44 CFR Part 64)(Docket No. FEMA–8107)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 21, 2010; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4444. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Suspension of Community Eligibility'' ((44 CFR Part 64)(Docket No. FEMA–8103)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 21, 2010; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4445. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Final Flood Elevation Determinations'' ((44 CFR Part 67)(Docket No. FEMA–2008–0020)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 21, 2010; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4446. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations'' ((44 CFR Part 65)(Docket No. FEMA–2008–0020)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 21, 2010; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4447. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Final Flood Elevation Determinations'' ((44 CFR Part 67)(Docket No. FEMA–2008–0020)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 21, 2010; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4448. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Criminal and Civil Penalties Under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act'' ((44 CFR Part 206)(Docket No. FEMA–2009–0007)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 21, 2010; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4449. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Department's 2010 Report on Foreign Policy-Based Export Controls; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4450. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to transactions involving U.S. exports to Israel; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4451. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to final cost and performance goals for coal-based technologies; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–4452. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''The Effect of Private Wire Laws on Development of Combined Heat and Power Facilities''; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–4453. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Electric Reliability Organization Revised Mandatory Reliability Standards for Interchange Scheduling and Coordination'' (Docket No. RM09–8–000) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 4, 2010; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–4454. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Regulations; Areas of the National Park System; Yellowstone National Park, Winter Use'' (RIN1024–AD73) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 4, 2010; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–4455. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Regulations; Areas of the National Park System; Grand Teton National Park, John D. Rockefeller, Jr. Memorial Parkway, Winter Use'' (RIN1024–AD82) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 4, 2010; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–4456. A communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report related to the Colorado River System Reservoirs for calendar year 2010; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–4457. A communication from the Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Removal of the Brown Pelican (Pelecanus occidentalis) From the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife'' (RIN1018–AV28) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 20, 2010; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4458. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulations, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Alternate Fracture Toughness Requirements for Protection Against Pressurized Thermal Shock Events'' (RIN3150–AI01) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 20, 2010; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4459. A communication from the Federal Register Certifying Officer, Financial Management Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Offset of Tax Refund Payments to Collect Past-Due, Legally Enforceable Nontax Debt'' (RIN1510–AB20) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 23, 2009; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–4460. A communication from the Federal Register Certifying Officer, Financial Management Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Debt Collection Authorities under the Debt Collection Improvement Act of 1996'' (RIN1510–AB19) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 23, 2009; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–4461. A communication from the Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Administration's processing of continuing disability reviews for fiscal year 2008; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–4462. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''2010 Section 1274A CPI Adjustments'' (Rev. Rul. 2010–2) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2010; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–4463. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Extension of Temporary Rules Allowing Issuers to Purchase and Hold Their Own Tax-Exempt Bonds'' (Rev. Rul. 2010–7) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2010; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–4464. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''LIFFE 1256(g)(7)(C) Qualified Board or Exchange'' (Rev. Rul. 2010–3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2010; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–4465. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Applicable Federal Rates—January 2010'' (Rev. Rul. 2010–1) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2010; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–4466. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Section 305 Treatment of a Stock Distribution by a Publicly Traded Regulated Investment Company or Real Estate Investment Trust in Which the Shareholders have an Election to Receive Money or Stock, Subject to an Aggregate Limitation on the Amount of Money to be Distributed'' (Revenue Procedure 2010–12) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2010; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–4467. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Notice Delaying the Effective Date of Revenue Ruling 2006–57'' (Notice 2009–95) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2010; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–4468. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Extension of Temporary Suspension of AHYDO Rules'' (Notice 2010–11) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2010; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–4469. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Use of Controlled Corporations to Avoid the Application of Section 304'' ((RIN1545–BI14)(TD9477)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2010; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–4470. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Extension of Notice 2008–55'' (Notice 2010–3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2010; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–4471. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Apportionment of Tax Items among the Members of a Controlled Group of Corporations'' (TD9476) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2010; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–4472. A communication from the Writer/Editor, Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safe Harbor Procedures for Employers Who Receive a No-Match Letter: Rescission'' (RIN1653–AA59) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 15, 2010; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–4473. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to loan guarantees to Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4474. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2010–0001—2010–0014); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4475. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2010–0224–2010–0232); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4476. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Interim Final Requirements for School Improvement Grants'' (RIN1810–AB06) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 20, 2010; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–4477. A communication from the Acting Director, Legislative and Regulatory Department, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Valuation of Benefits and Assets; Expected Retirement Age'' (29 CFR Part 4044) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 4, 2010; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–4478. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Definition of ''Plan Assets''—Participant Contributions'' (RIN1210–AB02) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 12, 2010; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–4479. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Administration and Management, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report relative to the Department's competitive sourcing efforts during fiscal year 2009; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–4480. A communication from the Office Manager, Office of the National Coordinator for HIT, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Health Information Technology: Initial Set of Standards, Implementation Specifications, and Certification, Criteria for Electronic Health Record Technology'' (RIN0991–AB58) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 12, 2010; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–4481. A communication from the Secretary, Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a performance report to the President and the Congress for the Prescription Drug User Fee Act; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–4482. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Head Start Impact Study Final Report—January 2010''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–4483. A communication from the Chief of the Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Remote Location Filing'' (RIN1505–AB20) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2010; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4484. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18–255, ''Fiscal Year 2010 Budget Support Act of 2009''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4485. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18–263, ''Public Land Surplus Standards Amendment''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4486. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18–264, ''Fire Alarm Notice and Tenant Fire Safety Amendment Act of 2009''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4487. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18–265, ''Whistleblower Protection Amendment Act of 2009''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4488. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18–266, ''Prescription Drug Dispensing Practices Reform Act of 2009''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4489. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18–267, ''Disclosure of Information to the Council Amendment Act of 2009''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4490. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18–268, ''Fiscal Year 2010 Limited Grant-Making Authority Clarification Temporary Act of 2009''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4491. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18–269, ''African American Civil War Memorial Freedom Foundation, Inc. African-American Civil War Museum Approval Temporary Act of 2009''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4492. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18–270, ''Retirement Incentive Temporary Amendment Act of 2009''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4493. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report

on D.C. Act 18–271, ''Fiscal Year 2010 Income Tax Secured Revenue Bond and General Obligation Bond Issuance Temporary Approval Act of 2009''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4494. A communication from the Auditor of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''District's Earmark Process Needs Improvement''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4495. A communication from the General Counsel, Government Accountability Office, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the number of federal agencies that did not fully implement a recommendation made by the Office in response to a bid protest during fiscal year 2009; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4496. A communication from the Chief Privacy Officer, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''2009 Report to Congress on Data Mining Technology and Policy''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4497. A communication from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semi-Annual Report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1, 2009 through September 30, 2009; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4498. A communication from the President's Pay Agent, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on locality-based comparability payments; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4499. A communication from the Deputy Chief of the Regulatory Management Division, Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Naturalization for Certain Persons in the U.S. Armed Forces'' (RIN1615–AB85) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2010; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–4500. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law an annual report relative to military and overseas voters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–4501. A communication from the Chief of the Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled '''Imported Directly' Requirement Under the United States-Bahrain Free Trade Agreement'' (RIN1505–AC13) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2010; to the Committee on Finance.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BURR (for himself, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. WEBB):

S. 2951. A bill to authorize funding to protect and conserve lands contiguous with the Blue Ridge Parkway to serve the public, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. FRANKEN:

S. 2952. A bill to establish funds to rapidly create new jobs in the private and public sector; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. WEBB (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 2953. A bill to modify the boundary of Petersburg National Battlefield in the Commonwealth of Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MENENDEZ:

S. 2954. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to apply the ban on contributions and expenditures by foreign nationals to domestic corporation which are owned or controlled by foreign principals; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. FEINGOLD:

S. 2955. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a temporary payroll increase tax credit for certain employers; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 2956. A bill to authorize the Pechanga Band of Luiseno Mission Indians Water Rights Settlement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LEMIEUX:

S. 2957. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to temporarily reduce payroll taxes of employees and employers by one-half, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BOND, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. BURR, Mr. BURRIS, Mr. BYRD, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. COBURN, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. DODD, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. GREGG, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HATCH, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KAUFMAN, Mr. KERRY, Mr. KIRK, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. KOHL, Mr. KYL, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEMIEUX, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. SPECTER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. VITTER, Mr. VOINOVICH, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WEBB, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. Res. 397. A resolution relative to the death of Charles McCurdy (''Mac'') Mathias, Jr., former United States Senator for the State of Maryland; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. REID:

S. Res. 398. A resolution to authorize representation by the Senate Legal Counsel in the case of Schonberg, et al. v. Sanders, et al; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. ENSIGN (for himself and Mr. REID):

S. Res. 399. A resolution honoring the heroic actions of Court Security Officer Stanley Cooper, Deputy United States Marshal Richard J. ''Joe'' Gardner, the law enforcement officers of the United States Marshals Service and Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, and the Court Security Officers in responding to the armed assault at the Lloyd D. George Federal Courthouse on January 4, 2010; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BURRIS (for himself and Mr. DURBIN):

S. Con. Res. 49. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that a commemorative postage stamp should be issued to honor the life of Elijah Parish Lovejoy; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 259

At the request of Mr. BOND, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 259, a bill to establish a grant program to provide vision care to children, and for other purposes.

S. 619

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 619, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to preserve the effectiveness of medically important antibiotics used in the treatment of human and animal diseases.

S. 694

At the request of Mr. DODD, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 694, a bill to provide assistance to Best Buddies to support the expansion and development of mentoring programs, and for other purposes.

S. 781

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 781, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for collegiate housing and infrastructure grants.

S. 1121

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1121, a bill to amend part D of title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide grants for the repair, renovation, and construction of elementary and secondary schools, including early learning facilities at the elementary schools.

S. 1179

At the request of Mr. ENSIGN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1179, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit taking minors across State lines in circumvention of laws requiring the involvement of parents in abortion decisions.

S. 1203

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from Minnesota

(Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1203, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the research credit through 2010 and to increase and make permanent the alternative simplified research credit, and for other purposes.

S. 1389

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1389, a bill to clarify the exemption for certain annuity contracts and insurance policies from Federal regulation under the Securities Act of 1933.

S. 1535

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1535, a bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 to establish additional prohibitions on shooting wildlife from aircraft, and for other purposes.

S. 1553

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1553, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the National Future Farmers of America Organization and the 85th anniversary of the founding of the National Future Farmers of America Organization.

S. 1610

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. LEMIEUX) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1610, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the shipping investment withdrawal rules in section 955 and to provide an incentive to reinvest foreign shipping earnings in the United States.

S. 1789

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WEBB) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1789, a bill to restore fairness to Federal cocaine sentencing.

S. 2727

At the request of Mr. BYRD, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2727, a bill to provide for continued application of arrangements under the Protocol on Inspections and Continuous Monitoring Activities Relating to the Treaty Between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms in the period following the Protocol's termination on December 5, 2009.

S. 2946

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2946, a bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to take action with respect to the Chicago waterway system to prevent the migration of bighead and silver carps into Lake Michigan, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 26

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. ENSIGN) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 26, a joint resolution disapproving a rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to the endangerment finding and the cause or contribute findings for greenhouse gases under section 202(a) of the Clean Air Act.

S. RES. 373

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 373, a resolution designating the month of February 2010 as ''National Teen Dating Violence Awareness and Prevention Month''.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. FRANKEN:

S. 2952. A bill to establish funds to rapidly create new jobs in the private and public sector; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, today I want to talk about jobs. Lately it seems that everyone says they want to talk about jobs and that we will get around to tackling jobs next week or the week after. I would like to kick off the discussion today, right now, and follow it up with what I plan to do about jobs. I would not be the first to observe that times are tough right now. Our Nation is still reeling from the most disastrous economic collapse in a generation. Failed regulatory policies—or really, just deregulation—bad lending practices, and Wall Street recklessness all contributed to the current crisis, double-digit unemployment for the first time in 25 years. Millions of American families are relying on their unemployment benefits to put food on the table and to pay their rent. Some are looking down at their final unemployment check, wondering what they are going to do next. For every single job opening, there are six unemployed workers. Too many people are left without options or hope in this dismal job market.

In the fall of 2008, when Wall Street's financial institutions started falling like dominos, our regulators told us: Congress has to pass TARP now or we face total economic ruin. This seemed to get Congress moving. It passed legislation in a matter of days. My feeling is that the American people, especially those folks out of work, need their advocates to say: We have to do this now. Every Senator who has heard from their constituents about the depressing job market, about the day-to-day struggles of being unemployed, should be on the floor insisting that we act now; that if we don't act now and act boldly and broadly, Main Street will continue to suffer, and that this unemployment crisis we are in will drag on and on.

The House has already acted. They passed a robust jobs package last December that provided needed funds to States and localities to keep teachers, firefighters, and police officers on the job. It provided funds for public infrastructure projects. These are all vital elements to a successful jobs creation package.

In addition to these fundamentals, the Senate has the opportunity to put forward new ideas for job creation. Today I am introducing my proposal, the SEED Act, Strengthening our Economy through Employment Development, SEED. We have seen Cash for Clunkers. We have talked about Cash for Caulkers. Now I am proposing cash for jobs. The SEED Act is modeled after a program we used for several years in Minnesota during the recession of the 1980s. By all accounts, it was extremely successful. Minnesota's program got over 7,400 people back to work in its first 6 months and created nearly 15,000 permanent, long-term jobs. It did that at a much lower cost per job than the stimulus package this body passed last year.

The SEED Act will incentivize rapid job creation by offering small and medium-size companies and nonprofits a direct wage subsidy to hire new workers and expand their operations. Small businesses are the driving force behind our economy. We all know that. They want to grow. But many of them need an added infusion of capital since TARP hasn't trickled down to them. Administered on a first-come-first-serve basis, these subsidies will provide 50 percent of wages of newly hired workers and will be disbursed through the already existing Workforce Investment Act system. Using this existing system will minimize the bureaucracy that plagues so many new initiatives. Additionally, employers who hire recently returned Iraq and Afghanistan vets would be eligible for a 60-percent subsidy. The subsidy would be available for a 12-month period, and the employer would commit to keeping the worker on for an additional 3 months after the subsidized year.

This model proved highly effective and efficient in Minnesota. Jim Glowacki is one of my constituents. He used Minnesota's program in the 1980s. After he lost his job, he decided to start his own business. He had few resources and little ability to borrow money. He used Minnesota's program, which was called MEED, to hire his first two employees. Now his company, the JPG Group, employs 17 full-time workers and has an annual payroll of over $800,000. His story epitomizes the incredible potential for this approach to spur job creation.

The second component of the SEED Act is to direct grants to States, localities, and tribes to fund green jobs; Providing funds to retrofit public buildings. In addition to creating green jobs, these retrofits will increase energy efficiency, decreasing our dependence on foreign oil and saving taxpayers money. These are public buildings. Too many of our public buildings, public housing, libraries, and schools are becoming outdated and don't utilize the green technologies available

today. There are many skilled workers currently on the bench who already have the training they need to immediately get to work on these projects. These new projects will increase demand for energy-efficient windows and doors and heating systems and insulation, providing a boost to our Nation's stalled manufacturing sector. Some of you may not know this, but Minnesota is the Silicon Valley of windows. We are home to the Nation's leaders in energy-efficient windows which makes some sense given our winters. Retrofitting public buildings is a win for everyone—for workers, localities, taxpayers, manufacturing, and the environment. This is a win-win-win-win-win, I think. Windows, too. If we reallocate $10 billion from the TARP program and pass this proposal into law, we have the potential of creating up to 500,000 jobs, and quickly.

Getting people back to work will ease the burden on public benefit programs like such as employment and COBRA subsidies. Many employers will convert their participating workers into permanent employees, setting them up for a long-term career. Minnesotans have stressed to me how efficiently this program worked in our State and that it provides an excellent return on investment. They have worked tirelessly to demonstrate the benefits of this type of bold proposal. I thank them for collaborating with me on this important piece of legislation. More than 50 Minnesota organizations, companies, and chambers of commerce have come out in support.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a list of these organizations.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The following Minnesota organizations support the SEED Act:

Northwest Private Industry Council; Rural Minnesota CEP Workforce Council; Northeast MN Workforce Council; Duluth Workforce Council; Central MN Workforce Council; Southwest MN Workforce Council; South Central Workforce Council; Southeast Minnesota Workforce Development Board; Hennepin-Carver Workforce Council; Minneapolis Private Industry/Workforce Council; Anoka County Workforce Council; Dakota-Scott County Workforce Council; Ramsey County Workforce Solutions; Washington County Workforce Investment Board; Stearns-Benton Employment & Training Council; Winona County Workforce Council; Minnesota Hmong Chamber of Commerce; Minnesota Black Chamber of Commerce; JPG Group; VAST Enterprises, LLC.

A Minnesota Without Poverty; Accessability, Inc.; Anoka County Human Services Job Training Center; Anne Marie's Alliance, St. Cloud; Anoka County Community Action Program; Arrowhead Economic Opportunity Agency; Children's Defense Fund–MN; CLASP; Department of Social Work, Augsburg College; Employment Action Center; Joint Religious Legislative Coalition; Heartland Community Action Agency; HIRED; Kootasca Community Action; Lifetrack Resources; L.I.F.T. To End Poverty; Minnesota Community Action Partnership; NASW–Minnesota (National Association of Social Workers); Northwest Community Action; Otter Tail–Wadena Community Action Council.

Project for Pride in Living; Sabathani Community Center; Southwestern Minnesota Opportunity Council; The Arc of Minnesota; Three Rivers Community Action; Twin Cities Community VoiceMail; Goodwill EasterSeals of Minnesota; YWCA Saint Paul; Greater Minneapolis Council of Churches; Minnesota FoodShare; JOBS NOW Coalition.

Mr. FRANKEN. I urge my colleagues to join me in quickly moving forward on a bill to put Americans back to work. I urge them to join me in support of the SEED Act, Strengthening our Economy through Employment and Development.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2952

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 ''Strengthening Our Economy Through Employment and Development Act''.

SEC. 2. USE OF UNEXPENDED AND REPAID FUNDS OF THE TROUBLED ASSET RELIEF PROGRAM.

Of the amounts made available to the Secretary of the Treasury under section 115 of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 (12 U.S.C. 5225) that are unobligated as of the date of enactment of this Act and of all assistance received under title I of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 (12 U.S.C. 5211 et seq.) that is repaid on or after the date of enactment of this Act, $10,000,000,000 shall be made available to carry out the Private Sector Wage Subsidy Fund under section 3 and the Public Sector Energy Efficiency Promotion Fund under section 4.

SEC. 3. PRIVATE SECTOR WAGE SUBSIDY FUND.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund, to be known as the ''Private Sector Wage Subsidy Fund'' (referred to in this section as the ''Fund''), consisting of $5,000,0000,000 made available to the Fund under section 2, to enable small and medium sized businesses and nonprofit organizations to hire eligible workers who will receive wage subsidies pursuant to this section.

(b) ALLOCATION TO LOCAL AREAS AND ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Labor shall allocate to each local area, to carry out this section, an amount that bears the same relationship to the funds made available under this section for a fiscal year, as the sum of the amounts received under paragraph (2)(A) or (3) of section 133(b) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2863(b)) and under paragraph (2)(B) of that section by the local area for that fiscal year bears to the total of such sums received by all local areas for that fiscal year.

(2) LOCAL AREA.—In this section, the term ''local area'' has the meaning given the term in section 101 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2801).

(3) ADMINISTRATION BY LOCAL AREAS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Each local area that receives an amount under this section shall provide allocations to businesses and nonprofit organizations in the same manner as the local area provides allocations for on-the-job training subsidies under the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2801 et seq.), to the extent consistent with this section.

(B) ALLOCATIONS TO EMPLOYERS.—Each local area that receives an amount under this section shall provide allocations to businesses and nonprofit organizations through twice-monthly or monthly subsidy checks for the first 9 months. The allocation for months 10, 11, and 12 shall be withheld until the end of the 15th month, at which point the business or nonprofit organization shall verify that the eligible worker is still on the payroll and shall then receive a lump-sum reimbursement for months 10, 11, and 12.

(C) FLEXIBILITY.—A local area that receives an amount under this section may offer customized or variant subsidy arrangements with businesses and nonprofit organizations if 30 percent of the allocated funds have not been obligated by the local area within 6 months.

(c) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Allocation of amounts from the Fund to businesses and nonprofit organizations shall be—

(1) made available not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) administered on a first-come, first-serve basis to incentivize rapid job creation.

(d) ELIGIBILITY.—A business or nonprofit organization is eligible to receive an allocation from the Fund for wage subsidies if such business or organization employs fewer than 500 individuals.

(e) WAGE SUBSIDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Wage subsidies allocated under this section to businesses and nonprofit organizations to hire eligible workers shall be consistent with the following:

(A) 1-YEAR PERIOD.—A wage subsidy shall be provided for a 1-year period.

(B) AMOUNT.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clauses (ii) and (iii), a wage subsidy shall be—

(I) 50 percent of total wages; or

(II) $12 per hour,

whichever amount is less.

(ii) IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN VETERANS.—Except as provided in clause (iii), in the case of an individual who is a veteran of military service in Iraq or Afghanistan after September 11, 2001, a wage subsidy shall be—

(I) 60 percent of total wages; or

(II) $14.40 per hour,

whichever amount is less.

(iii) ADDITIONAL AMOUNT FOR EMPLOYERS THAT OFFER HEALTH INSURANCE.—Notwithstanding the subsidy maximum amounts provided under clauses (i) and (ii), a business or nonprofit organization that receives an allocation from the Fund for wage subsidies under this section and contributes to the cost of health insurance coverage for its employees shall receive an additional $1 per hour for each eligible worker hired pursuant to this section to help defray the cost of contributing to such coverage.

(C) JOB WAGE MINIMUM.—Except as provided in subparagraph (D), a job for which a wage subsidy is allocated under this section shall—

(i) pay not less than $10 per hour; or

(ii) start at $9 per hour with a certification from the business or nonprofit organization that the wage will be increased to not less than $10 per hour by the end of the subsidy period.

(D) MINIMUM WAGE REQUIREMENT.—If the locality in which a job for which a wage subsidy is allocated under this section is located has a minimum wage requirement that is more than $10 per hour, then such job shall pay not less than such minimum wage requirement.

(2) CERTIFICATION BY EMPLOYER.—A business or nonprofit organization that receives

an allocation from the Fund for wage subsidies under this section shall provide to the local area a certification that includes each of the following:

(A) The business or organization will hire the employees hired under the wage subsidy program for newly created positions not for vacancies in already existing positions.

(B) The business or organization will retain the employees hired under the wage subsidy program for not less than 15 months.

(C) The business or organization will not displace existing workers, or reduce the hours of existing workers, with the employees hired under the wage subsidy program.

(D) The business or organization will offer comparable wages and the same benefits to subsidized workers as comparable, existing workers.

(E) The business or organization will hire the worker for a minimum of 30 hours per week.

(F) If the business or nonprofit organization employs individuals represented by a labor organization, the business or nonprofit organization will obtain sign-off by the labor organization in coordination with the existing collective bargaining agreement.

(3) FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH CERTIFICATION.—The Secretary of Labor shall promulgate regulations regarding waivers of a business or nonprofit organization's obligation to retain an employee hired under the wage subsidy program for not less than 15 months.

