



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 156

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, MARCH 12, 2010

No. 36

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, March 15, 2010, at 2 p.m.

House of Representatives

FRIDAY, MARCH 12, 2010

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 12, 2010.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DONNA F. EDWARDS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer: For the Members of Congress and all those scattered around the world who have been called to be Your ambassadors of reconciliation and peace, Lord, we pray this day.

Almighty Creator of the universe, receive them all in Your love and continue to call them out of darkness into light, out of ignorance to the knowledge of Your glorious name and bring hope to Your people.

Open human hearts to know You and You alone as the Most High, the Holy One, Whose dwelling is wrapped in mystery and beyond our imagining.

You alone flatten the arrogance of the proud, frustrate the designs of the godless, raise up the lowly and humble the self-righteous.

You are the benefactor of all the blessed and the Savior of all humanity.

Be a help to all in peril or in crisis. Be strength for the sick and the weak and consolation to those who mourn or who are afraid. Gift us and the whole world with peace now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. 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, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Ms. PINGREE of Maine led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Repub-

lic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Ms. PINGREE of Maine asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to come together and finally pass a health reform bill that provides Americans with the stability, affordability, and access to high quality choice in coverage they so richly deserve.

We must act now. We absolutely cannot afford to wait any longer.

Over the last year, we saw what happens when you give pharmaceutical companies, insurance companies, and entrenched special interests time to spend millions of dollars on ad campaigns that spread misinformation, fear, and confusion.

In my home State of Maine, our largest insurer, Anthem, used this time to demand a 23 percent rate hike on individuals. And they weren't alone. Last year, profits for the five biggest insurance companies rose by 56 percent over the year before.

Enough is enough. Americans are counting on us. They sent us here to

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H1361

work hard and make difficult choices, entrusting us to represent them with integrity and to set aside partisanship and pettiness to do what is best for the American people. And I, for one, look forward to showing them that their trust was not misplaced.

HEALTH CARE COSTS IN A DISMAL ECONOMY

(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, this week it was announced that the unemployment rate in my home State reached a tragic new high of 12.6 percent. Statewide, 172,400 people have lost their jobs since the end of 2007.

In this crisis, the administration has irresponsibly announced that March 18 is their deadline to pass a job-killing health care takeover that imposes 100 new mandates on private individuals and businesses; includes billions of dollars in new taxes, and trillions in new government spending, squeezing Medicare; forces employers to cancel health care coverage, and forces people into a government-run health care plan.

More taxes, borrowing, and spending is not the way to reform health care in America. NFIB warns 1.6 million jobs will be killed. We should first consider job-creation policies, and then work on a step-by-step approach to lowering health care costs.

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

HEALTH CARE COSTS

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, Republicans have talked so much about the need for tort reform, you would think that lawyers single-handedly were responsible for America's skyrocketing health care costs. But a new report from Public Citizen found that the value of malpractice settlements is actually the lowest it has been since 1999, and that for 5 consecutive years the number of malpractice settlements has actually dropped.

And, of course, the health care costs have gone down; right? No, absolutely not.

Health care spending increased 83 percent between 2000 and 2009, while malpractice payments fell 8 percent during the same period.

Blaming our health care crisis on litigation costs is simply baloney. I hope my Republican friends can find another theme song for their attempt to derail what the American people want, and that is health care that is guaranteed and will not bankrupt America.

CONGRATULATING KANSAS JAYHAWKS

(Ms. JENKINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JENKINS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the University of Kansas men's basketball program and to congratulate them on a tremendous accomplishment. Yesterday, the Jayhawks defeated Texas Tech to pick up their 2,000th victory. The only other schools to reach this milestone are the University of Kentucky and North Carolina, and it should be noted that the basketball arenas at both of those schools are named after native Kansans and former Kansas basketball players. From James Naismith, the inventor of basketball, to the legendary Forrest "Phog" Allen, to current coach Bill Self, KU is a proven perennial power in college basketball.

This year, the Jayhawks will compete for their sixth national championship. In commemoration of this impressive accomplishment, I ask my congressional colleagues in the Congress to join me in a hearty, Rock Chalk Jayhawk, go KU.

JOBS—OUR TIME TO LEAD

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

Mr. HALL of New York. I rise today to talk about the Nation's unemployment problem. There are people in my district who are struggling. They want to work; they know how to work. Many of them are highly skilled and have great ideas, but they cannot find a job. It is our job, Madam Speaker, to help them.