(4) ELIGIBLE WORKERS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A business or nonprofit organization that receives an allocation from the Fund for wage subsidies under this section shall hire only eligible workers to receive such wage subsidies.

(B) ELIGIBLE WORKERS DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''eligible worker'' means an individual who—

(i) has exhausted the individual's State-funded unemployment insurance benefits (as verified by the State or local department of labor or similar entity); or

(ii) has been unemployed for not less than 6 months.

(f) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—Of the funds allocated to each local area under this section, not more than 10 percent may be used by the local areas for costs and expenses for administration, marketing, job placement, and program support services.

SEC. 4. PUBLIC SECTOR ENERGY EFFICIENCY PROMOTION FUND.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund, to be known as the ''Public Sector Energy Efficiency Promotion Fund'' (referred to in this section as the ''Fund''), consisting of such amounts as are made available to the Fund under section 2.

(b) GRANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On request by the Secretary of Energy (referred to in this section as the ''Secretary''), the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer from the Fund to the Secretary such amounts as the Secretary determines are necessary to distribute grants to States to provide funds to retrofit public buildings to increase energy efficiency.

(2) RESERVATION FOR INDIAN TRIBES.—The Secretary shall reserve 1 percent of amounts transferred under paragraph (1) to award grants to Indian tribes to carry out activities described in this section.

(c) ALLOCATION TO STATES.—Grants made available under this section shall be allocated to States in accordance with section 543(c) of the Energy Security and Independence Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17153(c)).

(d) DISTRIBUTION TO POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS.—A State that receives a grant under this section—

(1) may retain not more than 30 percent of the amount of the grant; and

(2) shall distribute the remainder of the grant to political subdivisions of the State through an application process.

(e) UNOBLIGATED FUNDS.—Any grant amounts not obligated by the date that is 1 year after the date of the receipt of the grant by the State or Indian tribe shall be—

(1) returned to the Treasury of the United States; and

(2) transferred to the Private Sector Wage Subsidy Fund established under section 3.

(f) USE OF FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), funds made available under this section may be used only—

(A) to retrofit public housing for increased energy efficiency;

(B) to retrofit public buildings, libraries, and schools for increased energy efficiency;

(C) to retrofit vacant or foreclosed homes for increased energy efficiency; or

(D) if there are not sufficient projects to carry out energy efficiency retrofits described in subparagraphs (A) through (C), to restore and refurbish public buildings.

(2) PRIORITY.—In using funds made available under this section, a State, political subdivision of a State, or Indian tribe shall give priority to projects that were identified by the State or Indian tribe before the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) ENERGY EFFICIENCY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Energy, in coordination with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, shall create standards for measurement and verification of energy efficiency in residential buildings, commercial buildings, and federally-funded housing facilities.

(B) ADMINISTRATION.—In creating the standards described in subparagraph (A), the Secretary of Energy shall include the following—

(i) the 2009 International Energy Conservation Code (IECC) or equivalent for residential buildings or the ASHRAE 90.1-2007 standard or equivalent for commercial buildings;

(ii) a maximum window U-factor of .30 and a maximum solar heat gain factor of .30 for both residential and commercial buildings;

(iii) certification of building energy and environment auditors, inspectors, and raters by the Residential Energy Services Network or an equivalent certification system, as determined by the Secretary;

(iv) certification or licensing of building energy and environmental retrofit contractors by the Building Performance Institute or an equivalent certification or licensing system, as determined by the Secretary;

(v) use of equipment and procedures of the Building Performance Institute, the Residential Energy Services Network, or other appropriate equipment and procedures (such as infrared photography and pressurized testing and tests for water use and indoor air quality), as determined by the Secretary, to test the energy and environmental efficiency of buildings effectively;

(vi) determination of energy savings in a performance-based building retrofit program through—

(I) in the case of residential buildings, comparison of before and after retrofit scores on the Home Energy Rating System Index, if the final score is produced by an objective third party, or compliance with 2009 IECC, as well as a maximum window U-factor of .30 and a maximum solar heat gain factor of .30;

(II) in the case of commercial buildings, benchmarks set by the Environmental Protection Agency, or compliance with the ASHRAE 90.1 2007 standard or equivalent, as well as a maximum window U-factor of .30 and a maximum solar heat gain factor of .30; and

(III) in the case of residential and commercial buildings, use of a program that is approved by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and subject to appropriate software standards and verification of at least 15 percent of all work completed;

(vii) suggested guidelines for using—

(I) the Energy Star portfolio manager;

(II) the Home Energy Rating System rating system;

(III) home performance improvements approved under the Energy Star program; and

(IV) any other tools associated with applicable retrofit programs; and

(viii) requirements, energy building codes, standards, or guidelines for renovation and postretrofit inspection and confirmation of work and energy savings.

(g) COMPETITIVE BIDDING.—Any project carried out under this section that requires an outside contractor shall be subject to a competitive bidding process.

(h) DAVIS-BACON COMPLIANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—All laborers and mechanics employed on projects funded directly by or assisted in whole or in part by this section, under any contractor or subcontractor, shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on projects of a character similar in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with subchapter IV of chapter 31 of title 40, United States Code.

(2) AUTHORITY.—With respect to the labor standards specified in this subsection, the Secretary of Labor shall have the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (64 Stat. 1267; 5 U.S.C. App.) and section 3145 of title 40, United States Code.

(i) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—Of the funds made available to carry out this section, not more than—

(1) 1 percent may be used by the Secretary of Energy for administrative costs; and

(2) 4 percent of funds may be used by States and Indian tribes that receive grants under this section for administrative costs.

SEC. 5. EVALUATION.

After the termination date described in section 6(a), the Secretary of Labor shall conduct an evaluation of job creation effectiveness of programs carried out with funds made available under this Act.

SEC. 6. SUNSET.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Private Sector Wage Subsidy Fund established under section 3, the Public Sector Energy Efficiency Promotion Fund established under section 4, and the authorization of amounts made available to carry out such Funds shall terminate on the date that is 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) AMOUNTS RETURNED TO TREASURY.—Any amounts that are in the Funds described in subsection (a) on the date of termination described in subsection (a) shall be returned to the Treasury of the United States.

By Mr. FEINGOLD:

S. 2955. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a temporary payroll increase tax credit for certain employers; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce legislation establishing a temporary jobs tax credit to help businesses expand their payroll here in the U.S. by hiring more employees, expanding work hours, or raising pay. The measure is modeled on a proposal by the Economic Policy Institute that would create an estimated 5 million jobs over the next two years.

As we should not undermine the long-term prospects of our economy for the sake of a short-term problem, the legislation is fully offset to ensure that over the next 10 years it will not increase the deficit.

Briefly, the legislation provides firms a tax credit of 15 percent of the increase in their eligible payroll in 2010, and 10 percent in 2011. Eligible payroll includes that portion of a firm's wages subject to Social Security taxes. For 2010 those are wages of $106,800 or less. Thus, pay hikes for very highly salaried workers would not be eligible for the tax credit.

The jobs tax credit is designed to avoid seasonal employment spikes by calculating it on a quarter over-year-ago-quarter basis. For example, wages for the first quarter of 2010 are compared with wages for the first quarter of 2009; wages for the third quarter of 2010 are compared with wages for the third quarter of 2009. To limit possible gaming of the credit the last quarter of 2010 would be measured against the last quarter of 2008, rather than 2009.

Only increased wages for employees here in the U.S. would be eligible for the credit.

President Obama was handed the worst economy since the Great Depression. While he has taken significant steps to turn the economy around, employment continues to be a problem.

The official unemployment rate is a tragically high 10 percent. But even that high level understates the true employment picture, for if one adds in the millions of people working part-time who want full-time employment, and the millions more who are discouraged and have given up looking for work, the rate is 17.3 percent, one of the highest levels since 1994.

We must take steps to help businesses put people back to work and this bill will do that.

No tax credit can be perfectly targeted. Any tax incentive we provide firms will provide some businesses with a windfall for behaving in ways they would have anyway, but a recent report by the Congressional Budget Office on various policy options to spur employment found that a tax break similar to this proposal would be among the most efficient and effective policies we could enact. The CBO report estimated a similar jobs tax credit would boost Gross Domestic Product by as much as $1.30 for every dollar spent, and would increase employment by as much as 18 net full-time equivalent jobs for every million dollars invested through the credit. In laying out the jobs tax credit proposal on which this measure is based, the Economic Policy Institute projected an increase of more than 5 million jobs over the next 2 years.

As I noted earlier, it is essential that we not aggravate the long-term problems facing our economy, and for that reason my legislation includes provisions that will offset the estimated cost of the jobs tax credit, which the Economic Policy Institute estimates to be $27 billion. Specifically, the proposal includes provisions originally proposed by the Senator from Michigan, Mr. LEVIN, in S. 506, the Stop Tax Haven Abuse Act.

Under the leadership of Senator LEVIN, the Homeland Security Committee's Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations found that offshore tax evasion costs the taxpayers of this country an estimated one hundred billion dollars every year. Because of this abuse, ordinary taxpayers are bearing more than their fair share of the cost of their government, and our children and grandchildren will be paying an even bigger bill for the increased deficits and debt that result from this practice.

The legislation Senator LEVIN developed as a result of his Subcommittee's work would go a long way to shutting down this abuse, and I am pleased to include it in a measure to help firms put people back to work.

The economic pain caused by the current recession is real. More than fifteen million people are considered officially unemployed today, and if we include those who want to work more hours and those who have given up looking for work, that number rises to over 26 million. As we know, losing one's job means more than losing income. It is one of the most traumatic events we can experience, and can be devastating for the millions of families that have been affected.

We must take action to address this employment crisis. As the Senate begins to debate possible responses, a jobs tax credit should be at the top of the proposals we consider. While the precise terms of such a credit can be debated, the need for it is clear.

I urge my colleagues to support this approach.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 2956. A bill to authorize the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Mission Indians Water Rights Settlement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Mission Indians Water Rights Settlement Act. This legislation will implement a settlement concerning the water rights of the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Mission Indians, who have been engaged for several decades in a struggle for recognition and protection of their federally reserved groundwater rights.

Since 1951, the Pechanga have been involved in litigation initiated by the U.S. concerning water rights in the Santa Margarita watershed. The Pechanga's interest has been in protecting their groundwater supplies, which are shared with municipal developments in the San Diego region. Beginning in 2006, the Pechanga worked with local water districts to negotiate a cooperative solution and put an end to their dispute.

The Pechanga Settlement Agreement is a comprehensive agreement negotiated among the Pechanga, the U.S. on their behalf, and several California water districts, including the Rancho California Water District and Eastern Municipal Water District. The settlement recognizes the Pechanga's tribal water right to 4994 acre-feet of water per year and outlines a series of measures to guarantee this amount. It is a win-win solution that protects the rights of the Pechanga while ensuring that other communities in Southern California will also have sufficient water supplies.

I am pleased to be joined by Senator FEINSTEIN in introducing this legislation. We have worked with our colleagues in the House, including Representatives BONO MACK, GRIJALVA, RICHARDSON, CALVERT, BACA, and ISSA, to craft this legislation. Our bill not only provides the Pechanga with long-overdue assurances of their water rights, but also exemplifies all the good that can be accomplished when parties put aside their differences and come to the table to negotiate a reasonable solution.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 397—RELATIVE TO THE DEATH OF CHARLES McCURDY (''MAC'') MATHIAS, JR., FORMER UNITED STATES SENATOR FOR THE STATE OF MARYLAND

Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BOND, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. BURR, Mr. BURRIS, Mr. BYRD, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. COBURN, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. DODD, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. GREGG, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HATCH, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KAUFMAN, Mr. KERRY, Mr. KIRK, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. KOHL, Mr. KYL, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEMIEUX, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. SPECTER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. VITTER, Mr. VOINOVICH, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WEBB, Mr.

WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 397

Whereas Mac Mathias served in the United States Navy during World War II from 1942–1946 and was a captain in the Naval Reserve;

Whereas Mac Mathias served the state of Maryland as an assistant attorney general, a city attorney, a member of the Maryland House of Delegates, and as a member of the United States House of Representatives;

Whereas Mac Mathias was called the ''conscience of the Senate'' by Majority Leader Mike Mansfield;

Whereas Mac Mathias served the Senate as Chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration in the Ninety-seventh through Ninety-ninth Congresses and co-chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing in the Ninety-seventh and Ninety-ninth Congresses; and

Whereas Mac Mathias served the people of Maryland with distinction for 18 years in the United States Senate; Now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of the Honorable Charles McC. Mathias, Jr., former member of the United States Senate.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the Senate adjourns today, it stand adjourned as a further mark of respect to the memory of the Honorable Charles McC. Mathias, Jr.

SENATE RESOLUTION 398—TO AUTHORIZE REPRESENTATION BY THE SENATE LEGAL COUNSEL IN THE CASE OF SCHONBERG, ET AL. V. SANDERS, ET AL.

Mr. REID submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 398

Whereas, in the case of Schonberg, et al. v. Sanders, et al., Case No. 5:09–CV–534, pending in the United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida, plaintiffs have named as defendants five Senators; and

Whereas, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 704(a)(1) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C. §§ 1A288b(a) and 288c(a)(1), the Senate may direct its counsel to defend Members of the Senate in civil actions relating to their official responsibilities: Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate Legal Counsel is authorized to represent Senators Lieberman, Lincoln, McConnell, McCain, and Sanders in the case of Schonberg, et al. v. Sanders, et al.

SENATE RESOLUTION 399—HONORING THE HEROIC ACTIONS OF COURT SECURITY OFFICER STANLEY COOPER, DEPUTY UNITED STATES MARSHAL RICHARD J. ''JOE'' GARDNER, THE LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS OF THE UNITED STATES MARSHALS SERVICE AND LAS VEGAS METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT, AND THE COURT SECURITY OFFICERS IN RESPONDING TO THE ARMED ASSAULT AT THE LLOYD D. GEORGE FEDERAL COURTHOUSE ON JANUARY 4, 2010

Mr. ENSIGN (for himself and Mr. REID) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 399

Whereas on January 4, 2010, during an assault at the entrance of the Lloyd D. George Federal Courthouse in Las Vegas, Nevada, Court Security Officer Stanley Cooper was fatally wounded and died heroically in the line of duty while protecting the employees, occupants, and visitors of the courthouse;

Whereas Deputy United States Marshal Richard J. ''Joe'' Gardner was wounded in the line of duty while protecting the employees, occupants, and visitors of the courthouse;

Whereas the Court Security Officers and members of the United States Marshals Service and the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department acted swiftly and bravely to subdue the gunman and minimize risk and injury to the public; and

Whereas the heroic actions of Court Security Officer Stanley Cooper, Deputy United States Marshal Richard J. ''Joe'' Gardner, and the law enforcement officers who responded to the attack prevented additional harm to innocent bystanders: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commends the brave actions and quick thinking exhibited by Court Security Officer Stanley Cooper during the assault at the entrance of the Lloyd D. George Federal Courthouse on January 4, 2010;

(2) offers its deepest condolences to the family and friends of Court Security Officer Stanley Cooper, who valiantly gave his life in the line of duty;

(3) commends Deputy United States Marshal Richard J. ''Joe'' Gardner for his actions and bravery in responding to the assault;

(4) wishes Deputy United States Marshal Richard J. ''Joe'' Gardner a speedy recovery from the wounds he sustained in the line of duty; and

(5) applauds the Court Security Officers and members of the United States Marshals Service and Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department for their brave and courageous actions in responding to the assault at the Lloyd D. George Federal Courthouse.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 49—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT A COMMEMORATIVE POSTAGE STAMP SHOULD BE ISSUED TO HONOR THE LIFE OF ELIJAH PARISH LOVEJOY

Mr. BURRIS (for himself and Mr. DURBIN) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:

S. CON. RES. 49

Whereas Elijah Parish Lovejoy was an advocate for the abolition of slavery and, as editor of the St. Louis Observer, wrote a series of editorials in which he strongly condemned the practice of slavery and supported efforts toward emancipation;

Whereas after being forced to move his printing press across the Mississippi River to Alton, Illinois, Lovejoy became the Stated Clerk of the Presbytery in 1837 and the first pastor of the present-day College Avenue Presbyterian Church;

Whereas on the night of November 7, 1837, Lovejoy was killed by a pro-slavery mob while he attempted to defend his press, a machine that came to serve as a symbol for the abolition of slavery;

Whereas the murder of Lovejoy resulted in a great strengthening of abolitionist sentiment and is recognized as one of the key events that led to the Civil War;

Whereas Lovejoy gave his life in defense of freedom and equality, two traits that define America;

Whereas the Elijah P. Lovejoy Memorial asks that a postage stamp be issued to honor the life of Elijah Parish Lovejoy and to commemorate the 175th anniversary of his death: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States Postal Service should issue a postage stamp honoring the life of Elijah Parish Lovejoy and commemorating the 175th anniversary of his death; and

(2) the Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee should recommend to the Postmaster General that such a stamp be issued.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3308. Mr. SESSIONS (for himself, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. KYL, and Mr. GREGG) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3299 proposed by Mr. BAUCUS (for Mr. REID) to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 45, increasing the statutory limit on the public debt.

SA 3309. Mr. BROWNBACK (for himself, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. ENSIGN, and Mr. VITTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3299 proposed by Mr. BAUCUS (for Mr. REID) to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 45, supra.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3308. Mr. SESSIONS (for himself, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. KYL, and Mr. GREGG) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3299 proposed by Mr. BAUCUS (for Mr. REID) to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 45, increasing the statutory limit on the public debt; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _01. DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by inserting at the end the following:

''DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS

''SEC. 316. (a) DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that includes any provision that would cause the discretionary spending limits as set forth in this section to be exceeded.

''(b) LIMITS.—In this section, the term 'discretionary spending limits' has the following meaning subject to adjustments in subsection (c):

''(1) For fiscal year 2010—

''(A) for the defense category (budget function 050), $556,128,000,000 in budget authority; and

''(B) for the nondefense category, $526,122,000,000 in budget authority.

''(2) For fiscal year 2011—

''(A) for the defense category (budget function 050), $564,293,000,000 in budget authority; and

''(B) for the nondefense category, $529,662,000,000 in budget authority.

''(3) For fiscal year 2012—

''(A) for the defense category (budget function 050), $573,612,000,000 in budget authority; and

''(B) for the nondefense category, $533,232,000,000 in budget authority.

''(4) For fiscal year 2013—

''(A) for the defense category (budget function 050), $584,421,000,000 in budget authority; and

''(B) for the nondefense category, $540,834,000,000 in budget authority.

''(5) For fiscal year 2014—

''(A) for the defense category (budget function 050), $598,249,000,000 in budget authority; and

''(B) for the nondefense category, $550,509,000,000 in budget authority.

''(6) With respect to fiscal years following 2014, the President shall recommend and the Congress shall consider legislation setting limits for those fiscal years.

''(c) ADJUSTMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—After the reporting of a bill or joint resolution relating to any matter described in paragraph (2), or the offering of an amendment thereto or the submission of a conference report thereon—

''(A) the Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may adjust the discretionary spending limits, the budgetary aggregates in the concurrent resolution on the budget most recently adopted by the Senate and the House of Representatives, and allocations pursuant to section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, by the amount of new budget authority in that measure for that purpose and the outlays flowing there from; and

''(B) following any adjustment under subparagraph (A), the Senate Committee on Appropriations may report appropriately revised suballocations pursuant to section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to carry out this subsection.

''(2) MATTERS DESCRIBED.—Matters referred to in paragraph (1) are as follows:

''(A) OVERSEAS DEPLOYMENTS AND OTHER ACTIVITIES.—If a bill or joint resolution is reported making appropriations for fiscal year 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, or 2014, that provides funding for overseas deployments and other activities, the adjustment for purposes paragraph (1) shall be the amount of budget authority in that measure for that purpose but not to exceed—

''(i) with respect to fiscal year 2010, $130,000,000,000 in new budget authority;

''(ii) with respect to fiscal year 2011, $50,000,000,000 in new budget authority;

''(iii) with respect to fiscal year 2012, $50,000,000,000 in new budget authority;

''(iv) with respect to fiscal year 2013, $50,000,000,000 in new budget authority: and

''(v) with respect to fiscal year 2014, $50,000,000,000 in new budget authority.

''(B) EMERGENCY SPENDING.—For fiscal year 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, or 2014 for appropriations for discretionary accounts designated as emergency requirements, the adjustment for purposes of paragraph (1) shall be the total of such appropriations in discretionary accounts designated as emergency requirements, but not to exceed $10,350,000,000 for fiscal year 2010, $10,454,000,000 for 2011, $10,558,000,000 for 2012, $10,664,000,000 for 2013, and $10,877,000,000 for 2014. Appropriations designated as emergencies in excess of these limitations shall be treated as new budget authority.

''(C) INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE TAX ENFORCEMENT.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—If a bill or joint resolution is reported making appropriations for fiscal year 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, or 2014 that includes the amount described in clause (ii)(I), plus an additional amount for enhanced tax enforcement to address the Federal tax gap (taxes owed but not paid) described in clause (ii)(II), the adjustment for purposes of paragraph (1) shall be the amount of budget authority in that measure for that initiative not exceeding the amount specified in clause (ii)(II) for that fiscal year.

''(ii) AMOUNTS.—The amounts referred to in clause (i) are as follows:

''(I) For fiscal year 2010, $7,100,000,000, for fiscal year 2011, $7,171,000,000, for fiscal year 2012, $7,243,000,000, for fiscal year 2013, $7,315,000,000, and for fiscal year 2014, $7,461,000,000.

''(II) For fiscal year 2010, $890,000,000, for fiscal year 2011, $899,000,000, for fiscal year 2012, $908,000,000, for fiscal year 2013, $917,000,000, and for fiscal year 2014, $935,000,000.

''(D) CONTINUING DISABILITY REVIEWS AND SSI REDETERMINATIONS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—If a bill or joint resolution is reported making appropriations for fiscal year 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, or 2014 that includes the amount described in clause (ii)(I), plus an additional amount for Continuing Disability Reviews and Supplemental Security Income Redeterminations for the Social Security Administration described in clause (ii)(II), the adjustment for purposes of paragraph (1) shall be the amount of budget authority in that measure for that initiative not exceeding the amount specified in clause (ii)(II) for that fiscal year.

''(ii) AMOUNTS.—The amounts referred to in clause (i) are as follows:

''(I) For fiscal year 2010, $273,000,000; for fiscal year 2011, $276,000,000; for fiscal year 2012, $278,000,000; for fiscal year 2013, $281,000,000; for fiscal year 2014, $287,000,000.

''(II) For fiscal year 2010, $485,000,000; for fiscal year 2011, $490,000,000; for fiscal year 2012, $495,000,000; for fiscal year 2013, $500,000,000; for fiscal year 2014, $510,000,000.

''(iii) ASSET VERIFICATION.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—The additional appropriation permitted under clause (ii)(II) may also provide that a portion of that amount, not to exceed the amount specified in subclause (II) for that fiscal year instead may be used for asset verification for Supplemental Security Income recipients, but only if, and to the extent that the Office of the Chief Actuary estimates that the initiative would be at least as cost effective as the redeterminations of eligibility described in this subparagraph.

''(II) AMOUNTS.—For fiscal year 2010, $34,000,000, for fiscal year 2011, $34,340,000, for fiscal year 2012, $34,683,000, for fiscal year 2013, $35,030,000 and for fiscal year 2014, $35,731,000.