In the 19th District of New York last Saturday, I sponsored two job fairs that helped hundreds of people connect with resources and people who can help them. Among them was 65-year-old George Myrnyj of Sparrow Bush. George retired last year from a career in manufacturing, but he still wants and needs to work. He has an idea for packaging do-it-yourself solar panel kits. Last Saturday, he was able to connect with people he thinks can help him.

Madam Speaker, I submit that it is our job to help George find a way to realize his dream and find a job or create one. This is not a time to do nothing. It is our time to lead.

OCS DELAY

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

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, offshore energy development is an important step toward reducing our dependence on foreign oil, creating new jobs, and putting our economy back on track.

In 2008, by ending the decades-long ban on offshore exploration, we opened

500 million acres containing an estimated 14 billion barrels of oil and 55 trillion cubic feet of natural gas.

Unfortunately, the Obama administration immediately instituted an extended public comment period, delaying progress.

Despite public support for increased offshore drilling, Secretary of the Interior Salazar recently stated the Obama administration will now wait until 2012 to put a new plan in place. This means the administration's initial 6-month delay has turned into a 3-year moratorium on new offshore exploration.

With the potential to create 1.2 million jobs and add \$8 trillion to our economy, it is irresponsible to continue to ignore the economic potential these areas hold.

HEALTH REFORM NOW

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

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, we need health care reform now, and failure to act is not an option. Doing nothing on health care reform doesn't mean that nothing happens. People will continue to lose coverage, to pay more in premiums, to be banned for preexisting conditions, to have caps on coverage, and other discriminatory practices.

By doing nothing for 8 years, the Republicans essentially endorsed these things. It isn't a choice, Madam Speaker, between the reform plan we have or nothing. The real option is how everything will continue to get worse.

INCURSION BY MEXICAN MILITARY HELICOPTER

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, yesterday an armed Mexican military helicopter was spotted and photographed over a residential area a mile inside the territorial boundary of the United States.

Texas Sheriff Sigi Gonzalez of Zapata County said the Mexican Navy helicopter was not the first incursion by the Mexican military onto the U.S. side of the Rio Grande River.

There is a violent border war raging in this area between the Los Zetas and Gulf drug cartels for territory. Eight Mexican journalists have been kidnapped, numerous individuals killed in old west style shoot-outs, and the violence and corruption has even spilled over to the U.S. side. The cartels have even infiltrated U.S. law enforcement agencies on the border, resulting in 400 corruption cases being filed.

The border has become a corrupt, violent area, and now the Mexican military crosses our border with unknown intentions. The United States cannot allow the border to be a war zone for murder, mayhem, violence, drugs, and corruption.

And that's just the way it is.

□ 0915

HEALTH CARE COVERAGE ONE-SIDED

(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, yesterday, The New York Times, the Washington Post and the Los Angeles Times each featured a news story about President Obama's trip to Missouri to promote his health care plan. Combined, the three articles feature 16 quotes from individuals who support the administration's plan compared to just two quotes from those opposing it. This is a high level of bias considering that most Americans oppose the health care proposal and about two-thirds of Americans want Congress to start over and get it right.

The national media continue to be an unpaid public relations firm for this administration's health care scheme. To restore their credibility, the national media should give Americans the facts on health care, not just the administration's opinions.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3650, HARMFUL ALGAL BLOOMS AND HYPOXIA RESEARCH AND CONTROL AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2010

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1168 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1168

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3650) to establish a National Harmful Algal Bloom and Hypoxia Program, to develop and coordinate a comprehensive and integrated strategy to address harmful algal blooms and hypoxia, and to provide for the development and implementation of comprehensive regional action plans to reduce harmful algal blooms and hypoxia. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Science and Technology now printed in the bill, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions of the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science and Technology; (2) the amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules, if offered by Representative Flake of Arizona or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes

equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maine is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER). All time yielded during consideration of this rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, the resolution provides for consideration of H.R. 3650, the Harmful Algal Blooms and Hypoxia Research and Control Amendments Act of 2009, under a structured rule.

The resolution waives all points of order against consideration of the bill except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The resolution provides 1 hour of debate on the bill. The resolution provides that in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Science Committee, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the Rules Committee report shall be considered as adopted.

The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against the bill, as amended. The resolution makes in order the amendment printed by the Rules Committee report if offered by Representative FLAKE or a designee. The resolution waives all points of order against the amendment except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The resolution provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Madam Speaker, harmful algal blooms, or HABs, are a growing problem along U.S. coasts and they impact almost every coastal district. Some algae, like red tide, produce toxins that contaminate shellfish and shut down shellfish beds to local harvesters.

Severe red tide blooms can be harmful to tourism across the country. When red tide affects an area, people can't go in the water, seafood isn't bought and sold, and stores and hotels along the coast are empty.

Over the past few decades, harmful algae have begun to bloom more frequently and with greater intensity. HABs are one of the most complex and economically significant coastal management challenges facing the Nation.

We know that algae growth is influenced by a number of factors, including light, water temperature, salinity, and

nutrient availability, but the factors that drive outbreaks like red tide are not understood as well, and additional efforts are needed to monitor, control, prevent, and mitigate these outbreaks.

A professor at the University of Maine has done research that shows that the blooms start offshore and are blown towards shore by easterly winds. This sounds simple enough; yet in the field of red tide research, this was groundbreaking work.

Addressing HABs on a national level requires a coordinated approach that involves a number of Federal agencies, including the EPA and NOAA. The underlying bill oversees the development and implementation of regional research and action plans to help coastal managers understand and deal with HAB outbreaks.

New England, and Maine in particular, have been especially hard hit by outbreaks. Severe red tide events occurred in 4 of the last 5 years, causing tens of millions of dollars in lost income to shellfish harvesters.

The shellfish industry is vital to the Maine economy, Madam Speaker. Over 2,000 harvesters and dealers depend directly on access to healthy shellfish beds to make their living and support their families. Maine's Department of Marine Resources estimates total annual economic value of the shellfish industry in Maine to be about \$50 million.

Last spring and summer, the shellfish industry in Maine was shut down because of severe red tide bloom. At its peak, the density of the red tide toxin was nearly 100 times the federally mandated quarantine level and closed 97 percent of the State's shellfish beds and 100 percent of the offshore beds in Federal waters. Many shellfish harvesters were stuck on land for months with nowhere to go. This all occurred during the peak of the tourist season, and the results were devastating.

Coastal families rely on the income generated during the short summer months to carry them through Maine's long, cold winters; and the timing could have not have been worse for these hardworking harvesters. Not only were they missing out on the best time to sell their product, but they had no way of knowing when it would be okay to return to the mudflats. The uncertainty made it impossible to know whether to look for other employment or to wait and see if the next week would bring clear water.

Predictions for 2010 indicate that it could be an even worse year for red tide in the Gulf of Maine. According to a recent NOAA report, the cysts that cause red tide are at some of the highest levels ever measured, 60 percent higher than what was observed in the sediments prior to the historic red tide of 2005.

While red tide in Maine is a coastal issue, HABs are increasingly occurring in our inland lakes and rivers. Blue-green algae blooms in some Midwest lakes and the Great Lakes have killed

dozens of dogs and poisoned people all over the region. Frequently, these freshwater algae blooms are caused by a combination of droughts and fertilizer runoff. These outbreaks lead to rashes, sore throats, and other health concerns. This bill helps address algal blooms in lakes as well.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this important bill, and I am glad that Senator SNOWE from Maine is a leader on this issue in the Senate and is the author of the Senate companion legislation. I look forward to continuing to work with her to improve the economic health of our coastal communities.

This bill will help shellfish harvesters in every coastal community by improving our knowledge and ability to predict red tide blooms. We need a national strategy to address HABs and to provide for the development of regional action plans to reduce HAB outbreaks.

I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on the rule and “yes” on the underlying bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, let me begin by expressing my appreciation to my Rules Committee colleague, the distinguished gentlewoman from North Haven, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Madam Speaker, I sat and listened attentively as my colleague talked about the challenge of dealing with algal blooms and hypoxia research. And I am reminded, as I mentioned in the Rules Committee yesterday afternoon, of the rather famous vice presidential debate that took place in 1992.

Now, vice presidential debates, Madam Speaker, are not terribly memorable, but in 1992, for those who are old enough to remember, we saw three top-tier Presidential candidates, George H.W. Bush was running for reelection, Bill Clinton was the Democratic nominee, and H. Ross Perot was running as an independent candidate. In that vice presidential debate we saw Vice President Quayle, challenger Al Gore, who went on to become Vice President, of course, and this totally unknown figure, Admiral James Stockdale, a great man whom I was privileged to know. The famous line that came from that vice presidential debate, Madam Speaker, was from not Vice President Quayle or Vice-President-to-be Gore, but from Admiral Stockdale, who looked into the camera and said, “I’m sure you’re asking who am I and why am I here.” That term went on to be used throughout the decade plus in our vernacular.