''(E) HEALTH CARE FRAUD AND ABUSE.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—If a bill or joint resolution is reported making appropriations for fiscal year 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, or 2014 that includes the amount described in clause (ii) for the Health Care Fraud and Abuse Control program at the Department of Health & Human Services for that fiscal year, the adjustment for purposes of paragraph (1) shall be the amount of budget authority in that measure for that initiative but not to exceed the amount described in clause (ii).

''(ii) AMOUNT.—The amount referred to in clause (i) is for fiscal year 2010, $311,000,000, for fiscal year 2011, $314,000,000, for fiscal year 2012, $317,000,000, for fiscal year 2013, $320,000,000, and for fiscal year 2014, $327,000,000.

''(F) UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE IMPROPER PAYMENT REVIEWS.—If a bill or joint resolution is reported making appropriations for fiscal year 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, or 2014 that includes $10,000,000, plus an additional amount for in-person reemployment and eligibility assessments and unemployment improper payment reviews for the Department of Labor, the adjustment for purposes paragraph (1) shall be the amount of budget authority in that measure for that initiative but not to exceed—

''(i) with respect to fiscal year 2010, $50,000,000 in new budget authority;

''(ii) with respect to fiscal year 2011, $51,000,000 in new budget authority; and

''(iii) with respect to fiscal year 2012, $51,000,000 in new budget authority.

''(iv) with respect to fiscal year 2013, $52,000,000 in new budget authority; and

''(v) with respect to fiscal year 2014, $53,000,000 in new budget authority.

''(G) LOW-INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (LIHEAP).—If a bill or joint resolution is reported making appropriations for fiscal year 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, or 2014 that includes $3,200,000,000 in funding for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program and provides an additional amount up to $1,900,000,000 for that program, the adjustment for purposes of paragraph (1) shall be the amount of budget authority in that measure for that initiative but not to exceed $1,900,000,000.

''(d) EMERGENCY SPENDING.—

''(1) AUTHORITY TO DESIGNATE.—In the Senate, with respect to a provision of direct spending or receipts legislation or appropriations for discretionary accounts that Congress designates as an emergency requirement in such measure, the amounts of new budget authority, outlays, and receipts in all fiscal years resulting from that provision shall be treated as an emergency requirement for the purpose of this subsection.

''(2) EXEMPTION OF EMERGENCY PROVISIONS.—Subject to the limitations provided in subsection (c)(2)(B), any new budget authority, outlays, and receipts resulting from any provision designated as an emergency requirement, pursuant to this subsection, in any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report shall not count for purposes of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress) (relating to pay-as-you-go), and section 311 of S. Con. Res. 70 (110th Congress) (relating to long-term deficits).

''(3) DESIGNATIONS.—If a provision of legislation is designated as an emergency requirement under this subsection, the committee report and any statement of managers accompanying that legislation shall include an explanation of the manner in which the provision meets the criteria in paragraph (6).

''(4) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection, the terms 'direct spending', 'receipts', and 'appropriations for discretionary accounts' mean any provision of a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that affects direct spending, receipts, or appropriations as those terms have been defined and interpreted for purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

''(5) POINT OF ORDER.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—When the Senate is considering a bill, resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report, if a point of order is made by a Senator against an emergency designation in that measure, that provision making such a designation shall be stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

''(B) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEALS.—

''(i) WAIVER.—Subparagraph (A) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

''(ii) APPEALS.—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this paragraph shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or joint resolution, as the case may be. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this paragraph.

''(C) DEFINITION OF AN EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), a provision shall be considered an emergency designation if it designates any item as an emergency requirement pursuant to this paragraph.

''(D) FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.—A point of order under subparagraph (A) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

''(E) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to this paragraph, and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report shall be deemed stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

''(6) CRITERIA.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subsection, any provision is an emergency requirement if the situation addressed by such provision is—

''(i) necessary, essential, or vital (not merely useful or beneficial);

''(ii) sudden, quickly coming into being, and not building up over time;

''(iii) an urgent, pressing, and compelling need requiring immediate action;

''(iv) subject to clause (ii), unforeseen, unpredictable, and unanticipated; and

''(v) not permanent, temporary in nature.

''(7) UNFORESEEN.—An emergency that is part of an aggregate level of anticipated emergencies, particularly when normally estimated in advance, is not unforeseen.

''(e) LIMITATIONS ON CHANGES TO EXEMPTIONS.—It shall not be in order in the Senate or the House of Representatives to consider any bill, resolution, amendment, or conference report that would exempt any new budget authority, outlays, and receipts from being counted for purposes of this section.

''(f) POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.—

''(1) WAIVER.—The provisions of this section shall be waived or suspended in the Senate only—

''(A) by the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn; or

''(B) in the case of the defense budget authority, if Congress declares war or authorizes the use of force.

''(2) APPEAL.—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this section shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the measure. An affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

''(3) LIMITATIONS ON CHANGES TO THIS SUBSECTION.—It shall not be in order in the Senate or the House of Representatives to consider any bill, resolution, amendment, or conference report that would repeal or otherwise change this subsection.''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents set forth in section 1(b) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 315 the following new item:

''Sec. 316. Discretionary spending limits.''.

SA 3309. Mr. BROWNBACK (for himself, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. ENSIGN, and Mr. VITTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3299 proposed by Mr. BAUCUS (for Mr. REID) to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 45, increasing the statutory limit on the public debt; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE II—COMMISSION ON CONGRESSIONAL BUDGETARY ACCOUNTABILITY AND REVIEW OF FEDERAL AGENCIES

SEC. 201. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) AGENCY.—The term ''agency'' means—

(A) an Executive agency, as defined under section 105 of title 5, United States Code; and

(B) the Executive Office of the President.

(2) CALENDAR DAY.—The term ''calendar day'' means a calendar day other than one on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 days to a date certain.

(3) COMMISSION BILL.—The term ''Commission bill'' means only a bill which is introduced as provided under section 206, and contains the proposed legislation included in the report submitted to Congress under section 203(b)(1), without modification.

(4) PROGRAM.—The term ''program'' means any activity or function of an agency.

SEC. 202. ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established the Commission on Congressional Budgetary Accountability and Review of Federal Agencies (referred to in this title as the ''Commission'').

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall consist of 8 members, of which, not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this title—

(A) 2 shall be appointed by the majority leader of the Senate;

(B) 2 shall be appointed by the minority leader of the Senate;

(C) 2 shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and

(D) 2 shall be appointed by the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

(2) COCHAIRPERSONS.—The majority leader of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall each designate a Cochairperson from among the members of the Commission.

(c) DATE.—Members of the Commission shall be appointed by not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this title.

(d) PERIOD OF APPOINTMENT; VACANCIES.—Members shall be appointed for the life of the Commission. Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(e) MEETINGS.—

(1) INITIAL MEETING.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which all members of the Commission have been appointed, the Commission shall hold its first meeting.

(2) SUBSEQUENT MEETINGS.—The Commission shall meet at the call of the Cochairpersons or a majority of its members.

(f) QUORUM.—Five members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum for purposes of voting, but a quorum is not required for members to meet and hold hearings.

SEC. 203. DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION.

(a) SYSTEMATIC ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAMS BY THE COMMISSION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this title, the Commission shall establish a systematic method for assessing the effectiveness and accountability of agency programs in accordance with paragraph (2) and divide the programs into 4 approximately equal budgetary parts based on the size of the budget and number of personnel of the agency program.

(2) METHOD OBJECTIVES.—The method established under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) recognize different types of Federal programs;

(B) assess programs based on the achievement of performance goals (as defined under section 1115(g)(4) of title 31, United States Code);

(C) assess programs based in part on the adequacy of the program's performance measures, financial management, and other factors;

(D) assess programs based in part on whether the program has fulfilled the legislative intent surrounding the creation of the program, taking into account any change in legislative intent during the program's existence; and

(E) assess programs based in part on collaborative analysis, with the program or agency, of program policy and goals which may not fit into easily measurable performance goals.

(b) EVALUATION, PLAN, AND LEGISLATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall—

(A) evaluate all agencies and programs within those agencies in each unit identified in the systemic assessment under subsection (a) (1 each year over the next 4 years), using the criteria under paragraph (4); and

(B) submit to Congress each of the next 4 years beginning January 1, 2011, with respect to each evaluation under subparagraph (A)—

(i) a plan with recommendations of the agencies and programs that should be realigned or eliminated within each part; and

(ii) proposed legislation to implement the plan described under clause (i).

(2) APPROVAL OF PLAN.—Any plan submitted under paragraph (1) shall be approved by an affirmative vote of at least 6 members of the Commission.

(3) RELOCATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.—The proposed legislation under paragraph (1) shall provide that if the position of an employee of an agency is eliminated as a result of the implementation of the plan under paragraph (1)(A), the affected agency shall make reasonable efforts to relocate such employee to another position within the agency or within another Federal agency.

(4) CRITERIA.—

(A) DUPLICATIVE.—If 2 or more agencies or programs are performing the same essential function and the function can be consolidated or streamlined into a single agency or

program, the Commission shall recommend that the agencies or programs be realigned.

(B) WASTEFUL OR INEFFICIENT.—The Commission may recommend the realignment or elimination of any agency or program that has wasted Federal funds by—

(i) egregious spending;

(ii) mismanagement of resources and personnel; or

(iii) use of such funds for personal benefit or the benefit of a special interest group.

(C) OUTDATED, IRRELEVANT, OR FAILED.—The Commission shall recommend the elimination of any agency or program that—

(i) has completed its intended purpose;

(ii) has become irrelevant; or

(iii) has failed to meet its objectives.

SEC. 204. POWERS OF THE COMMISSION.

(a) HEARINGS.—Subject to subsection (d), the Cochairpersons of the Commission may, for the purpose of carrying out this title—

(1) hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, receive such evidence, and administer such oaths as the Chairperson of the Commission considers advisable;

(2) require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses as the Chairperson of the Commission considers advisable; and

(3) require, by subpoena or otherwise, the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, documents, tapes, and other evidentiary materials relating to any matter under investigation by the Commission.

(b) SUBPOENAS.—

(1) ISSUANCE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A subpoena may be issued under this section only by the affirmative vote of 5 members of the Commission.

(B) SIGNATURES.—Subpoenas issued under this section may be—

(i) issued under the signatures of any 2 members of the Commission who are not members of the same political party; and

(ii) served by any person designated by the Cochairpersons or by a member designated by a majority of the Commission.

(2) ENFORCEMENT.—In the case of contumacy or failure to obey a subpoena issued under this section, the United States district court for the judicial district in which the subpoenaed person resides, is served, or may be found, may issue an order requiring such person to appear at any designated place to testify or to produce documentary or other evidence. Any failure to obey the order of the court may be punished by the court as a contempt of that court.

(c) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—Upon the request of the Commission, the head of a Federal agency shall provide such technical assistance to the Commission as the Commission determines to be necessary to carry out its duties.

(d) INFORMATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall have reasonable access to budgetary, performance or programmatic materials, resources, statistical data, and other information the Commission determines to be necessary to carry out its duties from the Congressional Budget Office, and other agencies and representatives of the executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government. Members of the Commission shall make requests for such access in writing when necessary.

(2) RECEIPT, HANDLING, STORAGE, AND DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION.—Information shall only be received, handled, stored, and disseminated by members of the Commission and its staff consistent with all applicable statutes, regulations, and Executive orders.

(3) LIMITATION OF ACCESS TO PERSONAL TAX INFORMATION.—Information requested, subpoenaed, or otherwise accessed under this title shall not include tax data from the United States Internal Revenue Service, the release of which would otherwise be in violation of law.

(e) POSTAL SERVICES.—The Commission may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

SEC. 205. COMMISSION PERSONNEL MATTERS.

(a) COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS.—

(1) NON-FEDERAL MEMBERS.—Except as provided under subsection (b), each member of the Commission who is not an officer or employee of the Federal Government shall not be compensated.

(2) FEDERAL OFFICERS OR EMPLOYEES.—All members of the Commission who are officers or employees of the United States shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as officers or employees of the United States.

(b) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—The members of the Commission shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for employees of agencies under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Commission.

(c) STAFF.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—With the approval of the majority of the Commission, the Cochairpersons of the Commission may, appoint an executive director and such other additional personnel as may be necessary to enable the Commission to perform its duties.

(2) COMPENSATION.—Upon the approval of the Cochairpersons, the executive director may fix the compensation of the executive director and other personnel without regard to chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, relating to classification of positions and General Schedule pay rates, except that the rate of pay for the executive director and other personnel may not exceed the maximum rate payable for a position at GS–15 of the General Schedule under section 5332 of such title.

(3) PERSONNEL AS FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The executive director and any personnel of the Commission who are employees shall be employees under section 2105 of title 5, United States Code, for purposes of chapters 63, 81, 83, 84, 85, 87, 89, 89A, 89B, and 90 of that title.

(B) MEMBERS OF COMMISSION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not be construed to apply to members of the Commission.

(d) DETAIL OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.—Any Federal Government employee may be detailed to the Commission without reimbursement from the Commission, and such detail shall be without interruption or loss of civil service status or privilege.

(e) PROCUREMENT OF TEMPORARY AND INTERMITTENT SERVICES.—With the approval of the majority of the Commission, the Chairperson of the Commission may procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, at rates for individuals which do not exceed the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title.

SEC. 206. EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION OF REFORM PROPOSALS.

(a) INTRODUCTION AND COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION.—

(1) INTRODUCTION.—The Commission bill language provisions submitted pursuant to section 203(b)(1) shall be introduced in the Senate by the majority leader, or the majority leader's designee, and in the House of Representatives, by the Speaker, or the Speaker's designee. Upon such introduction, the Commission bill shall be referred to the appropriate committees of Congress under paragraph (2). If the Commission bill is not introduced in accordance with the preceding sentence, then any member of Congress may introduce the Commission bill in their respective House of Congress beginning on the date that is the 5th calendar day that such House is in session following the date of the submission of such aggregate legislative language provisions.

(2) COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION.—

(A) REFERRAL.—A Commission bill introduced under paragraph (1) shall be referred to any appropriate committee of jurisdiction in the Senate, any appropriate committee of jurisdiction in the House of Representatives, the Committee on the Budget of the Senate and the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives. A committee to which a Commission bill is referred under this paragraph may review and comment on such bill, may report such bill to the respective House, and may not amend such bill.

(B) REPORTING.—Not later than 30 calendar days after the introduction of the Commission bill, each Committee of Congress to which the Commission bill was referred shall report the bill.

(C) DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE.—If a committee to which is referred a Commission bill has not reported such Commission bill at the end of 30 calendar days after its introduction or at the end of the first day after there has been reported to the House involved a Commission bill, whichever is earlier, such committee shall be deemed to be discharged from further consideration of such Commission bill, and such Commission bill shall be placed on the appropriate calendar of the House involved.

(b) EXPEDITED PROCEDURE.—

(1) CONSIDERATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 5 calendar days after the date on which a committee has reported a Commission bill or been discharged from consideration of a Commission bill, the majority leader of the Senate, or the majority leader's designee, or the Speaker of the House of Representatives, or the Speaker's designee, shall move to proceed to the consideration of the Commission bill. It shall also be in order for any member of the Senate or the House of Representatives, respectively, to move to proceed to the consideration of the Commission bill at any time after the conclusion of such 5-day period.

(B) MOTION TO PROCEED.—A motion to proceed to the consideration of a Commission bill is highly privileged in the House of Representatives and is privileged in the Senate and is not debatable. The motion is not subject to amendment or to a motion to postpone consideration of the Commission bill. If the motion to proceed is agreed to, the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, shall immediately proceed to consideration of the Commission bill without intervening motion, order, or other business, and the Commission bill shall remain the unfinished business of the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, until disposed of.

(C) LIMITED DEBATE.—Debate on the Commission bill and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith shall be limited to not more than 10 hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the Commission bill. A motion further to limit debate on the Commission bill is in order and is not debatable. All time used for consideration of the Commission bill, including time used for

quorum calls (except quorum calls immediately preceding a vote) and voting, shall come from the 10 hours of debate.

(D) AMENDMENTS.—No amendment to the Commission bill shall be in order in the Senate and the House of Representatives.

(E) VOTE ON FINAL PASSAGE.—Immediately following the conclusion of the debate on the Commission bill, the vote on final passage of the Commission bill shall occur.

(F) OTHER MOTIONS NOT IN ORDER.—A motion to postpone consideration of the Commission bill, a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the Commission bill is not in order. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the Commission bill is agreed to or not agreed to is not in order.

(2) CONSIDERATION BY OTHER HOUSE.—If, before the passage by one House of the Commission bill that was introduced in such House, such House receives from the other House a Commission bill as passed by such other House—

(A) the Commission bill of the other House shall not be referred to a committee and may only be considered for final passage in the House that receives it under subparagraph (C);

(B) the procedure in the House in receipt of the Commission bill of the other House, shall be the same as if no Commission bill had been received from the other House; and

(C) notwithstanding subparagraph (B), the vote on final passage shall be on the Commission bill of the other House.

(3) Upon disposition of a Commission bill that is received by one House from the other House, it shall no longer be in order to consider the Commission bill that was introduced in the receiving House.

(c) RULES OF THE SENATE AND THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—This section is enacted—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and is deemed to be part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of a Commission bill, and it supersedes other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent with such rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as they relate to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

SEC. 207. TERMINATION OF THE COMMISSION.

The Commission shall terminate 90 days after the date on which the Commission submits the final evaluation and plan report under section 203.

SEC. 208. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for carrying out this title for each of the fiscal years 2010 through 2014.

NOTICE OF HEARING

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a business meeting scheduled before the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, previously announced for February 11th, has been rescheduled and will now be held on Wednesday, February 10, 2010, at 9:30 a.m., immediately preceding the full committee hearing, in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The purpose of the business meeting is to consider pending nominations.

For further information, please contact Sam Fowler or Amanda Kelly.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 26, 2010 at 2:30 p.m., in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 26, 2010 at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled ''Intelligence Reform: The Lessons and Implications of the Christmas Day Attack, Part II.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 26, 2010 at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following staff of mine be granted the privileges of the floor during consideration of the debt limit legislation: Christopher Goble, Dustin Stevens, Lucas Hamilton, Tsveta Polhemus.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Paula Haurilesko, a detailee to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, be granted the privilege of the floor for the remainder of the week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IN MEMORY OF FORMER SENATOR CHARLES McCURDY (''MAC'') MATHIAS, JR.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 397 submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 397) relative to the death of Charles McCurdy (''Mac'') Mathias, Jr., former United States Senator for the State of Maryland.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and any statements related to the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 397) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 397

Whereas Mac Mathias served in the United States Navy during World War II from 1942–1946 and was a captain in the Naval Reserve;

Whereas Mac Mathias served the state of Maryland as an assistant attorney general, a city attorney, a member of the Maryland House of Delegates, and as a member of the United States House of Representatives;

Whereas Mac Mathias was called the ''conscience of the Senate'' by Majority Leader Mike Mansfield;

Whereas Mac Mathias served the Senate as Chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration in the Ninety-seventh through Ninety-ninth Congresses and co-chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing in the Ninety-seventh and Ninety-ninth Congresses; and

Whereas Mac Mathias served the people of Maryland with distinction for 18 years in the United States Senate; Now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of the Honorable Charles McC. Mathias, Jr., former member of the United States Senate.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the Senate adjourns today, it stand adjourned as a further mark of respect to the memory of the Honorable Charles McC. Mathias, Jr.

AUTHORIZING REPRESENTATION BY SENATE LEGAL COUNSEL

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 398 submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 398) to authorize representation by the Senate Legal Counsel in the case of Schonberg, et al. v. Sanders, et al.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, this resolution concerns a civil action filed by two individuals against five Senators, two Representatives, and the Federal Election Commission. Plaintiffs' challenge rests on their claim to a right that Congress pass health care legislation that would benefit them. Plaintiffs' legal claim is that the Federal Election Campaign Act's designation of Members of Congress as agents of their

campaign committees violates the Constitution's prohibition on Members of Congress holding any other office under the United States while serving in the Congress.

Plaintiffs' complaint over the legislative actions of Senators is not cognizable before the courts. In addition, Senators' involvement with their campaign committees does not constitute holding an office of the United States and does not violate the Constitution.

This resolution authorizes the Senate Legal Counsel to represent the Senators named as defendants in this case and to move for its dismissal.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and any statements relating to the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 398) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 398

Whereas, in the case of Schonberg, et al. v. Sanders, et al., Case No. 5:09–CV–534, pending in the United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida, plaintiffs have named as defendants five Senators; and

Whereas, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 704(a)(1) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C. §§ 288b(a) and 288c(a)(1), the Senate may direct its counsel to defend Members of the Senate in civil actions relating to their official responsibilities: Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate Legal Counsel is authorized to represent Senators Lieberman, Lincoln, McConnell, McCain, and Sanders in the case of Schonberg, et al. v. Sanders, et al.

HONORING LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS IN LAS VEGAS, NEVADA

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 399, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 399) honoring the heroic actions of Court Security Officer Stanley Cooper, Deputy United States Marshal Richard J. ''Joe'' Gardner, the law enforcement officers of the United States Marshals Service and Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, and the Court Security Officers in responding to the armed assault at the Lloyd D. George Federal Courthouse on January 4, 2010.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 399) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 399

Whereas on January 4, 2010, during an assault at the entrance of the Lloyd D. George Federal Courthouse in Las Vegas, Nevada, Court Security Officer Stanley Cooper was fatally wounded and died heroically in the line of duty while protecting the employees, occupants, and visitors of the courthouse;

Whereas Deputy United States Marshal Richard J. ''Joe'' Gardner was wounded in the line of duty while protecting the employees, occupants, and visitors of the courthouse;

Whereas the Court Security Officers and members of the United States Marshals Service and the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department acted swiftly and bravely to subdue the gunman and minimize risk and injury to the public; and

Whereas the heroic actions of Court Security Officer Stanley Cooper, Deputy United States Marshal Richard J. ''Joe'' Gardner, and the law enforcement officers who responded to the attack prevented additional harm to innocent bystanders: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commends the brave actions and quick thinking exhibited by Court Security Officer Stanley Cooper during the assault at the entrance of the Lloyd D. George Federal Courthouse on January 4, 2010;

(2) offers its deepest condolences to the family and friends of Court Security Officer Stanley Cooper, who valiantly gave his life in the line of duty;

(3) commends Deputy United States Marshal Richard J. ''Joe'' Gardner for his actions and bravery in responding to the assault;

(4) wishes Deputy United States Marshal Richard J. ''Joe'' Gardner a speedy recovery from the wounds he sustained in the line of duty; and

(5) applauds the Court Security Officers and members of the United States Marshals Service and Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department for their brave and courageous actions in responding to the assault at the Lloyd D. George Federal Courthouse.

Mr. DURBIN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR JANUARY 27 AND 28, 2010

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 8:20 p.m. on Wednesday, January 27; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and at 8:30 p.m. the Senate proceed as a body to the Hall of the House to hear an address from the President of the United States; that upon conclusion of the Joint Session, the Senate adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, January 28; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate resume consideration of H.J. Res. 45, the debt limit, as provided for under the previous order; further, I ask that when the Senate resumes consideration of H.J. Res. 45, there be 1 hour for debate equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with Senator SANDERS controlling 15 minutes of majority time prior to the first vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, the Senate will not be in session until 8:20 p.m. tomorrow because of the Republicans' 1-day issues conference.

Tomorrow is the State of the Union Address and Senators are encouraged to gather in the Senate Chamber at 8:20 p.m. so that we may proceed to the Hall of the House at 8:30 p.m. to hear President Obama's address.

Senators should expect a series of five rollcall votes to begin as early as 10:30 a.m. on Thursday. Those votes will be in relation to the debt limit resolution.

Also, under a previous order, following the series of votes Thursday morning, there will be 1 hour for debate prior to a cloture vote on the Bernanke nomination.

Mr. President, I would like to clarify my unanimous consent request, and that is that there be 1 hour of morning business before the 1 hour of debate closing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Duly noted. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. And the acknowledgment of Mr. SANDERS' right to control 15 minutes be part of that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 8:20 P.M. TOMORROW

Mr. DURBIN. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent the Senate adjourn under the provisions of S. Res. 397, as a further mark of respect for the late Senator Mathias of Maryland.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 9:02 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, January 27, at 8:20 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

ELISABETH ANN HAGEN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE FOR FOOD SAFETY, VICE RICHARD A. RAYMOND, RESIGNED.

FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE FOR PROMOTION WITHIN AND INTO THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE TO THE CLASSES INDICATED:

CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER:

KAREN L. ZENS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR:

DAVID W. FULTON, OF VIRGINIA
THOMAS E. MOORE, OF VIRGINIA

CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR:

MARIA J. ANDREWS, OF MISSOURI
MICHAEL A. LALLY, OF NEW YORK
JOHN M. MCCASLIN, OF OHIO
REGINALD A. MILLER, OF VIRGINIA
RICHARD STEFFENS, OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. BYRON C. HEPBURN

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COLONEL JEFFREY N. COLT
COLONEL PETER A. DELUCA
COLONEL ROBERT M. DYESS, JR.
COLONEL DONALD M. MACWILLIE

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

DAVID A. NORDSTRAND

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

HELEN K. CROUCH
MICKRA H. KING

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

RANDALL B. DELL
EDDIE P. SANCHEZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

CHARLES T. HUGUELET
ROBERT LEE
KENNETH B. MCKAY
MICHAEL E. SAVAGE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

GLENDA K. M. GRONES
TERESA W. RYAN
SANDRA G. STEBLIN
MONA P. TERNUS
NANCY A. WESTBROOK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

FRANK J. ARCHER
DAVID B. CARMACK
MATTHEW J. CAZAN
JAMES W. DICKEY
LEE H. DIEHL
SHARON H. EVERS
APRIL S. FITZGERALD
DOUGLAS E. HEMLER
KRISTINE H. HENDERSON
KARL M. LARSEN
GEZA V. LORANTH
GUY R. MOISE
DEBORAH L. MUELLER
BONNIE J. NOWACZYK
EDUARDO SAN MIGUEL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

THOMAS J. PIZZOLO
MICHAEL K. SAVAGE
CLIFFORD ZDANOWICZ, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

TARN M. ABELL
JOSEPH ALMODOVAR
ROSS R. ANDERSON
COURTNEY J. ARNOLD
LAEN D. AUGUST
THOMAS L. AYERS
JAMES R. BARKLEY
SAMUEL A. BELLIA
HELEN K. BIRCHENOUGH
LISA A. BOYCE
DONALD R. BUCKLEY
JOHN H. BURLING
CHRISTINE M. CARTAYA
RICHARD M. COCKLEY
DAVID E. DAVIS
THOMAS B. DAVIS
STEPHEN R. DAY
GARY W. DICKINSON
TED A. DOEDERLEIN
BRIAN M. DWYER
SAMUEL L. ELKINS
KEVIN R. FESLER
JAMES B. FINNEY
DALE A. FORMAN
YVES T. FUHRMANN
SCOTT D. GAHRING
TERENCE J. GIBSON
ERNEST M. GOODMAN
ANNE B. GUNTER
MICHAEL P. HAMES
DOUGLAS L. HARRISON
KATHY S. HASH
CATHLEEN A. HAVERSTOCK
HUBERT C. HEGTVEDT
ROBERT W. HEHEMANN
JOHN M. HILLYER
DANA M. HOWARD
ERIC A. JORGENSEN
KENNETH L. KEMPER
CATHERINE K. KLEMAN
KEITH A. KNUDSON
TRACI L. KUEKERMURPHY
CRAIG L. LAFAVE
BRENDAN P. LEWIS
STEVEN T. LIDDY
TEDDY A. LUKE
JAMES T. MAIN
MARTHA J. MANN
TODD A. MANNING
JENNIFER A. MARRS
TIMOTHY J. MCCOY
JOHN D. MCKAYE
TONY H. MCKENZIE
PATRICE A. MELANCON
MARK D. METZ
MICHAEL E. MICHNO
DENISE M. MINNICK
JOSE R. MONTEAGUDO
BRADFORD G. MONTGOMERY
ELLEN M. MOORE
JEFFREY S. MULLEN
MYLES P. MURPHY
CHARLENE N. NELSON
ROBERT S. OATES
RICHARD W. PARKINSON
CRAIG C. PETERS
JAMES M. PHILLIPS
TERESA M. PITTS
DAVID L. POND
CARL E. PRICE
PAUL R. PRYOR
BRYAN P. RADLIFF
WESLEY C. REED
RUSSELL P. REIMER
MARK J. ROBERTS
ELWIN A. ROZYSKIE
BARRY A. RUTLEDGE
SCOTT A. SAUTER
LANE A. SEAHOLM
HOUSTON A. SEWELL
PATRICK A. SHOPE
ROBERT J. SIANI
MARK E. SIGLER
PATRICK G. SLATTERY
TAMMY L. SMEEKS
RONALD J. STAUFFER
MATHIAS J. SUTTON
ELIZABETH A. SYDOW
LLOYD I. TERRY
PAUL T. THEISEN
KIMBERLY A. THOMPSON
MARYBETH P. ULRICH
CONSTANCE M. VONHOFFMAN
EDWIN O. WALLER
ROBERT S. WEAVER
PATRICK W. WEBB
JOHN B. WILLIAMS

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

LOUIS GEVIRTZMAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C. SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

BRENDA M. ARZU
JOHN W. HUSTLEBY
CLAUDE L. LOVELL III
TONY P. MEYER
JOHN R. MILLS

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be captain

DAVID W. TERHUNE

To be commander

PETER G. MAYER
CESAR C. SANTOS

To be lieutenant commander

LEO C. ALTAMIRANO
LISA E. BERGER
VIRGILIO A. CANTU
JOHN D. HARRAH, JR
DAREN R. MEALER
CORY L. RUSSELL
OMAR SAEED
DET R. SMITH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 5721:

To be lieutenant commander

ERIC R. AKINS
MARK B. ALLEN
LARRY J. ARBUCKLE
LARRION D. CASSIDY
BRIAN L. COCHRAN
JOSHUA P. CORBIN
JANUARY J. CRIVELLO
JOHN M. CYCYK
TIMOTHY J. DEBELAK
DANIEL R. FULTON
PRESTON W. GILMORE
LEONARDO GIOVANNELLI
PATRICK A. GRIFFIN
JOHN W. HAMILTON
KARL D. HOERSTER
DAVID A. JOHNS
DAVID J. LATTA
JASON E. MUCH
BRIAN T. MURPHY
LEWIS J. PATTERSON
REGINALD N. PRESTON
PATRICK K. PRUITT
CRAIG M. REPLOGLE
DARIN R. RIGGS
GREGORY K. RING
MATTHEW R. SHELLOCK
MATTHEW F. THOMPSON
ADAM B. WEINER
MICHELLE D. WEISSINGER
SCOTT T. WILBUR

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SUPPORT FOR H. RES. 1021

SPEECH OF

HON. RUSS CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 20, 2010

Mr. CARNAHAN. Madam Speaker, as Chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on International Organizations, Human Rights, and Oversight, I wanted to support the House Resolution which expresses condolences to and solidarity with the people of Haiti in the aftermath of the devastating earthquake of January 12th, 2010.

I would like to praise the work of Meds and Food for Kids (MFK), an internationally renowned non-profit program, based in St. Louis. MFK was designated by the U.S. Agency for International Development as an official distributor of food to the malnourished people of Haiti.

It is also important to recognize and leverage the work of international organizations such as the United Nations and the World Food Program. This earthquake, which destroyed the U.N. Headquarters, has caused the greatest single loss of life in U.N. history. The U.N. Security Council voted on January 19 to send 3,500 more peacekeepers to Haiti.

President Obama announced $100 million in additional assistance to help Haiti during this time of crisis. I want to help ensure that taxpayer resources, as well as donations given through private charities, are spent efficiently, transparently, and effectively, and are used to help those Haitians most in need.

Rebuilding efforts will take years. It is important that once this story slips from the front pages of newspapers that the international community, including the United States, is still there to lend a lending hand.

IN MEMORY OF H.G. DULANEY

HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 2010

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Speaker, last year the fourth district of Texas and our Nation lost a distinguished gentleman and historian from Ector, Texas. H.G. Dulaney passed away on July 4th, 2009 at the age of 91. The great H.G., a legendary presence aide in his own right, was a longtime aide to the late Speaker of the House Sam Rayburn and served for many years as Director of the Sam Rayburn Library in Bonham.

H.G. Dulaney, son of Horace Greeley and Lucy Dulaney, was born in Fannin County on May 11, 1918 and lived there all of his life, except for a few years in Washington working for Speaker Rayburn. He graduated from Ector High School and attended Draughon's Business College in Dallas. He married Rita Redman on September 9, 1941 in Colbert, Oklahoma, and they had two children, Loretta and Mike. H.G. served in the Army Air Force from 1942–1945 during WWII, spending 18 months in the India-Burma theater. Following his release from the service he returned to Fannin County where he briefly worked for Bonham Abstract Company and the Farmers Home Administration Department of Agriculture.

In 1951, 33-year-old H.G. Dulaney was persuaded by a local attorney, Buster Cole, to go to Washington to work for Speaker Rayburn. H.G. enjoyed telling the story of his first trip to Washington, D.C. with his shoes squeaking with every step he took and his many remembrances of "Mr. Sam," probably the most powerful man who ever led the U.S. House of Representatives. H.G. spent several years as a Congressional Aide to Speaker Rayburn, taking dictation and writing letters, among many other tasks. Mr. Sam ultimately became like a father to him.

In 1956, Mr. Sam appointed H.G. to take care of his personal business at the library. While the library construction was being completed, H.G. studied at the Library of Congress and the National Archives to prepare himself for his new job. He took special courses in accounting and library science at Southeastern University in Washington, D.C., and after he took over as Library Director in 1957, he continued his studies at East Texas State University.

H.G. Dulaney is a name that is synonymous with the Sam Rayburn Library. He was actively involved in preparations for the Library from its inception through construction and opening in 1957, and served as the Director of the Library until 2002, including its transfer into The University of Texas at Austin in 1990. Following his retirement, he was the Director Emeritus and Consultant at The Sam Rayburn Library. During his years at the Rayburn Library he served as Co-Editor of "Impressions of Mr. Sam—A Cartoon Profile" (1987) and "Speak, Mr. Speaker" (1978) and was the Editor of the Sam Rayburn Newsletter (1957–2002). Throughout more than half a century of operation, H.G. nurtured the Library and shared his wealth of knowledge and insights about Speaker Rayburn with visitors and students from all over the country.

H.G. was a member of Ector United Methodist Church, Ector Masonic Lodge, Dodd City Lions Club, The Texas Historical Commission, and the Fannin County Historical Commission. He also served a number of years on the Ector Carson Cemetery Board and The Public Housing Authority Board. In 1980, H.G. received the Good Government Award from the Zeta Gamma chapter of Pi Sigma Alpha, the Political Science National Honor Society, and he was also named Bonham Citizen of the Year in 1997, among many other awards he received over his lifetime. In September 2002, in honor of his official retirement from the Sam Rayburn Library and Museum, the Fannin County Commissioner's Court and the City of Bonham signed a proclamation declaring H.G. Dulaney Day. In addition, the main exhibit gallery of the Rayburn Museum was renamed in his honor, commemorated with the permanent installation of his portrait. In 2005, H.G. was doubly honored by the Friends of Sam Rayburn. He was given the Inaugural Public Service Award and the award was named in his honor—the H.G. Dulaney Friends of Sam Rayburn Award for Public Service. The same year, the Sam Rayburn Foundation established a scholarship in his name.

H.G. is survived by a son, Mike, and his wife Marla Dulaney and five grandchildren. He was preceded in death by his parents, Horace Greeley and Lucy Dulaney, his wife Rita Redman Dulaney and daughter, Loretta Dulaney Chapman.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in memory and in honor of this great American and historian who dedicated his life to preserving the history of this institution. He will be truly missed.

HONORING AND REMEMBERING MONIQUE PEGUES OF FORT WORTH

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 2010

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and remember Monique Pegues, who departed this life Friday, January 22, 2010.

Ms. Pegues was a devoted Christian, wife, daughter, mother, sister and friend who left an indelible mark on each person in which she came in contact. She led an accomplished life that was exhibited to others through her love of God, family and career.

Ms. Pegues was an active member of First St John Baptist Church and a 1994 honors graduate of my alma mater, the University of North Texas at Denton. As a respected colleague, she was chosen by her peers to represent them as President to the DFW Chapter of the Women's Transportation Seminar (WTS) and as Chairperson to the North Central Texas Regional Certification Agency (NCTRCA). Ms. Pegues was also a member of several other organizations, such as Leadership Fort Worth and Toastmasters International. She also volunteered with Meals on Wheels, Big Brothers/Big Sisters and the Salvation Army. In strong recognition of her many accomplishments, Ms. Pegues was recognized in 2009 as part of Mass Transit's exclusive national list of "Top 40, Under 40".

Emboldened with a can-do spirit, professional demeanor and reserved confidence, Ms. Pegues quickly assimilated through the ranks of the Fort Worth Transportation Authority (The "T") to become the organization's Director of Governmental Relations. In this capacity, she developed effective long-lasting relationships with key elected officials and staffers here on "The Hill" in Washington, DC and in the Capitol in Austin, and was instrumental

as a change-agent as evidenced through her highly-navigated role as liaison to various local, state, and federal governing jurisdictions.

Ms. Pegues was a compassionate person with a never-ceasing love for the Fort Worth community in which she grew up and then chose to give back to by becoming a public administrator. Yet for all her public accomplishments, her private persona as a devoted wife to Calvin, and mother to three young sons Cortlin, Colin and Carrington, who together were her focal point and source of pride, served as the most important and dedicated role in which she attributed her joy, admiration and love.

Madam Speaker, today I rise and join the Fort Worth community in honoring the exemplary life, legacy and achievements of Monique Pegues as an affirmation to the many contributions she bestowed upon all who knew her.

JACOB R. WILSON

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 2010

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Jacob R. Wilson. Jacob is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 249, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Jacob has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Jacob has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Jacob has earned the rank of Firebuilder in the Tribe of Mic-O-Say. Jacob has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Jacob led 20 scouts in the construction of a new 4x8 sign for Weston Christian Church, at the corner of Washington and Spring Streets in Weston, Missouri.

Madam Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Jacob R. Wilson for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

A TRIBUTE IN RECOGNITION OF THE MEXICAN AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY (MABA) ON THE OCCASION OF ITS 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 2010

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Mexican American Bar Association of Los Angeles County (MABA) on the occasion of its 50th Anniversary. Headquartered in the South Park community of Downtown Los Angeles in the 34th Congressional District, I am proud to represent this non-profit organization dedicated to advancing the careers of Latinos in the legal profession and empowering Latino communities.

Over the years, I have had the privilege of working with MABA members in various ways to assist Latino families in my congressional district. MABA members have had profound impacts on our community, including in advocating for immigrant rights, providing legal counsel at my annual citizenship workshops, and generously providing pro bono consultation to the residents of the City of Commerce whose homes were damaged by the derailment of a Union Pacific train.

In 2005, I was particularly touched to become the organization's first-ever recipient of the Edward R. Roybal Public Service Award. Named in honor of my late father, the annual award recognizes individuals for their extraordinary public service to the Latino community. On behalf of my father and the Roybal family, I remain deeply grateful to MABA for honoring my father's legacy of public service in this very special way.

I am sure my father would be very proud that this year's Edward R. Roybal Public Service Award will go to Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa for his outstanding contributions to our city. MABA's other outstanding honorees at this year's February 6 anniversary gala at the Biltmore Hotel in Downtown Los Angeles are: Thomas Saenz; Herman Sillas; Eddie ''Piolin'' Sotelo; Mario Trujillo; Carlos Moyado; and The Law Firm of Moreno, Becerra and Casillas. They are all to be commended for their steadfast advocacy on behalf of Latino families.

In celebrating MABA's 50th Anniversary, it is appropriate to take a look back to this fine organization's humble beginnings. The organization's roots actually trace back to 1956 when Manuel Martinez was sworn in as an attorney in Los Angeles. Although there were few Mexican American attorneys at the time, Manuel Martinez quickly realized that attorneys of Mexican descent needed a support group to help guide their careers and ultimately succeed in the legal profession. Three years later, in 1959, he joined with another local attorney named Antonio Bueno to form the Mexican Lawyers' Club, which met regularly at El Farolito Restaurant in East Los Angeles.

In 1971, the Mexican Lawyers' Club evolved into the Mexican American Bar Association. Today, MABA of Los Angeles County boasts more than 800 members from various ethnic, racial and political backgrounds. Through the years, MABA of Los Angeles County is credited with helping numerous generations of attorneys develop their careers while staying true to its core mission of empowering and giving back to the Latino community. Considered the voice and heart of the Latino legal community, MABA members have ascended to the highest levels of the legal community: in private practice, non-profit, and governmental positions, including three appointments to the California State Supreme Court.

Madam Speaker, on the occasion of MABA of Los Angeles County's 50th Anniversary, I ask my colleagues to please join me in celebrating the growth and outstanding achievements of this distinguished and influential organization and in congratulating all of its members for making this visionary bar association the success that it is today.

IN HONOR OF THE FEDERATION OF ITALIAN AMERICAN ORGANIZATIONS OF QUEENS

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 2010

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Speaker, it is my great pleasure to pay tribute to the Federation of Italian American Organizations of Queens for its tremendous contributions to the civic, social and cultural life of our nation's greatest city. This month the Federation is installing its slate of 2010 officers at a ceremony presided over by State Senator George Onorato at the Istria Sport Club in Astoria.

The Federation of Italian American Organization of Queens was founded in 1971 to represent and unify the diverse Italian American community in Queens. Currently the Federation is comprised of thirty-four member groups, which each serve the community in a unique and substantial manner. By providing an umbrella organization for these dozens of institutions, the Federation has enhanced the ability of all its member organizations to accomplish their goals and advance their interests.

The Federation not only offers assistance to its member organizations, it directly offers a variety of services to individuals of all nationalities. It assists senior citizens with health, housing and insurance issues. Youths are served through the Federation's Drug Awareness Run and Soccer programs. It helps meet the wider community's diverse needs through the Federation's voter registration drives, as well as by offering classes in Defensive Driving and English as a Second Language.

I am pleased to join you in honoring the men and women the Federation of Italian American Organizations of Queens is installing as its new officers. I congratulate the Federation's President Joseph DiPietro, First Vice President Joseph Gaeta, Second Vice President Caterina Curatoio, Third Vice President Jerry Iannece, Treasurer Gino Macari, Assistant Treasurer Angelo Capone, Public Relations officer Maria Fosco, Recording Secretary Vincenza Russo, Assistant Recording Secretary Sandro Iannese, Correspondence Secretary John Ciafone, Parliamentarian Carlo Bucich, Historian Joseph Chiarappa, and Sergeant at Arms Anthony Barrata. Under their leadership, this important organization will surely continue to be a valuable resource to the community.

Madam Speaker, I ask that my distinguished colleagues join me in saluting the great work of the Federation of Italian American Organizations of Queens, and in recognizing the extraordinary men and women of the Federation and their contributions to the quality of life in New York City.

HONORING MR. FRED AJOOTIAN OF LANCASTER COUNTY, VIRGINIA

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 2010

Mr. WITTMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. Fred Ajootian. Fred

Ajootian was a proud Lancaster County resident and a strong supporter of the Virginia Department of Game and Wildlife, and he honored this nation through a lifetime of service to the community. Fred was a devoted husband to his beloved wife, Marguerite, and a dedicated father to their two children, Aileen and Caroline.

Fred began his life of service in the United States Navy during World War II on the USS SIERRA off the coast of Shanghai, China. His passion for the Navy endured and he chose a career in shipbuilding where he continued his life's interest. As an avid outdoorsman, Fred also served on the Wetlands Board in Lancaster County where he volunteered his time for many years.

Fred also was active after his retirement from shipbuilding, continuing his service through volunteering his time at the Rappahannock Pistol and Rifle Club. He also managed the Ocran Boat shop in White Stone, Virginia.

Fred Ajootian will be greatly missed by all who knew him. He touched many people's lives and the work that he did for his community will never be forgotten. My thoughts and prayers are with his family and friends.

IN HONOR OF THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PARMA COMMUNITY GENERAL HOSPITAL'S ELDER DAY CENTER

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 2010

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Parma Community General Hospital's ElderCenter, as it celebrates twenty years of providing a haven of recreation, socialization, medical care and exercise for adults with mild to moderate impairments.

Recognizing the need for adult day services, Parma Hospital, an independent, community hospital located in the heart of Parma, Ohio, created the ElderCenter. It provides resources and comfort for adults transitioning through mental and physical challenges of impairment, illness and aging. The ElderCenter also provides an incalculable source of support, peace of mind and respite for caregivers, most of whom are family members.

The programs and services of the ElderCenter are designed to accommodate adults of all ages and diagnoses. ElderCenter offers regular medical checks, nutritious meals and snacks, opportunities for socialization and physical and mental stimulation. The services and support provided by ElderCenter allows clients to remain in their homes for many years. In 2006, the ElderCenter Day Program was honored with the ''Service to Seniors Award'' by the Western Reserve Area Agency on Aging. In addition, the Day Program has sparked the interest of researchers at Case Western Reserve University, whose initial findings revealed that ElderCenter participants are fifty percent less likely to be readmitted to the hospital than those who did not participate. These results show that the true power of wellbeing is in direct relationship to the partnership between home and community.

Madam Speaker and Colleagues, please join me in honor of the founders, staff, volunteers, participants and families of Parma Community General Hospital's ElderCenter, as they celebrate twenty years of providing meaningful activities, programs, and quality health care services for adults throughout our community.

RECOGNIZING THE HEROISM OF RANDALL ''RANDY'' NORMAN OF HOLLEY, NEW YORK

HON. CHRISTOPHER JOHN LEE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 2010

Mr. LEE of New York. Madam Speaker, I ask that the House join me in recognizing Mr. Randall ''Randy'' Norman of Holley, New York, for his selfless actions on February 14, 2009.

On that day, while Randy was on his way to work, he saw Mary Silliman being attacked outside of Lakeside Hospital in Brockport, New York. While trying to help Silliman, Randy was shot and killed.

Randy chose to protect others with little regard for his own safety. Had Randy not taken the actions he did, the community could have been subject to further terror.

Randy has posthumously received The Stand Up Guy award for his heroic efforts to prevent bodily harm to a woman. He has also earned praise from many members of the community including Sergeant Mark Cuzzupoli who offered these kind words: ''I would definitely characterize him as a hero. As a person who tried to make a difference.''

Madam Speaker, I ask that the House join me today in recognizing Randy Norman's selfless actions last February. We can all learn a lot from Randy's selflessness on that February day last year.

HOMELAND SECURITY ACT OF 2002 AMENDMENT

SPEECH OF

HON. LAURA RICHARDSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 20, 2010

Ms. RICHARDSON. Madam Speaker, as a member of the Homeland Security Committee, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2611, which will amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize the Securing the Cities Initiative of the Department of Homeland Security. This legislation will implement a unified strategy and provide the technology for defending New York City, Long Island and surrounding areas against radiological and nuclear threats.

I would like to acknowledge Speaker PELOSI and Chairman THOMPSON for their leadership in bringing this important bill to the floor. I would also like to thank my colleague Congressman KING, who authored this important legislation.

H.R. 2611 amends the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize appropriations to the Director of the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) for the Securing the Cities Initiative. The Initiative uses next generation radiation detection technology to detect the transport of nuclear and radiological material in urban areas by terrorists or other unauthorized individuals. As the representative of one of the largest ports in the nation, Long Beach, I so pleased to support this initiative.

In conclusion, Madam Speaker, I support this bill because it is another step to making our cities and ports as safe as we possibly can. The Securing the Cities Initiative is a critical national capability to detect the dangerous introduction of nuclear and radiological material.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 2611.

CELEBRATING 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF SONG TRIBUTE TO DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 20, 2010

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 1010, ''Celebrating the life and work of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. during the 30th anniversary of the Stevie Wonder song tribute to Dr. King, ''Happy Birthday,'' introduced by my distinguished colleague from Michigan, Representative CONYERS. The first Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. federal holiday was officially observed on January 20, 1986, and was celebrated with a concert headlined by Stevie Wonder, who has, in the years since, continued his commitment to promoting peace and equality, for which he has been recognized with a Lifetime Achievement Award from the National Civil Rights Museum in Memphis, Tennessee.

Stevie Wonder encouraged the establishment of a federal holiday in recognition of Dr. King on his album sleeve for ''Hotter Than July'' by expressing that, ''I and a growing number of people believe that it is time for our country to adopt legislation that will make January 15, Martin Luther King's birthday, a national holiday, both in recognition of what he achieved and as a reminder of the distance which still has to be traveled.'' The tribute song ''Happy Birthday,'' became a rallying cry that led to 6,000,000 signatures supporting a federal holiday in honor of civil rights leader Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Legislation designating the third Monday of January as a federal holiday in observance of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. occurred on November 3, 1983, was signed into law. This campaign secured a federal holiday in honor of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., which lasted for fifteen years, with the 1980 Stevie Wonder song that solidified the campaign's success.

The life and work of Dr. King, to advance justice, equality, and peace for an entire human race ended prematurely when he was assassinated in Memphis, Tennessee, on April 4, 1968, while he was challenging the wages and treatment of Memphis sanitation workers. Four days after the assassination of Dr. King, on April 8, 1968, Representative JOHN CONYERS, Jr. introduced legislation to recognize civil rights leader Dr. King with a federal holiday coinciding with his birthday on January 15, 1929.

Stevie Wonder dedicated his album sleeve for ''Hotter Than July,'' an album released on

September 29, 1980, and upon which ''Happy Birthday'' is recorded, to Dr. King, with an inscription that read, ''Martin Luther King, Jr. showed us, non-violently, a better way of life, a way of mutual respect, helping us to avoid much bitter confrontation and inevitable bloodshed.'' On January 17, 2000, for the first time, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Day was officially observed in all fifty states.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. was a dreamer. His dreams were a tool through which he was able to lift his mind beyond the reality of his segregated society, and into a realm where it was possible that white and black, red and brown, and all others live and work alongside each other and prosper. But Martin Luther King, Jr. was not just an idle daydreamer. He shared his visions through speeches that motivated others to join in his nonviolent effort to lift themselves from poverty and isolation by creating a new America where equal justice and institutions were facts of life.

It appears that too many of our nation's young people have forgotten how to dream. They have forgotten what Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. taught us, when he started his journey towards equality—with peace in his heart and the dream of equality in his eyes.

Today, children and young people often ask: ''What is a dream?'' or ''How can it change my life?'' We must once again introduce our young people to the life of Dr. King and his enduring dream. His vision is still so pertinent today, our lives continue to be shaped by his efforts.

A young Martin managed to find a dream, one that he pieced together from his readings—in the Bible, and literature, and just about any other book he could get his hands on. And not only did those books help him educate himself, but they also allowed him to work through the destructive and traumatic experiences of blatant discrimination, and the discriminatory abuse inflicted on himself, his family, and his people.

The life and work of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. was properly captured in Dr. King's most famed speech, ''I Have A Dream,'' on August 28, 1963, when he said, ''I have a dream that one day this nation will rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed: 'We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal.' '' The legacy of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. is continued today, as evidenced by the work of organizations like the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, which is currently led by Dr. King's daughter, Bernice King, and was at one time led by Dr. King's son, Martin Luther King, III. In addition to organizations, the legacy of Dr. King continues on today with people in the United States and throughout the world, with individual acts of compassion, courage, and peace.

This legislation will benefit the well-being of the public as it celebrates the life and work of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. during the 30th anniversary of the Stevie Wonder tribute song to Dr. King. It recognizes the legacy left by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. with commitments to freedom, equality, and justice, as exhibited by Stevie Wonder and so many others; and finally, encourages the people of the United States to commemorate the legacy of Dr. King by renewing pledges to advance those principles and actions that are consistent with Dr. King's belief that ''all men are created equal.'' As such, I strongly support this legislation and urge my colleagues to join me and do the same.

IN RECOGNITION OF MARY COLEMAN GILMER'S 105TH BIRTHDAY

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 2010

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I would like to request the House's attention today to pay recognition to the special life of Mary Coleman Gilmer of Montgomery, Alabama.

Mrs. Gilmer was born on January 24, 1905 in Conecuh County, Alabama. In 1926, Mrs. Gilmer married Gaddie Gilmer, and in the 1940's she graduated from Alabama State Teacher's College High School Class.

Mrs. Gilmer and her husband Gaddie adopted two daughters, Cubie Rae Chambliss and Jacqueline Lorraine Larry from two of her nieces. Both daughters graduated from Alabama State University. Mrs. Gilmer now has five grandchildren.

Mrs. Gilmer has spent her life actively working in the church and has been the Minister of music at several churches in Alabama. She also worked for the Atlanta Life Insurance Company for many years.

Today her friends and family will celebrate her birthday in Montgomery. I would like to join her family and friends in wishing Mrs. Mary Coleman Gilmer a very Happy 105th Birthday.

HONORING MR. ROB CALLAHAN

HON. JO ANN EMERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 2010

Mrs. EMERSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the good work of a dedicated public servant in Missouri's Eighth Congressional District. Mr. Rob Callahan has made a wonderful commitment to the residents of southern Missouri who have served our country in uniform. Once a year, Mr. Callahan leads a trip for veterans who would like to visit Washington, DC called the Southeast Missouri Honor Tour.

While they are here, the veterans of American military service can see the monuments erected to honor them. They are able to visit the memorials that stand in testament to the Americans who served alongside them, and Mr. Callahan ensures that they are able to visit Capitol Hill. The planning and logistics of these trips are not simple but Mr. Callahan does an exemplary job not only of ensuring the trip is worthwhile, but also of finding sources of support from the community so the veterans (most of whom are on fixed incomes) can afford the considerable expense of the trip.

Mr. Callahan is a 20-year veteran of the U.S. Air Force, and he understands the pride of service felt by every veteran who is able to visit our Nation's capital. It is a wonderful way to say thank you to the Americans in Southern Missouri who have served our country, defended our freedoms, and made sacrifices for our liberties.

I am very proud that Mr. Callahan will receive the Citizen of the Year award in Poplar Bluff, Missouri. He has earned this recognition several times over, and I commend Mr. Callahan and his excellent work to the U.S. House of Representatives.

TRIBUTE TO DR. RAJESH VYAS

HON. ED WHITFIELD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 2010

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor a member of our Foreign Service and a great American. Dr. Rajesh Vyas is a former resident of Kentucky's First Congressional district and currently serves as our nation's Regional Medical Officer at the U.S. Embassy in Manila. Recently, Dr. Vyas celebrated his twentieth year of practicing medicine.

Prior to starting with the State Department, Dr. Vyas practiced medicine for two years at Logan Memorial Hospital and lived in Russellville, Kentucky, both in my Congressional district. Dr. Vyas also served our nation's veterans at the Department of Veterans Affairs for a number of years.

After joining the Foreign Service, Dr. Vyas was posted to Pakistan and served at our Islamabad Embassy. From there he was dispatched to his current position in Manila. He has responsibility for overseeing the medical services provided at a number of our diplomatic missions throughout Asia. In other words, Dr. Vyas serves and protects the men and women who represent our country at our Embassies and Consulates throughout the world.

Ironically, when a Foreign Service officer recently became very ill in Manila, this same Dr. Vyas who had practiced medicine in my Congressional district in Kentucky took steps that saved his life, and that officer was a former member of my own staff. Dr. Vyas accurately assessed the situation, determined what the individual needed and then developed a plan that took into account the limits of local health care to get the American officer the care and treatment he needed. Without the doctor's situational and cultural awareness, this American diplomat might have lost his life.

Dr. Vyas has spent twenty years practicing medicine and a significant number of those years serving and protecting our veterans and our diplomats overseas. I know his wife and two sons are tremendously proud of him and I am, too. I ask the House to join me in saluting this fine American who protects those who have served us in our armed forces and the men and women of our diplomatic corps who are serving us at this very moment overseas.

HONORING DAVID A. FORD

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 2010

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, a community prospers and thrives on the contributions of its citizens to the common good. David A. Ford

has been active in all aspects of the community life of Mount Vernon for all of his adult life, serving as Commissioner of the Water Department since 1977 and in innumerable positions in the volunteer and political sectors. There are few aspects of life in Mount Vernon that he has not touched and made better.

While his life was community involvement, his passion was politics. From 1969 to 1996, he was Chairman of the Mount Vernon Democratic City Committee. He is Chairman of the Black Democrats of Westchester County and a member of the Council of Black Elected Democrats of New York State. He is also a New York State Committeeperson for the 84th Assembly District. More personally, and to my joy, he serves as my Special Assistant.

He has also served as President of the Lions Club of Mount Vernon and President of the Mount Vernon YMCA. He is a Life Member of the 369 Veteran's Association, and a Life Member of the Mount Vernon NAACP. He is Chairman of the Board of Mount Vernon Neighborhood Health Center and a member of the National Association of Health Care Providers.

And under his leadership the Board of Water Supply has continued a longstanding tradition of excellence.

He is a veteran of WWII. He is married to the former Eula (Daisy) Gadson and is the proud father of five children (David Jr., Renee, Garey, Michael, and Karen). He has five grandchildren: Rachel, Shaarod, Nardara, Jerel and David Christopher) and one great-grandchild, Amira.

David is retiring and I wish him all the very best that retirement has to offer. This is Mount Vernon's loss for he has contributed to his community for longer and better than we are ever likely to see again. On a personal note I am happy to say that he will still be advising me, which means he will still be helping me to help the people of Mount Vernon.

A TRIBUTE TO HOLY FAMILY CHURCH

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 2010

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the centennial anniversary of Holy Family Church of South Pasadena, California.

In 1906, land was purchased for the construction of a Catholic church and Bishop Thomas J. Conaty assigned Reverend Richard J. Cotter, D.D. the task of establishing a new parish in South Pasadena located at El Centro Street and Fremont Avenue. On May 10, 1910, seventy-five families gathered with Father Cotter for worship in a small cottage at the El Centro/Fremont location and called themselves Holy Family Parish.

By the following August, a temporary ''bungalow church'' was built to house the growing congregation until funds could be raised for a more permanent building. On November 24, 1923, the property at Fremont Avenue and Rollin Street, where the church stands today, was acquired for construction of a new church. Designed by architect Emmett G. Martin, this beautiful house of worship, recognized as one of the finest examples of Spanish Renaissance Baroque architecture in Southern California, held its first Masses on Easter Sunday in 1928, with the formal dedication by Bishop Cantwell following two weeks later.

Over the decades, many additions and acquisitions were made. The parish elementary school opened in 1937, and properties were acquired for a parish office, parish hall and buildings for religious education. Two mahogany side altars, a magnificent mural and stained glass windows were added in the 1950s and 1960s. In 1977, the Oak St. House was acquired for the religious education program, and in 1984, the Ramona St. House was purchased, followed by the acquisition of two adjacent residential properties. By 1994, more space was needed, and the Vision Project to build a new ministerial campus was created. The challenge was to tear down, remodel or relocate everything but the church. The groundbreaking ceremonies took place in June 1997, and the completion of the Vision Project was in 2000.

Over the course of one hundred years, the leadership of Holy Family Church has included the Right Reverend Michael J. Galvin from 1922–1923, Reverend James B. Morris from 1926–1954, the Right Reverend Leo Joseph Murphy from 1954–1971, Reverend Monsignor Thomas McGovern from 1968–1984 and Reverend Monsignor Clement J. Connolly from 1984 to the present.

Since its inception, Holy Family Church has provided spiritual guidance and tangible support to the greater South Pasadena community. Some of the church's many programs include the Giving Bank, which provides direct relief to people in the Los Angeles area facing hunger, Detention Ministry, which reaches out to incarcerated youth at Juvenile Hall, Infant Care Outreach Program, which serves low-income women and families in need, Pastoral Care: Ministry to the Elderly and Sick and sponsorship of Boy Scout Troop 333. Church parishioners are involved with Dolores Mission in East Los Angeles, serving on their school advisory board and tutoring in the after-school program.

I consider it a great privilege to recognize Holy Family Church upon its one-hundredth anniversary, and I ask all Members to join me in congratulating the congregation for their one hundred years of service to the community.

HONORING COLLEEN DIPIRRO FOR HER DEDICATED SERVICE AS PRESIDENT AND CEO OF THE AMHERST, NEW YORK CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

HON. CHRISTOPHER JOHN LEE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 2010

Mr. LEE of New York. Madam Speaker, I ask that this body join me in congratulating Colleen DiPirro of Williamsville, New York for her 28 years of dedicated service to the Amherst Chamber of Commerce.

When Colleen began her involvement with the Amherst Chamber of Commerce, she was the only staff member. Membership in the organization was at 180 and the Chamber's budget was $24,000 per year.

Shortly after Colleen assumed leadership of the Chamber, it was named one of the ten largest in all of New York State.

Today, the Amherst Chamber of Commerce counts more than 2,300 local businesses as members and operates under a budget in excess of $2 million. Colleen's outstanding leadership is directly responsible for this incredible growth over the last 28 years.

Colleen is an outstanding asset to the Western New York business community and I wish to extend my deepest appreciation for the outstanding work she has done over the last 28 years.

Madam Speaker, I ask that this body please join me in recognizing the many wonderful contributions Colleen has made to the Amherst community, and wish her much continued success in the months and years ahead.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. W. TODD AKIN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 2010

Mr. AKIN. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 11 on motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended—H.R. 3538—the Idaho Wilderness Resources Protection Act, had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

HONORING JOHN SHIELDS

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 2010

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, for a Democracy to succeed, the people have to be an active part of the political process. John Shields, who is retiring as the Mayor of Nyack, joined the political process, albeit later in life than most people.

He was born in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania and grew up as something of an Army brat, traveling from place to place. After high school he tried summer stock. He moved to New York City in 1965 where he sold caviar and worked in a drug rehabilitation center. He went to City College of New York, graduating in 1972, and for the next 30 years taught in New York City schools.

He moved to Nyack in 1976 and in 1994 he ran for the Nyack Village Board and was elected Trustee. There followed two more terms as Trustee and four terms as Mayor and now he is retiring from elective office.

John is primarily an activist, and got into politics as an extension of his activism. In 2004 he sued New York State for the right for same sex couples to marry. He noted that as Mayor, he could legally marry heterosexual couples while the state denied him that equal right for himself. And while he may have lost the suit he has not quit the battle.

He still lives in Nyack, is still involved in the community, serving on the Board of Directors of Head Start of Rockland. He has not decided what to do next, but I wish him all the best that life has to offer in this next stage of his life.

HONORING THE SPIRIT OF THE WHEELIN' TEAM 457

HON. CANDICE S. MILLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 2010

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I would like to acknowledge the members of Wheelin' Team 457, based in North Branch, Michigan. Wheelin' Team 457 is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization that was founded in 2003 by current President Ray K. Brown. The primary mission of the group is to assist the physically challenged with outdoor and indoor sports and other recreational activities. The team also engages in an extraordinary community relations campaign to educate the public on disability issues.

In addition to providing a wonderful service to the State of Michigan and the country, Wheelin' Team 457 has been very successful in competitive wheelchair sports. The team is undefeated and has posted a remarkable overall record of 13 wins and zero losses. I think it is fair to say that no matter the sport it is extremely difficult to maintain perfection over an extended time period.

This accomplishment, and the increased popularity of Wheelin' Team 457, has allowed members to expand beyond the sports world and assist people with other activities like fishing, hunting, billiards and archery just to name a few. I want to congratulate Wheelin' Team 457 on reaching this notable achievement and applaud you all for your hard work and dedication to be the best.

Furthermore, I want to commend team for the work they do to help citizens with physical challenges to get their lives "moving" once again. As human beings, we sometimes can fall victim to our own self-sorrow. But Wheelin' Team 457 has made it a priority to help those living with physical disabilities stay motivated. I know this is a constant and a tremendous challenge, but I believe the members of Wheelin' Team 457 are ready to face any obstacle head-on, fulfilling their mission each and every day!

I offer Wheelin' Team 457 my best wishes for 2010! As the Team states on its Web site, "When it comes to adapting, we have many ways to make the task of participation a reality. There is nothing more rewarding than to see someone take part in an activity that they thought was out of their ability."

I echo these words and I urge Wheelin' Team 457 to continue to roll on!

HONORING MAURICE GROSSMAN

HON. RAÚL M. GRIJALVA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 2010

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise today to honor Maurice Grossman, one of Tucson's true treasures, who passed away January 21st at the age of 82.

Maurice was beloved by many who knew him, not just for his art but for his dedication to human rights and the Democratic Party.

A retired art professor from the University of Arizona, Maurice Grossman spent his life as a ceramic artist, activist and a leader in the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender community.

Maurice served in the Navy during World War II, before attending Wayne State University in Detroit. After attending and teaching at other universities, he traveled to Japan as a Fulbright scholar, then finally to Tucson to teach.

The founder of the University of Arizona's ceramics program in 1955, Maurice received several prestigious awards during his career, including a National Endowment for the Arts grant in 1986 and the UA's Creative Teaching Award. Maurice's commitment to supporting other artists was unflagging and genuine. He would invariably turn up at openings and contribute his works to galleries, both big and small.

Always the activist, Maurice single-handedly took it upon himself to register people to vote. He felt that it was his duty to make sure that everyone, regardless of background, had a voice. When he retired in 1989, he became more involved in the effort to help fight discrimination against the LGBT community.

Maurice was quoted in a 2004 article as saying, "It's not just about equal rights for us. It's about equal rights for everyone. Do we want to take a step forward or a step back?"

Maurice never stepped back. He was an extraordinary man and a true individual. His role as an activist for equality and human rights will not soon be forgotten.

I was privileged to know Maurice personally. Always enthusiastic, I could count on not only his support but his passion. His dedication to the community was never-ending.

Madam Speaker, I rise to honor Maurice Grossman and thank him for being a role model for so many of us.

RECOGNIZING THE RELIEF EFFORTS OF DILLARD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL FOR THE PEOPLE OF HAITI

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 2010

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the students and staff of Dillard Elementary School in Ft. Lauderdale, Florida, for their dedication to helping the people of Haiti in the wake of the 7.0 earthquake of January 12, 2010. Not enough sorrow can be expressed for the people of Haiti and all those affected by this tragic event.

Every day, more information filters in from Port-au-Prince and surrounding areas that begins to shed light on the extent of the catastrophe in Haiti. This earthquake was a horror of epic proportions. It is estimated that over 200,000 Haitians, including hundreds of people from countries around the world, have died. In the aftermath of disaster, there have been numerous aftershocks reaching magnitudes of up to 6.1, and more unrest is expected. For years, Haitians have lived in misery beyond human understanding. Long after the final aftershock, the thousands of Haitians left homeless, injured, and starving will have to rebuild their country from the ground up. It is our moral duty as members of our global community to provide aid to Haiti in its time of great need.

This cry for help has been answered by the students and staff of Dillard Elementary School. They are committed to raising $5,000 for the people of Haiti through community fundraisers and have already begun a coin drive with great enthusiasm. This is our nation at its finest hour. Seeing communities all across the nation rally around this noble cause is a reminder of the human compassion and dignity that we all share.

My office is proud to support Dillard Elementary School in its efforts, as are many of my constituents and businesses in Florida's 23rd district, including Paradise Bank, The Westside Gazette, and Palm Harbor Prep.

Madam Speaker, the students and staff of Dillard Elementary School are role models for us all. I hope that we will follow their example and dig deep to help the people of Haiti in one of its darkest hours.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE INAUGURAL GRADUATING CLASS OF THE VERDUGO POWER ACADEMY

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 2010

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the first graduating class of the Verdugo Power Academy—a partnership between Glendale Community College, The Verdugo Workforce Investment Board and Glendale Water and Power.

The organizations have joined together to establish a new training program for people interested in working in the power industry. The program will address the projected shortage of utility workers in the power utility industry and the challenges in recruiting and retention, and will create a local source to produce qualified job candidates.

This project is funded through a Verdugo Workforce Investment Board grant from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act that has been awarded to Glendale Community College—a prime example of last year's stimulus bill producing a better trained workforce and new jobs.

The first class of students completed their challenging 16-week program and graduated on January 15, 2010. These new graduates now have the opportunity to pursue a well-paying career with a utility.

I offer my congratulations to the graduates and wish them well in their future endeavors. I also offer my thanks and congratulations to the faculty, staff and community leaders who developed the instructional curriculum and provided the facilities, materials, instructional support and technical expertise that made the program a tremendous success.

HONORING DR. BRUCE BELLINGHAM

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 2010

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to mark the passing of a great educator and true champion for the arts hi eastern Connecticut. Dr. Bruce Bellingham of Coventry,

esteemed professor, consummate musician and beloved husband, passed away on January 3, 2010.

A native of Hamilton, Ontario, Dr. Bellingham was deeply dedicated to allowing people of all ages to understand and appreciate music in that same manner that he did. He was a member of the American Federation of Musicians, the Viola da Gamba Society of Great Britain, an associate member of Early Music America, and President of the Viola da Gamba Society of America. He joined the University of Connecticut faculty in 1974 and was a Professor Emeritus of Music History in UConn's School of Fine Arts.

His passion for the music and culture of the past was matched only by his contributions to the present. In 1976, Dr. Bellingham directed the Storrs Collegium Musicum, where music of the late Middle Ages, Renaissance and Baroque periods was performed on original or masterfully recreated instruments of the era. Around this same time, he founded and conducted the Willimantic Orchestra. In 1983, he celebrated the 150th anniversary of Willimantic's incorporation by bringing local talent together to perform Burton Leavitt's operetta The Frogs of Windham.

Dr. Bellingham was also a passionate volunteer who used his great knowledge of culture and history to meaningfully engage members of his community. He was a long-time patron of the Jorgenson Center for the Performing Arts and founding member of its CoStars volunteer organization. He actively participated in youth outreach programs at Jorgenson and taught at UConn's Center for Learning in Retirement as well as the Adult Learning Program in West Harford. Dr. Bellingham and his wife, Deborah Walsh Bellingham, were recipients of the School of Fine Arts Outstanding Volunteer Award in 2009 for their support and service.

Dr. Bellingham will be dearly missed by his students, fellow educators, and the artistic community of eastern Connecticut. The depth of affection for Bruce was visibly on display January 10, 2010 at his memorial service at von der Mehden Recital Hall on the University of Connecticut campus that filled to capacity. I ask my colleagues to join me in mourning the loss and honoring the life of Bruce Bellingham.

HONORING WILLIAM ''BILL'' BROWN FOR ACHIEVING HONORARY STATUS IN THE BATAVIA (NY) ROTARY CLUB

HON. CHRISTOPHER JOHN LEE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 2010

Mr. LEE of New York. Madam Speaker, I ask that the House join me in recognizing Mr. William ''Bill'' Brown of Batavia, New York on achieving Honorary status in the Batavia Rotary Club.

Bill has been recognized to receive this award by distinguishing himself through ''meritorious service in the furtherance of Rotary ideals.''

Bill first joined the Batavia Rotary Club in January of 1960, and he served as the organization's president from 1974 to 1975. He was one of the first Batavia Rotary Club members to be awarded a Paul Harris Fellow for his generous donation to those less fortunate.

Additionally, Bill was chairman of Rotary Radio Days for 35 years and was a popular participant in the annual Rotary Comedy Show.

Bill has always stood by his commitment and dedication to ''service above self.''

Madam Speaker, I ask that this House join me in recognizing Bill for his commitment to the Batavia Rotary Club and achieving Honorary status in the organization.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE NATIONAL URBAN FELLOWS 40TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. JERROLD NADLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 2010

Mr. NADLER of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the National Urban Fellows on the occasion of its 40th anniversary.

The National Urban Fellows has recruited and developed mid-career men and women of color in pursuit of equity and social justice since 1970. National Urban Fellows is the only program in the country where individuals receive both an advanced degree and essential leadership experience. The 14-month, full-time graduate degree program comprises two semesters of academic course work and a nine-month mentorship assignment. The program culminates with a Master of Public Administration Degree (MPA) from Bernard M. Baruch College, School of Public Affairs, of the City University of New York. After graduation Alumni work in public service, government and nonprofit leadership. For 40 years National Urban Fellows has developed leaders who identify issues, shape solutions and form policy.

Today, 40 years later, National Urban Fellows has graduated well over 1,100 men and women of color who hold policy-making positions as mayors, city and county managers, commissioners and officers of major nonprofit and philanthropic organizations in urban areas across the country.

The National Urban Fellows program's 40 years of distinguished work is commendable and fully deserving of the recognition. Please join me in congratulating this esteemed organization.

ACCELERATION OF INCOME TAX BENEFITS FOR CHARITABLE CASH CONTRIBUTIONS

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 20, 2010

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker. I rise in support of H.R. 4462—a bill that will accelerate the income tax benefits for charitable cash contributions for the relief of victims of the earthquake in Haiti.

As you know, on Tuesday, January 12th, a massive, 7.0 magnitude earthquake struck Haiti near the capital of Port-au-Prince. There is still no official estimate of death or destruction, the damage to buildings is extensive and the number of injured or dead is estimated to be in the hundreds, even thousands.

Several eyewitnesses reported heavy damage and bodies in the streets of the capital, Port-au-Prince, where concrete-block homes line steep hillsides.

Haiti sits on a large fault that has caused catastrophic quakes in the past, but this one was described as among the most powerful to hit the region within the last 200 years. With many poor residents living in tin-roof shacks that sit precariously on steep ravines and with much of the construction in Port-au-Prince and elsewhere in the country of questionable quality, the expectation was that the quake caused major damage to buildings and significant loss of life.

The dimensions of the disaster are still unfolding, but Haiti's Prime Minister Jean-Max Bellerive told CNN that he believes there are well over 100,000 dead, and leading senator Youri Latortue estimated the number at possibly as high as 500,000, according the Associated Press.

America is responding, and will continue to respond with immediate humanitarian assistance to help the people of this struggling island nation rebuild their livelihoods. I send my condolences to the people and government of Haiti as they grieve once again in the aftermath of a natural disaster. As Haiti's neighbor, it is the United States' responsibility to help Haiti recover, and build the capacity to mitigate against future disasters.

American and her allies have already initiated a comprehensive, interagency response to the earthquake. The State Department, Department of Defense, Department of Homeland Security, Coast Guard, USAID—all worked overnight to ensure that critical resources are positioned to support the response and recovery effort, including efforts to find and assist American citizens in Haiti.

U.S. Southern Command will deploy a team of 30 people to Haiti to support U.S. relief efforts in the aftermath of yesterday's devastating earthquake. The team includes U.S. military engineers, operational planners, and a command and control group and communication specialists, will arrive in Haiti today on two C–130 Hercules aircraft. The team will work with U.S. Embassy personnel as well as Haitian, United Nations and international officials to assess the situation and facilitate follow on U.S. military support.

Our friends in the international community must also be commended for their efforts. The United Nations is releasing $10 million from its emergency funds. The European Commission has approved C3 million ($4.37 million) with more funds likely. Countless other nations from Germany, to China, to Israel to Mexico have also pledged support. I commend each of these nations for coming to a nation in dire need of assistance.

Many of my constituents ask what they can do to help, or how they can find their loved ones. Those who are interested in helping immediately can text 'HAITI' to '90999' and a donation of $10 will be made automatically to the Red Cross for relief efforts. The donation will be charged to your cell phone bill.

The outpouring of support and funding from the American people was both instant and sustained. According to the Washington Post, the text messaging effort raised $5 million in its first day, breaking the previous one-day

record of about $450,000. Text-message donations continue to play a larger-than-expected role in the push for earthquake relief in Haiti. As of late Sunday, the American Red Cross said that it had collected pledges of about $103 million, including $22 million through the text donation program. Another organization, Partners in Health, raised $25 million in the five days following the Jan. 12 earthquake in Haiti. This is equal to what it budgeted for Haiti in all of 2009. Overall, U.S. charities raised more than $150 million in the four days after the quake, according to the Chronicle of Philanthropy, which based its tally on proceeds reported by the nation's 22 largest charities. That total surpasses the $108 million raised in the four days following Hurricane Katrina in 2005 and the $30 million raised in the three days following the tsunami in Asia in 2004.

Financially, 2009 was not an easy year for many Americans. Although thousands of jobs were created and we are back on the road to economic recovery, Americans lived on tighter budgets than usual. This legislation will allow those Americans who have generously donated money to Haiti to receive their tax break this year instead of next year.

Once again, I am devastated by the immeasurable tragedy that occurred in Haiti. Along with my colleagues, I hope to visit Haiti in the near future to meet with their leaders and see what the United States can do to rebuild the shattered livelihoods.

In January of 2005, Congress enacted this type of relief for individuals that made charitable contributions to victims of the Indian Ocean tsunami that occurred in late December of 2004. That bill (H.R. 241 in the 109th Congress) passed the House of Representatives without objection and subsequently passed the Senate by unanimous consent. I hope that this legislation, like our response to the 2004 tsunami, will encourage Americans to contribute more money to Haiti. As Haiti starts on its long recovery, every dollar is critically important. Once again, I am proud to represent such a compassionate and generous nation.

A TRIBUTE TO DANIEL STEWART BERKEY

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 2010

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary life and work of Daniel Stewart Berkey who passed away at the age of 68 on October 19, 2009. Daniel is survived by his beloved wife, Ann Richardson Berkey, his daughter Elizabeth Wellington Berkey, and his son, William Cabot Berkey. Other surviving relatives include his brother-in-law, Thomas Latham Richardson of Sarasota, Florida, his brother, Richard Scott Berkey, Jr., of Vienna, Virginia and several aunts, nieces and nephews.

Daniel Berkey was born on June 25, 1941, in New Brunswick, New Jersey. He earned his Bachelor's degree from Lehigh University in 1963, then entered the United States Army where he earned the rank of Captain. He served his country with distinction in Vietnam and was awarded the Bronze Star and the Army Commendation Medal.

Upon his return to the United States, Daniel entered the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania and earned an MBA in 1970. He worked for Lipton Tea and at the U.S. Department of the Interior in Washington, D.C., where he met his wife, Ann Cabot Richardson. They were married in 1975 and moved to Houston. In 1977, the couple moved to San Francisco where Dan launched a successful financial services consulting company, Berkey Associates. His wife Ann serves as Senior Vice President for Corporate Public Affairs at McKesson Corporation.

Daniel loved to camp, hike, and ski, and with his wife spent many happy family vacations in state and national parks.

Dan survived two battles with non-Hodgkins Lymphoma, and received a bone marrow transplant in 2003. He fought courageously for 18 months before finally succumbing to the relentless disease after the cancer returned.

Madam Speaker, I ask the entire House of Representatives to join me in honoring Daniel Stewart Berkey. He was a great and good man who gave generously to his beloved family, his community and his country. He will be missed by every person who had the good fortune to know him, and may this tribute bring comfort to his family who were the greatest source of pride to him.

BOBBY D. ARIAS

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 2010

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate my good friend Bobby D. Arias on the occasion of his 60th Birthday. Bobby is being honored by his many colleagues, family and friends for his dedicated career as President of the Communities in Schools of Greater Los Angeles/San Fernando Valley.

As a lifelong resident of Southern California, Bobby began his career as an Executive Director of USC's Learning Center and the Director of Athletics at Loyola Marymount University (LMU) in Los Angeles. While at LMU, Bobby was instrumental in bringing the 1984 Olympic Weightlifting Competition to that institution, in addition to negotiating contracts for the Lakers/Clippers and the NBA Summer Pro-League to practice at LMU facilities.

I know first hand of Bobby's commitment to our community. Since 2004 Bobby has volunteered to be the Master of Ceremonies at the annual San Fernando Valley Veterans Day Parade. Additionally, Bobby has committed himself to improving the minds, spirits, and bodies of children throughout Southern California as the Southwest Regional Director for our nation's largest Drop out Prevention Program, Communities In Schools, Inc. He developed public and private partnerships between the community and its schools, brokering in-need resources to at-risk youth and their families. In 1996, he also served as the Chairman for the Executive Committee for Arnold Schwarzenegger's inner City Games, an Olympic style sporting/academic event for 100,000 at-risk youth throughout the Los Angeles County.

As a result of his professional achievements, Bobby has received numerous awards including the prestigious "Man of the Year" award for youth empowerment from MCI and Hispanic Magazine, and the "California All Star Dad's" Award by the California Department of Social Services.

Madam Speaker and distinguished colleagues, I ask you to join me in wishing Bobby Arias a happy birthday and best wishes for continued success.

IN HONOR OF LANCE CORPORAL JEREMY M. KANE

HON. JOHN H. ADLER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 2010

Mr. ADLER of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart and deep sense of gratitude to honor the life of a brave young man from Cherry Hill, New Jersey. Lance Corporal Jeremy M. Kane, 22 years old, was killed in Afghanistan on January 23, 2010 when a suicide bomber attacked his unit in the Helmand Province. Jeremy joined the Marines with his entire life before him. He chose to risk everything to fight for the values Americans hold close to our hearts, in a land halfway around the world. Today, I join Jeremy's family, his friends, and the entire Cherry Hill community in mourning his death. While we struggle to bear our sorrow over his death, we can also take pride in the example he set, bravely fighting to make the world a safer place. It is this courage and strength of character that people will remember when they think of Jeremy.

After graduating from Cherry Hill High School East in 2006, Jeremy attended Rutgers University to study criminal justice. He joined the Marine Corps on September 11, 2006, during his freshman year at Rutgers University and served as a reservist. His father, Bruce, had served as a major in the Army and passed away in June 2008 while Jeremy was undergoing Marine Corps training. His mother, Melinda, said Jeremy believed it was "his duty to serve his country." Jeremy also leaves behind his two brothers, Benjamin and Daniel.

In recognition of this selfless individual and brave patriot who gave his life to protect this nation, I ask that the House of Representatives and all Americans join me to honor the legacy of Lance Corporal Jeremy M. Kane.

IN HONOR OF CARL TUBBESING, DEPUTY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF STATE LEGISLATURES

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 2010

Mr. COSTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Carl Tubbesing, Deputy Executive Director of the National Conference of State Legislatures, NCSL, upon his retirement after 35 years of distinguished service to the organization.

Through his tireless efforts promoting state's rights and federalism during his tenure at the NCSL, Carl Tubbesing has earned the admiration and affection of his many colleagues across the country. Legislatures cannot run effectively without professional, high-quality staff

and resources. NCSL provides these resources, producing numerous publications, conducting research, and assisting lawmakers in crafting legislation.

Prior to joining NCSL in 1975, Carl Tubbesing taught Government and Public Affairs at Southern Illinois University in Edwardsville. After joining NCSL shortly after the organization's inception, he worked in the Denver office as Assistant Director of State Services working to meet the needs of state legislatures and their staffs nationwide. From there, he advanced to Director of State Federal relations where he was instrumental in the passage of the Child Care Development Block Grant, providing federal funding to states to assist low income families with child care burdens. Carl was also a valuable partner as NCSL strove to enact the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (UMRA). This legislation aimed to curb the practice of imposing unfunded mandates on state and local governments.

In 2000, as I assumed the role of NCSL President, Carl Tubbesing was instrumental in the adoption of the Farm Bill, including a major expansion of the Food Stamp program and a restoration of food stamp benefits to legal immigrants. Over the past ten years he has continued his admirable work on behalf of state legislatures, including providing temporary fiscal relief to states and territories in 2003, and more recently providing technical assistance to states as they implemented provisions under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA).

Carl Tubbesing has always been an incredible leader, and a valuable resource to myself and other lawmakers and we are sad to say goodbye. He is a man of outstanding character and we will remain grateful for his unwavering dedication and exceptional insight.

I want to personally wish Carl continued success and my best wishes upon his retirement.

INDIAN ARTS AND CRAFTS AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2010

SPEECH OF

HON. LAURA RICHARDSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 19, 2010

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Native American Caucus, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 725, the Indian Arts and Crafts Amendments Act of 2009, which will safeguard an industry critical to the Native American economy and small businesses.

First, I would like to acknowledge Speaker PELOSI, Majority Leader HOYER, and Chairman RAHALL for their leadership in bringing this important bill to the floor. I would also like to thank my colleague Congressman PASTOR, the author of this legislation, who worked so hard to help such an underserved community protect their economic livelihood.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 725, the Indian Arts and Crafts Amendments Act of 2009 amends 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 misrepresented as an Indian produced good or product. H.R. 725 authorizes the Indian Arts and Crafts Board to refer offenses to any federal law enforcement officer for investigation. In addition, this bill proposes new penalties for goods offered or displayed for sale or sold for less than $1,000 at a $25,000 fine, a 1-year imprisonment, or both.

In California, the State I represent, there are over one hundred Native American tribes, many of varying levels of economic success. Misrepresentation of products is one of the biggest problems facing the Native American art industry and market. Not only does the industry have to compete with the larger market, but Native Americans must compete with those who copy and counterfeit their work. Income from a single artist is often the sole source of support for their family, as well as being a source of strength and pride that reinforces cultures and traditions within communities. Therefore, as a long time friend and supporter of the Native American community, I am so pleased to champion a bill such as H.R. 725, which protects the unique economic opportunities of this community.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I support this bill because it protects an important industry in the areas and populations that needs assistance. The communities benefiting from H.R. 725 represent some of the most traditionally disadvantaged, isolated, and underserved populations in America. I am proud to work with my colleagues to ensure that Native Americans receive full protection of their most viable industry.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 725.

CONDEMNING VIOLENT SUPPRESSION IN GUINEA

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 20, 2010

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of House Resolution 1013. This resolution condemns the violent suppression of legitimate political dissent and gross human rights abuses in the Republic of Guinea. Over the past year the Republic of Guinea has experienced a complete loss of its human rights and democratic values that we cherish so dearly as Americans, and it is important that we not only condemn some of the horrific actions of the Guinean government, but also provide assistance for the reinstitution of democratically elected leaders and for the recovery of Guinea and its people. After the death of long-time President Lansana Conte in late 2008, Moussa Dadis Camara, a captain in the Guinean Army illegitimately took over the Guinean presidency in a bloodless coup.

This action was taken unilaterally by Camara without prior consultation or petition from the Guinean people. These undemocratic actions taken by the military junta and Captain Camera are shocking and unacceptable. Shortly after taking power, Captain Camara declared his intentions of instituting free and fair democratic elections under outside pressures from the international community. Over the past several months, however, Captain Camara has consistently delayed and postponed elections.

The situation intensified last September as Guinean security forces opened fire on a group of thousands of peaceful protestors wounding thousands and killing about 150 people. I condemn in the strongest terms this atrocious violence taken against peacefully protesting unarmed civilians.

My heart goes out to the friends, families and loved ones of the victims in this brutal attack. This cruel and unwarranted attack against unarmed and peaceful demonstrators is an attack against humanity as well as the democratic principles we stand for in the U.S. I especially condemn the actions taken by certain members of the security forces and their commanders who brutally raped, molested and killed women and children on the streets of Conakry during the violent confrontation. These are human rights violations of the worst kind and I vehemently oppose both the government of Guinea in addition to the troops and complacent officers who allowed these actions to take place.

I stand behind the people of Guinea in deploring these unjust and undemocratic actions and support a full transition of the country's leadership through future democratic elections. Since the beginning of Camara's illegitimate presidency over a year ago, the economic, social and political situation in Guinea has continually declined until this past December when a former aide to Camara, Lt. Aboubakar Diakite, attempted to assassinate the president and take over the country. After being shot in the head by Diakite, President Camara was evacuated to Senegal for treatment and then to Morocco for surgery.

The tense and unstable political situation in Guinea must be reconciled between opposing forces with a full and complete return to democratic rule through free and fair elections. We must also provide the people of Guinea with the tools and potential for future growth that would change this troubled nation. The United States can assist Guinea in returning to good governance by increasing transparent and accountable trade with Guinea, by providing further humanitarian assistance contingent on government reform in Guinea, and by providing election monitors to the people of Guinea in future elections.

I also call on the international community as a whole to conduct their trade and governmental interaction with the Republic of Guinea in a strategic manner that would take into account the conditions of the Guinean people and the disorder within the Guinean government. President Camara remains in exile, and is currently recovering in Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso after a failed assassination attempt on his life last December. Earlier this month both the president and the interim president reached an agreement which would institute a transitional government and hold presidential elections within the next six months. Though Camara and his interim president Gen. Sekouba Konate have appealed for peace and reconciliation and have urged their countrymen to put aside ethnic differences, there is still a vital need in the country for increased economic growth, improved standards of living for all people and a more transparent and just system of governance.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution. I also ask my colleagues for their continued support of the Guinean people and ask for their continued support of a complete return to democratic rule and respect for human rights in Guinea.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. J. GRESHAM BARRETT

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 2010

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, unfortunately, I missed the following recorded votes on the House floor on Wednesday, January 20, 2010, and Thursday, January 21, 2010.

On Wednesday, January 20, 2009, I ask that the RECORD reflect that had I been present I would have voted ''no'' on rollcall vote #9 (on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 1017), ''no'' on rollcall vote #10 (on motion to suspend the rules and agree to H.R. 3726), ''aye'' on rollcall vote #11 (on motion to suspend the rules and agree to H.R. 3538).

On Thursday, January 21, 2009, I ask that the RECORD reflect that had I been present I would have voted ''no'' on rollcall vote #12 (on passage of H.R. 3254), ''aye'' on rollcall vote #13 (on passage of H.R. 3342), ''no'' on rollcall vote #14 (on passage of H.R. 1065), ''aye'' on rollcall vote #15 (on motion to suspend the rules and agree to H. Res. 1021), ''aye'' on rollcall vote #16 (on motion to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 730).

HONORING SEVEN AMERICANS KILLED IN AFGHANISTAN ON DECEMBER 30, 2009

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN A. BOEHNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 20, 2010

Mr. BOEHNER. Madam Speaker, on December 30, 2009, we were reminded of the dangers and challenges our intelligence community faces every day, working in anonymity to keep our country safe. We were reminded that they often operate under harsh conditions, leaving loved ones behind, and that their service will likely never be publicly recognized. Seven Americans died in service to their country and several others were severely wounded. If we can collectively take anything from this tragedy, I hope it is to re-commit ourselves to be mindful of the toll the our military, intelligence, and civilian personnel persevere under every day to keep this country safe and to do everything in our power to support their mission. I extend my personal condolences to the families, loved ones, friends, and colleagues of our fallen and wounded personnel.

A BAD PRESCRIPTION FOR WISCONSIN

HON. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 2010

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, as the new year begins, we are back to debating the seemingly old health care legislation. This bill would cost Wisconsinites and Wisconsin businesses. The legislation essentially puts the government in control of health care)—an industry that comprises nearly one-sixth of our economy. And, as I've repeatedly heard at dozens of my Town Hall Meetings, Wisconsinites overwhelmingly oppose this legislation.

Until the Federal Government can effectively manage Medicare and Medicaid, it shouldn't be creating a new program. Additionally, there are 27,156 seniors in Wisconsin's Fifth Congressional District who use Medicare Advantage and who would likely see reduced benefits.

And in another bad move for my State, the Senate version proposes an additional $2 billion annual tax for each of the next 10 years on medical device manufacturers. This would negatively affect good companies, such as GE Healthcare in Waukesha, Wisconsin, and hundreds of our small business suppliers. In addition to stifling innovation and hindering research and development, the added costs would hurt consumers, as anyone purchasing medical products, such as wheelchairs, or whose care includes the use of equipment, such as an MRI machine, would feel the pinch.

Making backroom deals to pass health care reform is a far cry from the transparency President Barack Obama promised. Every Wisconsinite will be affected by this legislation so they have a right to be in the know and to watch the debate unfold on C–SPAN. It's common sense that the people who elect us be included in the process.

Yes, health care needs to be reformed in our country. However, patching two pieces of horrible legislation together into one awful bill that would cost Wisconsinites more while lessening their care will not receive my support.

The bottom line is that this legislation is bad medicine that would make our health care system sicker.

BUILDING AN AFGHAN AIR FORCE

HON. CLIFF STEARNS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 2010

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, during the last week in December, I had the opportunity to travel to Afghanistan and see firsthand the situation on the ground. It goes without saying that I was most impressed with the hard work and courage displayed by our troops who are stationed over there. I am always in awe of our men women in the Armed Forces. Their bravery and professionalism is something that all Americans should be proud of.

One aspect of our mission there that does not receive much attention compared to other parts of the mission is the effort to build an Afghan air force. The work of the Combined Air Power Transition Force (CAPTF) Partnership and the Afghan National Army Air Corps (ANAAC) deserves to be commended. During our trip we had the opportunity to meet with and be briefed by CAPTF Commanding General, United States Air Force Brigadier General Michael Boera. General Boera and his people run an impressive operation.

The Combined Air Power Transition Force has a mission to set the conditions for a professional, fully independent and operationally capable Afghan air force that meets the security requirements of Afghanistan today and tomorrow. Furthermore, the Afghan National Army Air Corps provides trained and ready airmen and soliders to execute critical tasks from the air in support of the Afghan National Army, and when directed by the Ministry of Defense, to support by air the civil authorities of Afghanistan at all levels.

CAPTF air advisors have oversight responsibilities for both the Ministry of Defense Afghan National Army Air Corps and the Ministry of Interior aviation assets used for Counternarcotics and General Support. In short, their goal is to ensure that the Afghan people will be able to protect their own airspace.

As an embedded partnership, CAPTF operates along four lines of operation to accomplish their mission. The first line of operation is build the Afghan Air Corps aircraft capacity. Second, CAPTF works to build Afghan airmen's capacity and capability. The third step is to build ANAAC's infrastructure to support their force, and fourth, to perform operations in the current counterinsurgency effort.

Transcending all four of those lines of operation is CAPTF's effort for institutional development such as improving their command and control capability, improving their air base management capability, and building up their ''Air University'' educational capability so critical to the foundation to a professional force.

The Afghan Air Corps currently has 46 aircraft and close to 3,000 personnel building to about 150 aircraft and over 8,000 personnel by 2016. Their mission sets include Presidential and other types of airlift, battlefield mobility, to include medical evacuation and casualty evacuation, and close air support.

The primary airframes flown by the Air Corps are Mi–17 and Mi–35 helicopters and C–27s, which is the first modern western aircraft introduced to the Afghans. CAPTF hopes to introduce additional aircraft into the Afghan inventory as they continue to grow in capability.

The ANAAC's Air Corps headquarters is in Kabul and they currently have two Air Wings, one at Kabul and one at Kandahar. A third is being built at Shindand airfield out to the west that will also be the home of their Training Center where the CAPTF will partner with them initially to train their pilots.

The Afghans also have Air Detachments at critical locations around the country to support the Afghan ground forces. It's important to note, the Afghan airmen are in the fight now even as we help them build capacity and capability. It's like flying the airplane while building it.

Much work remains, but General Boera and all the hardworking people of the Combined Air Power Transition Force are certainly moving in the right direction. All Americans should be proud!

INTRODUCTION OF THE ''ROYALTY RELIEF FOR AMERICAN CONSUMERS ACT OF 2010''

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 2010

Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, yesterday the administration announced that President Obama will propose a three-year freeze on non-security discretionary

spending in his State of the Union address tomorrow as a way of addressing the federal deficit. However, as President Obama works to reduce the budget deficit and put our nation on a path of fiscal responsibility, oil companies are pushing us further into the red by continuing to drill for free on public land.

The "Royalty Relief for American Consumers Act of 2010" that I am introducing today with the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, would recover the more than $50 billion that taxpayers currently stand to lose in foregone oil royalty payments as a result of defective leases issued by the Department of Interior between 1996 and 2000. The minerals below our public lands belong to the American people and no company should be allowed to exploit them for free. This legislation would protect American taxpayers and reduce our budget deficit by up to $54 billion.

The legislation that we are introducing today would offer oil companies a simple choice: they can continue to drill for free on public lands but they will not be permitted to purchase new leases from the federal government. The language in the Royalty Relief for American Consumers Act has repeatedly passed the House of Representatives in 2006, 2007 and 2008. It is time that we start drilling for deficit dollars by reclaiming these lost royalty payments and ending the free ride that oil companies are currently enjoying on public land.

As President Obama steps up efforts to reduce the federal budget deficit, ensuring that oil companies are paying their fair share is a common sense way to help restore fiscal responsibility. We can no longer afford to allow oil companies to drill for free while taxpayers are left holding the bill. Enacting this legislation will put an end to this taxpayer rip off once and for all.

HONORING PASQUOTANK COUNTY COMMISSIONER JIMMIE HARRIS

HON. G. K. BUTTERFIELD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 2010

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize the recent passing of Jimmie Harris, a great local civic leader in Pasquotank County, North Carolina.

A county commissioner and former volunteer fire department chief, Mr. Harris will long be remembered for his leadership on issues related to fire services, agriculture, education and the local hospital. He was passionate about doing everything he could to improve the community, and even those people with opposing viewpoints had great respect for him.

This is an enormous loss, and there is a great deal of sadness throughout the community.

Mr. Harris was a retired farmer and served as Providence Volunteer Fire Department Chief for over 20 years. He was also a devoted member of Berea Baptist Church, and had served on many civic boards and organizations.

Along with his wife, Brenda Corbett Harris, Mr. Harris is survived by his mother, a daughter, a son, two sisters and three grandchildren. They gathered with friends, family and loved ones last week at the Berea Baptist Church Family Life Center for a memorial service.

Madam Speaker, I ask that my colleagues rise in recognition of Mr. Harris' passing and his lifetime of outstanding public service to his community. I also ask that we pass along our best wishes and prayers to his family, friends and loved ones during this difficult time.

EXPRESSING CONDOLENCES TO HAITI

SPEECH OF

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 20, 2010

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, I rise in reluctant opposition to this resolution. Certainly I am moved by the horrific destruction in Haiti and would without hesitation express condolences to those who have suffered and continue to suffer. As a medical doctor, I have through my career worked to alleviate the pain and suffering of others. Unfortunately, however, this resolution does not simply express our condolences, but rather it commits the U.S. government "to begin the reconstruction of Haiti" and affirms that "the recovery and long-term needs of Haiti will require a sustained commitment by the United States. . . ." I do not believe that a resolution expressing our deep regret and sorrow over this tragedy should be used to commit the United States to a "long-term" occupation of Haiti during which time the U.S. government will provide for the reconstruction of that country.

I am concerned over the possibility of an open-ended U.S. military occupation of Haiti and this legislation does nothing to alleviate my concerns. On the contrary, when this resolution refers to the need for a long-term U.S. plan for Haiti, I see a return to the failed attempts by the Clinton and Bush Administrations to establish Haiti as an American protectorate. Already we are seeing many argue that this kind of humanitarian mission is a perfect fit for the U.S. military. I do not agree.

Certainly I would support and encourage the efforts of the American people to help the people of Haiti at this tragic time. I believe that the American people are very generous on their own and fear that a U.S. government commitment to reconstruct Haiti may actually discourage private contributions. Mr. Speaker, already we see private U.S. citizens and corporations raising millions of dollars for relief and reconstruction of Haiti. I do not believe the U.S. government should get in the way of these laudable efforts. I do express my condolences but I unfortunately must urge my colleagues to vote against this resolution committing the United States government to rebuild Haiti.

EXPRESSING CONDOLENCES TO HAITI

SPEECH OF

HON. AL GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 20, 2010

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I would like to extend my support to H. Res. 1021, which expresses condolences to and solidarity with the people of Haiti in the aftermath of the devastating earthquake of January 12, 2010.

I would like to thank my colleague, BARBARA LEE, chairwoman of the Congressional Black Caucus, for offering this legislation and express heartfelt condolences and sympathy for the people of Haiti in the wake of this horrific natural disaster.

On January 12, 2010, a 7.0 magnitude earthquake struck the country of Haiti. An estimated 3 million people have been directly affected by the disaster in Haiti, more than 1.5 million people left homeless, and severe damage has been sustained by roads, ports, hospitals, and homes.

The challenges in helping Haiti are immense, and the U.S. and partner countries have made important contributions to the recovery efforts. I commend the Obama administration for granting Temporary Protected Status for Haitian nationals in the United States, many of whom are unable to return home due to the destruction in Haiti.

I applaud the individuals, businesses and philanthropic organizations across the United States and throughout the international community who have responded to the crisis in Haiti with an outpouring of generosity and support.

It is clear that the people of Haiti are now facing a humanitarian crisis that is unimaginable and that will take years to recover from. I support a sustained commitment to people of Haiti and encourage innovative thinking in providing long-term assistance to the country.

I am committed to helping the Haitian people recover from this tragedy and to rebuild their homes, communities, and lives in the days, weeks and years to come.

Again, thank you to Rep. BARBARA LEE for introducing this resolution and urge all my colleagues to support H. Res. 1021.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MARVIN L. GILLUM

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 2010

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, I rise to share with our colleagues the recent passing of Marvin L. Gillum. He died on January 21, 2010, at the age of 85.

Marvin had a long history of service to the city of Manassas, Virginia, and the greater Prince William County community. He served as mayor of Manassas for eight years from 1996 to 2004, and was also a former chairman of the Manassas School Board.

I submit for the RECORD an obituary for Marvin that ran in the Manassas News & Messenger on January 22:

MARVIN L. GILLUM

Marvin L. Gillum, age 85, died peacefully at his home Thursday, January 21, 2010. He was born on February 2, 1924 in his town, Manassas. He graduated from Osbourn High School in 1940 and continued his education at the Virginia Military Institute (VMI) where he earned a B.S. in chemistry and pre-med. He then received his D.D.S. from the Medical College of Virginia School of Dentistry. He worked as a dentist for forty years. His father, Dr. V.V. Gillum, established the family business in 1914 in Manassas where he served a number of patients who arrived by train from all over the area. Marvin served his country as a Captain in the U.S. Air Force

Dental Corps during the Korean War. After retiring from dentistry in 1987, Dr. Gillum chose a second career in investment brokerage. He served Scott & Stringfellow as an Executive Vice President, a Senior Vice President, and sat on the Board of Directors.

In 1947, he and his bride Mardi came to Manassas where they raised three daughters, Cindy, Debby and Melanie, who have given their parents six grandchildren and two grandchildren through marriage. Marvin and Mardi were blessed with 62 wonderful years of marriage. Apart from his devotion to his wife and family, Dr. Gillum's personal interests included tennis, bridge, piano and organ, reading, baseball, the Washington Redskins, and his alma mater VMI. His community activities read like a full chapter in ''Who's Who in America,'' and include Mayor of Manassas for eight years (1996–2004); 15 years on the Manassas School Board with ten as chairman; former chairman of Prince William Health System Foundation; first chairman of the Manassas Historical Commission; a trustee of the Manassas Baptist Church and former deacon (where he had been a member since age five); former director of the City of Manassas Education Foundation; former board member of Historic Manassas, Inc; former commissioner of the Manassas Baseball League; former director of the Prince William Chapter of the American Red Cross; advisory board of the Prince William Campus of George Mason University; honorary chairman of the March of Dimes; former director of SERVE, Inc.; past president of the Manassas Rotary Club; Outstanding Alumni Graduate Award -Osbourn High School Alumni Association; Vice Chairman and Board of Directors for Manassas Dance Company; former member of Manassas Kiwanis Club; and the Grand Marshal of the Greater Manassas Christmas Parade in 1994. He has also been an avid supporter of the local fine arts, backing such attractions as the new home for the Center for the Arts and the Loy E. Harris Pavilion. During his tenure as mayor, the city experienced a renaissance which included receiving the 2003 Great America Main Street Award and designation as one of ''Washingtonian'' magazine's top places to live in the Washington area. He truly loved his city and his lifelong endeavor was to enhance the quality of community life for all who lived here.

He was preceded in death by his parents Dr. V.V. and Lois Layman Gillum and his sister, Jocelyn Gillum Scott.

Survivors include his wife, Martha Droste Gillum; his three daughters, Cindy Gillum Coiner and husband Bill of Midlothian, Va., Debby Gillum Milligan and husband Dick of Manassas and Melanie Gillum Przybocki and husband Dave of Manassas. Grandchildren include: Caroline Milligan of Winchester, Va., Meredith Milligan of Manassas, Cara Clayton of Sarasota, Fla., Cory Clayton and wife Signe of Denmark, Rob Dufour of Newport News, Va., Mollie Przybocki of Manassas, Wil and Jenny Coiner of Midlothian and one brother-in-law, David Scott of Decatur, Ga.

The family will receive friends from 1 to 4 and 6 to 8 p.m. Friday, January 29, 2010 at Pierce Funeral Home, 9609 Center Street, Manassas. A Celebration of Life will be held at Grace E. Metz School, 9950 Wellington Road, Manassas at 1 p.m. Saturday, January 30, 2010. A private family interment will take place after the service at Stonewall Memory Gardens, Manassas.

Contributions may be made in his memory to his beloved Manassas Baptist Church, 8800 Sudley Road, Manassas, VA 20110 (Marvin always wanted a chime tower for all to hear) or to the George Mason University, Hylton Performing Arts Center, 10900 University Blvd. MS5D2, Manassas, VA 20110 (for all to enjoy) in loving memory of Marvin L. Gillum. Condolences may be sent to www.piercefh.com.

IN MEMORY OF REBECCA H. CAPUZZI, BELOVED MOTHER AND GRANDMOTHER

HON. ROBERT E. ANDREWS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 2010

Mr. ANDREWS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and memory of Rebecca H. Capuzzi, of Philadelphia who passed away on December 20, 2009 at Jefferson Hospital after a brief illness.

Born on April 22, 1922 in Philadelphia, she was the daughter of the late David Hoffman and Mary (Singerman) Hoffman. Mrs. Capuzzi is survived by her two daughters, Donna and Judy, her son-in-law, Bernard, and her treasured grandson, Brandon. She was the devoted wife of the late John Capuzzi, a well known art restorer in Philadelphia. Mrs. Capuzzi's appreciation for the arts was evident to all those lucky enough to know her. She encouraged her beloved grandson, Brandon, to learn about the importance of the arts and often brought him to cultural institutions and performances. She will be interred at West Laurel Hill Cemetery, Mausoleum of Peace, with her husband.

Madam Speaker, Rebecca Capuzzi's commitment to her family should not go unrecognized. I express my deepest condolences to her family for their loss and pay tribute to the memory of this astounding individual.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. W. TODD AKIN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 2010

Mr. AKIN. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 10 on motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended—H.R. 3726—to establish the Castle Nugent National Historic Site on the island of St. Croix, U.S. Virgin Islands, as a unit of the National Park System.

Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

HONORING MELVIN BARBER

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 2010

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Melvin Barber. A successful businessman, an avid traveler, and a beloved member of my extended family, Mr. Barber had an exceptional ability to make friends wherever he went. Mr. Barber passed away on Monday, January 11, 2010, at the age of 87.

Melvin Barber was a native of Weatherford, Oklahoma, where he was born to Alfred Barber and Eva West in 1922. Mr. Barber remained in Oklahoma throughout his youth, growing up in the nearby towns of Drummond and Enid. Upon graduation from Booker T. Washington High School, Mr. Barber matriculated at Langston University in Langston, Oklahoma. Mr. Barber's college education was interrupted by the onset of the Second World War; he was drafted in 1942 and began a term of service which lasted for the duration of the war.

After receiving an honorable discharge from the U.S. Army in 1946, Mr. Barber moved to Washington, D.C., where he enrolled at Howard University. While at Howard, Mr. Barber became a Brother of Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity, Inc. For over 50 years Mr. Barber was a committed member of the fraternity, striving to embody their motto of ''Achievement in Every Human Endeavour.''

Once Mr. Barber had completed his degree at Howard, he moved to Cincinnati, Ohio, in pursuit of career opportunities. In Cincinnati, Mr. Barber found a position as a Medical Research Associate in the Institute of Environmental Health at the University of Cincinnati Medical Center. Mr. Barber dedicated himself to this position, staying at the Institute for over 30 years.

In addition to being an accomplished researcher, Mr. Barber was a successful businessman and a cherished member of his community. For many years, Mr. Barber owned and operated Highland Computer Systems. He was also an active member of Allen Temple AME Church of Cincinnati, extending his ministry to the community by acting as a sponsor and mentor for many disadvantaged youth throughout the Cincinnati area.

In 1996, Melvin moved from Ohio to Arizona, where he took up residence in the town of Peoria. In his retirement, Melvin indulged his passion for travel, visiting countries and making friends around the world. When not travelling, he followed sports, particularly the Phoenix Suns and the Arizona Diamondbacks, and created beautiful works of stained glass artwork.

Melvin left us on Monday, January 11, 2010. I will always remember the treasured moments we shared at family events, where he loved to play dominoes and cards with his sister, Gertrude; my mother, Mildred; my sisters, Beverly and Mildred; and my brothers in law, Martin and Calvin. He always enjoyed good food, and he was consistently engaged with current events. I recall in particular his excitement at the election of our first African American President, President ''Obaama,'' as he insisted on calling him. I will deeply miss his laugh, his kindness, his dedication to my 98–year old Aunt Juanita, and his tremendous love for life.

Today we salute, honor, and celebrate the life of a great human being, an outstanding member of his community, and a true renaissance man. May his soul rest in eternal peace.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 2010

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I regret that I was unavoidably absent Thursday afternoon, January 21, on very urgent business. Had I been present for the five votes which occurred, I would have voted ''aye'' on

H.R. 3254, rollcall vote No. 12; I would have voted ''aye'' on H.R. 3342, rollcall vote No. 13; I would have voted ''aye'' on H.R. 1065, rollcall vote No. 14; I would have voted ''aye'' on H. Res. 1021, rollcall vote No. 15; I would have voted ''aye'' on H.R. 730, rollcall vote No. 16.

IN HONOR OF ANGEL ISLAND IMMIGRATION STATION

HON. LYNN C. WOOLSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 2010

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today with a mixture of sorrow and pride to honor the Angel Island Immigration Station on its 100th anniversary—sorrow because of the Station's history of unjust treatment of immigrants, especially those from China, and pride because we are now acknowledging and respecting the struggle and courage of these immigrants.

Located off the coast of Tiburon, California, in Angel Island State Park in San Francisco Bay, the Station is the site of the detention of 175,000 Chinese immigrants from 1910 to 1940. Because of the Chinese Exclusion Act, many of them were held for weeks, months or years in a prison-like barracks where life was difficult and humiliating.

The ghosts of these people speak to us through poetry written and etched into the walls of these barracks. The experiences reflected here remind us that it is essential to treat all people with dignity and respect. In today's debates about immigration policy, at a time when we have moved beyond the inhumanity of the Chinese Exclusion Act, these ghosts tell us to learn from our past and set a new course that reflects who we are as a nation.

And now, thanks to the Angel Island Immigration Station Foundation and its many supporters and partners, including the California State Parks and the National Park Service, the Immigration Station is being restored. It helps us understand this rich and complex history by hosting more than 50,000 people, including 30,000 schoolchildren, every year.

Angel Island itself was once inhabited by the native Miwoks and was discovered by Europeans in 1769. It has served for both cattle ranching and military uses, from the Civil War era Camp Reynolds to a base for Nike missiles in the 1950s and 1960s. In 1891, a quarantine station for immigrants was established and, on January 21, 1910, over 200 Chinese immigrants shipped from San Francisco marked the opening of the Angel Island Immigration Station. It was officially closed in 1946, and many of the barracks were razed when the Island became a State Park in 1957. Today, the Park's stunning views and abundant wildlife complement the historic structures.

As a mother and grandmother, I am grateful that the restored Angel Island Immigration Station will continue to keep the past alive for our young people. And as the Congresswoman representing this unique resource, I have had the privilege of participating in its rehabilitation by securing Federal funding for a bi-partisan effort that recognizes that we all have a stake in remembering that America is a nation of immigrants.

Madam Speaker, Angel Island Immigration Station today, on the occasion of its 100th anniversary, is both a reminder and a challenge. It reminds us that America hasn't always lived up to its highest ideals of freedom and equality. But it challenges us to live up to those ideals now and in the future. One of the poems from its walls poignantly serves to educate and inspire us:

In the quiet of night, I heard, faintly, the whistling of wind.
The forms and shadows saddened me; upon seeing the landscape, I composed a poem.
The floating clouds, the fog, darken the sky.
The moon shines faintly as the insects chirp.
Grief and bitterness entwined are heaven sent.
The sad person sits alone, leaning by a window.

INTRODUCTION OF THE TANNING BED CANCER CONTROL ACT

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 2010

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Speaker, today I am introducing bipartisan legislation along with my friend and colleague from Pennsylvania, Representative Charlie Dent: the Tanning Bed Cancer Control Act.

In July 2009, the World Health Organization moved tanning beds into their highest cancer risk category, ''carcinogenic to humans.'' This new classification places tanning beds alongside tobacco smoke, asbestos, and uranium as known cancer-causing agents. This science clearly tells us that regulatory safeguards must be put in place to protect the more than 1 million people who tan in tanning salons across the country each day. One American dies of melanoma almost every hour. We can no longer ignore the startling health effects of indoor tanning.

This bill empowers the FDA to examine two sides of tanning bed regulation. First, it requires a study be conducted to determine whether or not tanning beds are appropriately classified in accordance with the risks of their use. Right now, tanning beds are classified in the lowest risk category, class I. Other examples of class I devices are Band Aids and tongue depressors, devices that pose no risk to consumers at all. The bill also addresses performance standards—factors such as the strength of the UV rays emitted and the recommended amount of time a consumer should remain in the bed. These standards have not been amended since 1985. Finally, the legislation calls on the FDA to carry out its own findings published in a 2008 Report to Congress and edit the warning label requirements to clearly and more effectively inform consumers of the health risks associated with tanning bed use.

This legislation does not seek to tell the FDA what to do; rather, it empowers the FDA to use its own authority to ensure that tanning bed regulations reflect science. There is no longer any mystery to this issue: tanning beds emit UV rays. UV rays cause cancer. It's very simple and deceptively dangerous. We cannot afford to stand by and watch people suffer as a result of misinformation and poor regulation.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 2010

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Madam Speaker, today our national debt is $12,303,736,486,568.45.

On January 6th, the start of the 111th Congress, the national debt was $10,638,425,746,293.80.

This means the national debt has increased by $1,665,310,740,274.65 so far this Congress.

Today the Congressional Budget Office released their Budget and Economic Outlook: Fiscal Years 2010–2020. They estimate a deficit of $1.3 trillion for fiscal year 2010. This debt and its interest payments we are passing to our children and all future Americans.

IN MEMORY OF KENNETH G. PIPPIN

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 2010

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, on January 18, 2010, our country lost an American patriot and a community leader with the passing of Kenneth Pippin:

Kenneth G. Pippin, 83, of Glen Burnie, Maryland, passed away on January 18, 2010, at Baltimore Washington Medical Center surrounded by his family. Kenneth, son of the late Rufus Pippin and Frances Pauline Owens Casto, was born in Wilder, Virginia. He grew up in Welch, West Virginia, where he graduated from high school. Right before his 18th birthday, Kenneth went to Welch's US Army Recruiting Office and asked them to draft him because his grandmother would not let him volunteer. Ken served in the Army during World War II as a paratrooper in the 82nd Airbrone Division, 505th Parachute Infantry Regiment. During the invasion of Normandy, with paratroopers suffering the heaviest causalities, Kenneth bravely volunteered to be a part of the parachute regiment. He spent most of his service in Europe. Shortly after his discharge from the Army, Kenneth moved to Baltimore, Maryland, where he completed technical school.

He married his high school sweetheart, Thelma Beasley, in 1948, after a long courtship. They had four wonderful children: three sons, Kenny, Kevin, and Kerwin, and one daughter, Karen. Kenneth and Thelma lived in Glen Burnie, Maryland, for 53 years. Kenneth worked as a printer for Baltimore Business Forms for 34 years and later retired from the Baltimore-Annapolis Railroad Company. He was also a member of Glen Burnie Baptist Church, The American Association of Military Insignia, and VFW Post 160.

Kenneth loved life and appreciated everything he had. He enjoyed spending summer vacations at his wife's family farm in Hillsville, Virginia. In retirement, he and Thelma became snowbirds and flew south every winter to their son's home in Sarasota, Florida. He enjoyed hunting, reading—especially about military history—and collecting military insignias. His

greatest love was his family and his wife of 61 years.

I have known Kenneth's son, Ken, for many years, and am grateful for his longtime service to South Carolina. I sincerely appreciate his work as President of the Carolina Southern Railroad and Chairman of the South Carolina Association of Railroads.

THINKING OUTSIDE THE BOX TO PRODUCE MORE DOMESTIC ENERGY

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 2010

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, one thing that most Americans can agree on is that we need to produce more energy at home. The more energy that we produce domestically, the less we need to rely on foreign sources of oil which often come from unstable parts of the world. Furthermore, domestic energy creates jobs right here at home, jobs that can help lead our nation out of the current recession. America's thirst for energy continues to grow and the more options we have to quench this thirst, the better off we will be. It is essential to look at all forms of domestic energy including domestic oil and natural gas, solar, renewable and the latest technology—waste to energy conversion. All options should be examined.

I recently had the opportunity to learn about a new and exciting technology that could help us produce more domestic energy from shale deposits, tar sands, waste tires, heavy oil, coal, municipal solids wastes and drill cuttings. A U.S. company, Global Resource Corporation is the developer of a microwave technology that converts waste into energy through a conversion process that essentially decomposes carbon materials into reusable high value fuels. An added benefit of this technology is that microwaves do not produce emissions, the process does not require water and all output can be reused.

It is vital to America that we support the development of new technologies like this one that will provide the energy and new jobs we desperately need in order to grow. This company is evaluating the option to build a plant in the Second Congressional District of Texas. With its large number of refineries, deposits and other waste, as well as old tires that will be converted into usable energy, this process would solve two problems at once, disposal of waste and used tires, and producing clean domestic energy. I support projects such as this one and hope that our country will adopt even more common sense solutions to our growing energy demands, utilizing the domestic resources we have available and creating jobs.

HONORING WILLIAM ''BILL'' CAVALA

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 2010

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I rise with my colleague, Mr. GARAMENDI, today to honor the exceptional life of Dr. Bill Cavala. Known throughout California politics as a brilliant democratic strategist and shrewd tactician, Bill Cavala was also renowned for his professionalism, teaching prowess and strong sense of loyalty. With his passing on December 26, 2009, we look to Bill Cavala's political legacy and the outstanding quality of his life's work.

Born William Lester Cavala, February 23, 1943 to Lester and Margaret Cavala, Bill was the oldest of three sons. He grew up in Sacramento and Oakland, exercising early political interest in the Junior Statesmen youth organization. He went on to earn bachelor's, master's and doctorate degrees in political science from the University of California, Berkeley. Bill's political studies never ceased as he amassed an encyclopedic and institutional knowledge of state legislative districts, California voter patterns, campaigning tactics and reapportionment. For a time, Bill Cavala worked at the university as a professor of political science, but for much of his 40-year political career he employed his passion for hands-on, field experience.

In 1971, Bill Cavala joined the staff of late Democratic Assemblyman Bob Crown, and worked with the Select Committee on Criminal Justice. Later, while teaching at UC Berkeley, he continued to perform constituent work within the offices of Assembly members John Miller, Ken Meade and Bill Lockyer, his former classmate. In 1981, Bill Cavala joined the staff of California State Assembly Speaker Willie Brown, Jr. as Senior Aide, where he served for 14 years. Bill Cavala was three-time Director of the Speaker's Office of Majority Services and worked as deputy director under seven different directors. He served Minority Leader Richard Katz and other Speakers of the Assembly, including Cruz Bustamante, Antonio Villaraigosa, Robert Hertzberg and Herb Wesson, Jr.

Bill Cavala fulfilled a crucial, behind-the-scenes role as he played a part in important decisions regarding redistricting, election law and the state budget. Throughout his career, he kept in mind the counsel of his much-admired mentors the late Congressman Philip Burton, wife Sala, and brother, John. Through their influence, Bill gained a deep appreciation for the role of public service and his potential to make meaningful societal contributions via the political process.

Despite his hefty workload from the California State Legislature and his commitments at UC Berkeley, Bill Cavala had a role in every election cycle over a 40-year span. His deft and daring campaign approaches resulted in countless winning campaigns, most recently in the congressional elections of Representatives JOHN GARAMENDI and JACKIE SPEIER. Friends and colleagues on both sides of the aisle admired his singular focus and political passion. In addition to politics, Bill Cavala had a love for baseball, golf, fine wine, gourmet cooking, mentorship, travel and film.

Today, we mourn the loss of a political pioneer, respected strategist and campaign mastermind who was considered by many the driving force in California politics for the past 40 years. Bill Cavala was a dear friend and he will be deeply missed by an extended group of loved ones, friends and colleagues. I offer my sincerest condolences to Bill's family and to the many friends and associates whose lives he has touched over the years.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S209–S262

Measures Introduced: Seven bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2951–2957, S. Res. 397, and S. Con. Res. 49. **Page S251**

Measures Passed:

Honoring Former Senator Charles McCurdy ("Mac") Mathias, Jr.: Senate agreed to S. Res. 397, relative to the death of Charles McCurdy ("Mac") Mathias, Jr., former United States Senator for the State of Maryland. **Page S260**

Legal Representation: Senate agreed to S. Res. 398, to authorize representation by the Senate Legal Counsel in the case of *Schonberg, et al. v. Sanders, et al*. **Pages S260–61**

Honoring Fallen Nevada Law Enforcement Officers: Senate agreed to S. Res. 399, honoring the heroic actions of Court Security Officer Stanley Cooper, Deputy United States Marshal Richard J. "Joe" Gardner, the law enforcement officers of the United States Marshals Service and Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, and the Court Security Officers in responding to the armed assault at the Lloyd D. George Federal Courthouse on January 4, 2010. **Page S261**

Measures Considered:

Increasing the Statutory Limit on the Public Debt—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of H.J. Res. 45, increasing the statutory limit on the public debt, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S211–23, S223–46**

Adopted:

By a unanimous vote of 97 yeas (Vote No. 4), Baucus Modified Amendment No. 3300 (to Amendment No. 3299), to protect Social Security. (A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the amendment, having achieved 60 affirmatives votes, be agreed to). **Pages S211, S216–21**

By a unanimous vote of 94 yeas (Vote No. 6), Division I of Coburn Modified Amendment No. 3303 (to Amendment No. 3299), to rescind $120 billion in Federal spending by consolidating duplicative government programs, cutting wasteful Washington spending, and returning billions of dollars of unspent money. (A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the division, having achieved 60 affirmatives votes, be agreed to). **Pages S226–33, S237–42**

Withdrawn:

By 53 yeas to 46 nays (Vote No. 5), Conrad/Gregg Amendment No. 3302 (to Amendment No. 3299), to establish a Bipartisan Task Force for Responsible Fiscal Action, to assure the long-term fiscal stability and economic security of the Federal Government of the United States, and to expand future prosperity and growth for all Americans. (A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the amendment, having failed to achieve 60 affirmative votes, be withdrawn). **Pages S211, S213–16, S221**

Baucus Amendment No. 3306 (to Amendment No. 3299), to establish a Bipartisan Task Force for Responsible Fiscal Action, to assure the long-term fiscal stability and economic security of the Federal Government of the United States, and to expand future prosperity and growth for all Americans. **Page S211**

By 46 yeas to 48 nays (Vote No. 7), Division II of Coburn Modified Amendment No. 3303 (to Amendment No. 3299), to rescind $120 billion in Federal spending by consolidating duplicative government programs, cutting wasteful Washington spending, and returning billions of dollars of unspent money. (A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the division, having failed to achieve 60 affirmative votes, be withdrawn). **Pages S242–43**

By 33 yeas to 61 nays (Vote No. 8), Division III of Coburn Modified Amendment No. 3303 (to Amendment No. 3299), to rescind $120 billion in Federal spending by consolidating duplicative government programs, cutting wasteful Washington spending, and returning billions of dollars of unspent money. (A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the division, having failed to achieve 60 affirmative votes, be withdrawn). **Page S243**

By 37 yeas to 57 nays (Vote No. 9), Division IV of Coburn Modified Amendment No. 3303 (to

Amendment No. 3299), to rescind $120 billion in Federal spending by consolidating duplicative government programs, cutting wasteful Washington spending, and returning billions of dollars of unspent money. (A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the division, having failed to achieve 60 affirmative votes, be withdrawn). **Pages S243–44**

Pending:

Baucus (for Reid) Amendment No. 3299, in the nature of a substitute. **Pages S211–23, S223–46**

Reid Amendment No. 3305 (to Amendment No. 3299), to reimpose statutory pay-as-you-go. **Page S211**

Sessions Amendment No. 3308 (to Amendment No. 3299), to reduce the deficit by establishing 5-year discretionary spending caps. **Pages S223–26, S233–37**

Brownback Amendment No. 3309 (to Amendment No. 3299), to establish a Commission on Congressional Budgetary Accountability and Review of Federal Agencies. **Pages S244–46**

A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that on Thursday, January 28, 2010, at approximately 9:30 a.m., Senate resume consideration of the resolution, with one hour for debate equally divided and controlled between the two Leaders or their designees, with Senator Sanders controlling 15 minutes of the majority time, prior to the first vote; that no further debate be in order except as provided for in this agreement; that prior to each of the following votes with respect to the resolution, there be 4 minutes of debate, equally divided and controlled in the usual form; Brownback No. 3309 (to Amendment No. 3299) (listed above); Sessions Amendment No. 3308 (to Amendment No. 3299) (listed above); Reid Amendment No. 3305 (to Amendment No. 3299) (listed above); Baucus (for Reid) Amendment No. 3299 (listed above); and passage of the resolution; provided further, that the cloture motions filed with respect to the resolution, be withdrawn; with the vote threshold requirement still in effect as provided in the order of December 22, 2009. **Page S261**

Bernanke Nomination—Agreement: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Ben S. Bernanke, to be Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Federal Reserve System. **Page S246**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination and, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur on Thursday, January 28, 2010. **Page S246**

A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that upon disposition of H.J. Res. 45, increasing the statutory limit on the public debt, Senate resume consideration of the nomination of Ben S. Bernanke, to be Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Federal Reserve System, and there be 60 minutes of debate prior to the vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two Leaders, or their designees. **Page S238**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Elisabeth Ann Hagen, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture for Food Safety.

1 Air Force nomination in the rank of general.

4 Army nominations in the rank of general.

Routine lists in the Air Force, Army, Foreign Service, and Navy. **Pages S261–62**

Messages from the House: **Page S248**

Executive Communications: **Pages S248–51**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S251–52**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S252–56**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S256–60**

Notices of Hearings/Meetings: **Page S260**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S260**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S260**

Record Votes: Six record votes were taken today. (Total—9) **Pages S220–21, S242–44**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned, in accordance with S. Res. 397, at 9:02 p.m., until 8:20 p.m. on Wednesday, January 27, 2010. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S261.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Michael Peter Huerta, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, who was introduced by Senators Boxer and Hatch, and David T. Matsuda, of the District of Columbia, to be Administrator of the Maritime Administration, who was introduced by Senator Lautenberg, both of the Department of Transportation, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

INTELLIGENCE REFORM

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee resumed hearings to examine intelligence reform focusing on the lessons and implications of the attack on flight 253 on December 25, 2009, after receiving testimony from former New Jersey Governor Tom Kean, and former Representative Lee Hamilton, both of the Bipartisan Policy Center's National Security Preparedness Group.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 24 public bills, H.R. 4502–4525; and 7 resolutions, H.J. Res. 72; H. Con. Res. 230–232; and H. Res. 1037, 1039–1040 were introduced. **Pages H386–87**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H387–88**

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

H. Res. 1038, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3726) to establish the Castle Nugent National Historic Site at St. Croix, United States Virgin Islands, and for other purposes; and for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4474) 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 (H. Rept. 111–401). **Page H353**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Larsen (WA) to act as Speaker Pro Tempore for today. **Page H333**

Recess: The House recessed at 12:51 p.m. and reconvened at 2 p.m. **Page H336**

Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the Guest Chaplain, Monsignor Stephen J. Rossetti, Catholic University of America. **Page H336**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Lester Flatt has made an invaluable contribution to American art as both a songwriter and a performer, leaving an indelible legacy in bluegrass music: H. Res. 583, amended, to express the sense of the House of Representatives that Lester Flatt has made an invaluable contribution to American art as both a songwriter and a performer, leaving an indelible legacy in bluegrass music; **Pages H338–39**

Expressing support for designation of January 2010 as "National Mentoring Month": H. Res. 990, to express support for designation of January 2010 as "National Mentoring Month", by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 398 yeas with none voting "nay", Roll No. 17; **Pages H339–41, H353–54**

Congratulating Messiah College men's and women's soccer teams on winning the 2009 NCAA Division III national championships: H. Res. 1030, to congratulate Messiah College men's and women's soccer teams on winning the 2009 NCAA Division III national championships; **Pages H341–42**

Expressing support for designation of the week of February 1 through February 5, 2010, as "National School Counseling Week": H. Res. 1029, to express support for designation of the week of February 1 through February 5, 2010, as "National School Counseling Week"; **Pages H342–44**

Recognizing the importance of cervical health and of detecting cervical cancer during its earliest stages and supporting the goals and ideals of Cervical Health Awareness Month: H. Res. 1011, to recognize the importance of cervical health and of detecting cervical cancer during its earliest stages and to support the goals and ideals of Cervical Health Awareness Month, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 400 yeas with none voting "nay", Roll No. 18; **Pages H344–45, H354**

Expressing support for the designation of January 10, 2010, through January 16, 2010, as National Influenza Vaccination Week: H. Res. 1003, amended, to express support for the designation of January 10, 2010, through January 16, 2010, as National Influenza Vaccination Week, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 398 yeas to 2 nays, Roll No. 19; **Pages H345–48, H354–55**

Emergency Aid to American Survivors of the Haiti Earthquake Act: S. 2949, to amend section 1113 of the Social Security Act to provide authority

for increased fiscal year 2010 payments for temporary assistance to United States citizens returned from foreign countries and to provide necessary funding to avoid shortfalls in the Medicare cost-sharing program for low-income qualifying individuals. **Pages H348–50**

Recess: The House recessed at 3:45 p.m. and reconvened at 6:33 p.m. **Page H353**

Suspension—Proceedings Postponed: The House debated the following measure under suspension of the rules. Further proceedings were postponed:

Expressing support for designation of January as Poverty in America Awareness Month: H. Res. 1024, to express support for designation of January as Poverty in America Awareness Month. **Pages H350–53**

Presidential Message: Read a message from the President wherein he transmitted a report on matters related to support for the interdiction of aircraft engaged in illicit drug trafficking—referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed (H. Doc. 111–89). **Pages H337–38**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate today appears on page H336.

Senate Referrals: S. 2950 was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. **Page H381**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H353–54, H354, H354–55. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 12:30 p.m. and adjourned at 11:15 p.m.

Committee Meetings

H.R. 3726, CASTLE NUGENT NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE ESTABLISHMENT ACT; H.R. 4474, IDAHO WILDERNESS WATER FACILITIES ACT

Committee on Rules: Granted, by a non-record vote, a closed rule providing for consideration of H.R. 3726, the Castle Nugent National Historic Site Establishment Act. The rule provides one hour of debate in the House equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill except clauses 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The rule provides that the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources, now printed in the bill, shall be considered as adopted and that the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions of the bill, as amended. The rule provides one motion to recommit H.R. 3726 with or without instructions. Testimony was heard from Chairman Rahall and Representative Hastings of Washington.

The rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 4474, the Idaho Wilderness Water Facilities Act, under a closed rule. The rule provides one hour of debate in the House equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill except clauses 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The rule provides that the bill shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions of the bill. The rule provides one motion to recommit H.R. 474 with or without instructions. Testimony was heard from Chairman Rahall and Representative Hastings of Washington.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 27, 2010

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services: to receive a closed briefing on cyber security, 3 p.m., SVC–217.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Subcommittee on Federal Financial Management, Government Information, Federal Services, and International Security, to hold hearings to examine cutting the Federal government's energy bill, focusing on an examination of the sustainable Federal government executive order, 2:30 p.m., SD–342.

House

Committee on Armed Services, hearing on Al Qa'ida in 2010: How Should the U.S. Respond? 10 a.m., 210 HVC.

Committee on the Budget, hearing on the Budget and Economic Outlook, 10 a.m., 210 Cannon.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, to consider H. Res. 983, Requesting the President, and directing the Secretary of Health and Human Services, to transmit to the House of Representatives copies of documents, records, and communications in their possession relating to certain agreements regarding health care reform, 2 p.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Commerce, Trade, and Consumer Protection, hearing on H.R. 3655, Bereaved Consumer's Bill of Rights Act of 2009, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Subcommittee on International Monetary Policy and Trade, hearing entitled

''The State of Global Microfinance: How Public and Private Funds Can Effectively Promote Financial Inclusion for All,'' 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, hearing entitled ''Flight 253: Learning Lessons from an Averted Tragedy,'' 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on House Administration, hearing on Review of the Use of Committee Funds in the First Session of the 111th Congress, 10 a.m., 1310 Longworth.

Committee on the Judiciary, to mark up the following measures: H.R. 569, Equal Justice for Our Military Act of 2009; H.R. 3695, Billy's Law; H. Res. 1031, Impeaching G. Thomas Porteous, Jr., judge of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana, for high crimes and misdemeanors; and H.R. 4506, Bankruptcy Judgeship Act of 2010, 10:15 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Insular Affairs, Oceans and Wildlife, hearing on H.R. 4416, Great Ape Conservation Reauthorization Amendments Act of 2010, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, hearing entitled ''The Federal Bailout of AIG''; followed by a mark up of the following measures: H. Res. 267, Recognizing the cultural and historical significance of Nowruz, expressing appreciation to Iranian-Americans for their contributions to society, and wishing Iranian-Americans and the people of Iran a prosperous new year; H.R. 526, Recognizing the 70th anniversary of John Mercer Langston Golf Course; H. Res. 957, Honoring Jimmie Johnson, 2009 NASCAR Sprint Cup Champion; H. Res. 1014, Recognizing and supporting the goals and ideals of North American Inclusion Month; H.R. 4238, To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 930 39th Avenue in Greeley, Colorado, as the ''W.D. Farr Post Office Building;'' and H.R. 4425, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2–116th Street in North Troy, New York, as the ''Martin G. Marty' Mahar Post Office,'' 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Science and Technology, hearing on the Advanced Research Projects Agency—Energy (ARPA–E): Assessing the Agency's Progress and Promise in Transforming the U.S. Energy Innovation System, 10 a.m. 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, to consider the following measures: H.R. 3562, To designate the Federal building under construction at 1220 Echelon Parkway in Jackson, Mississippi, as the ''Chaney, Goodman, Schwerner Federal Building;'' H. Res. 197, To commend the American Sail Training Association for its advancement of character building under sail and for its advancement of international goodwill; H. Res. 917, Recognizing the Florida Keys Highway on the occasion of its designation as an All American Road by the U.S. Department of Transportation; and H. Res. 995, Of Inquiry requesting the President to transmit to the House of Representatives all information in the possession of the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency relating to nutrient management of the Illinois River Watershed, Arkansas and Oklahoma, 12:30 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Aviation, hearing on Reauthorization of the National Transportation Safety Board, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, executive, briefing on Fort Hood, 3 p.m., 304 HVC.

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, executive, briefing on Peru, 1:30 p.m., 304 HVC.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

8:20 p.m., Wednesday, January 27

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: At 8:30 p.m., Senate will proceed as a body to the Hall of the House of Representatives to receive an address from the President of the United States.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Wednesday, January 27

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Consideration of H.R. 4474—Idaho Wilderness Water Facilities Act (Subject to a Rule) and H.R. 3726—Castle Nugent National Historic Site Establishment Act of 2010 (Subject to a Rule). Joint Session with the Senate to Receive the State of the Union Address from the President of the United States.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Adler, John H., N.J., E88
Akin, W. Todd, Mo., E85, E92
Andrews, Robert E., N.J., E92
Barrett, J. Gresham, S.C., E90
Berman, Howard L., Calif., E88
Bishop, Sanford D., Jr., Ga., E92
Boehner, John A., Ohio, E90
Burgess, Michael C., Tex., E81
Butterfield, G.K., N.C., E91
Carnahan, Russ, Mo., E81
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E93
Costa, Jim, Calif., E88
Courtney, Joe, Conn., E86
Emerson, Jo Ann, Mo., E84
Engel, Eliot L., N.Y., E84, E85
Eshoo, Anna G., Calif., E88
Graves, Sam, Mo., E82
Green, Al, Tex., E91
Grijalva, Raúl M., Ariz., E86
Hall, Ralph M., Tex., E81
Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E86
Jackson Lee, Sheila, Tex., E83, E87, E89
Kucinich, Dennis J., Ohio, E83
Lee, Barbara, Calif., E92, E94
Lee, Christopher John, N.Y., E83, E85, E87
Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E82, E93
Markey, Edward J., Mass., E90
Miller, Candice S., Mich., E86
Nadler, Jerrold, N.Y., E87
Paul, Ron, Tex., E91
Poe, Ted, Tex., E94
Richardson, Laura, Calif., E83, E89
Rogers, Mike, Ala., E84
Roybal-Allard, Lucille, Calif., E82
Schiff, Adam B., Calif., E85, E86
Sensenbrenner, F. James, Jr., Wisc., E90
Stearns, Cliff, Fla., E90
Whitfield, Ed, Ky., E84
Wilson, Joe, S.C., E93
Wittman, Robert J., Va., E82
Wolf, Frank R., Va., E91
Woolsey, Lynn C., Calif., E93

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through *GPO Access*, a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the *Congressional Record* is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available through *GPO Access* at www.gpo.gov/gpoaccess. Customers can also access this information with WAIS client software, via telnet at swais.access.gpo.gov, or dial-in using communications software and a modem at 202–512–1661. Questions or comments regarding this database or *GPO Access* can be directed to the *GPO Access* User Support Team at: E-Mail: gpoaccess@gpo.gov; Phone 1–888–293–6498 (toll-free), 202–512–1530 (D.C. area); Fax: 202–512–1262. The Team's hours of availability are Monday through Friday, 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Eastern Standard Time, except Federal holidays. ¶The *Congressional Record* paper and 24x microfiche edition will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $252.00 for six months, $503.00 per year, or purchased as follows: less than 200 pages, $10.50; between 200 and 400 pages, $21.00; greater than 400 pages, $31.50, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $146.00 per year, or purchased for $3.00 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly *Congressional Record Index* may be purchased for the same per issue prices. To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250–7954, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2250. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.