I was reminded of that as we look at what it is that we’re doing right here, Madam Speaker. One can’t help but ask, who am I and why are we here? And having listened to the very

thoughtful statement on algal blooms and hypoxia research from my friend from North Haven, I would like to yield to her, if I might, Madam Speaker, to see if she could give us a really good description of why it is that we are here at this moment at 9:25 Friday morning when this was a measure that had been considered under a suspension of the rules and we had, mid-afternoon yesterday, completed the work and I know many of my colleagues have gone into their districts.

So I would like to yield to my colleague and ask her to provide us a clear, clear definition as to exactly why it is that we’re here.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I appreciate my colleague’s yielding, and I appreciate his thoughtful comments about red tide and hypoxia research.

I can only answer for the residents of my home State, who are deeply concerned about algal blooms, red tide, the economic impact in our communities, and the importance of passing this legislation so that the research is done.

Mr. DREIER. Well, Madam Speaker, let me reclaim my time and say that we had an emergency Rules Committee meeting yesterday to bring this measure up. Now, I understand the importance of dealing with algal blooms and hypoxia research, but in my State of California we have many counties, Madam Speaker, that tragically have an unemployment rate that is in excess of 20 percent. We have a nationwide unemployment rate that is hovering right around 10 percent, 9.7 percent—it’s been around 10 percent for 7 months—and we know that millions and millions of Americans have lost their homes and many more continue to face either the threat of foreclosure or years of upside-down mortgages. Our deficit is \$1.4 trillion, and we all know that our national debt has exceeded \$12 trillion.

Credit remains very scarce. We hear regularly decried from both sides of the aisle about working families and small business owners who depend on a robust financial services system. We have serious, very serious issues as a Nation that the American people expect us to deal with aggressively and responsibly. And I would argue, Madam Speaker, that while we are considering the algal blooms and hypoxia research measure under an emergency structure that was put forth by the Rules Committee, I’m not in any way diminishing its importance, but I think these issues that I just mentioned are what are on the minds of Americans all across this country: job creation and economic growth.

So what is it that we do in response to the economic crisis that we’re facing in the United States of America? It is, as I said, the Harmful Algal Blooms and Hypoxia Research and Control Amendments.

□ 0930

Now, Madam Speaker, I yielded to my colleague to say why it is that we

are really here, which is the fact that we were promised transparency. You don’t need a really, really good pair of reading glasses to know exactly why it is that we are here.

Very simply, we are here because the Democratic leadership is doing everything that it possibly can to twist arms and to line up votes. Based on public opinion polling and on three elections that have been held within the last couple of months in Virginia, New Jersey, and Massachusetts, they are twisting arms to try and pass a very, very, very unpopular and, I believe, outrageous, horrible measure that would see us have the Federal Government take control of one-sixth of our Nation’s economy.

The most recent maneuver they were considering to ram this thing through was something that has been dubbed the “Slaughter solution.” Many media outlets have tried to explain to the American people what exactly the Slaughter solution would be. Most explanations have left listeners more confused and outraged than when they started. It is a twisted and contorted process that can make anyone’s head spin, but this is it in a nutshell:

Madam Speaker, the Slaughter solution is an end run around a vote in the House of Representatives on the health care bill. As the health care process has moved forward, the substance of what the Democratic majority is trying to accomplish has become ever more unpopular. The result is that they simply do not have the votes to pass a bill that can get to the President for his signature. We all know that.

In the last 30 minutes, the President has announced that he is delaying his trip to Indonesia and to Australia. We know that they are doing everything within their power to try and twist arms and to encourage people to vote for something that is extraordinarily unpopular and that, I believe, would be devastating for our Nation’s economy.

So, Madam Speaker, what is it that you do if you don’t have the votes? What is it that you do? Do you start over and work for a bipartisan solution, which is what the American people want? This is not a partisan issue on our part. We are saying let’s take the commonsense approach that the American people have said we should take, a step-by-step approach. So is that the message that has come through?

Do you listen? Do you listen, as many of us have, to what it is that the American people are saying through town hall meetings and through other fora, and do you incorporate their ideas into this quest that we all share of trying to drive health care costs down so that we can increase access to health insurance for our fellow Americans?

Apparently, the answer to every single one of those, Madam Speaker, is “no,” for this Democratic majority; when you don’t have the votes, you simply come up with a scheme to avoid

a vote altogether, which is what the Slaughter solution is. This so-called "Slaughter solution" would allow the House to wait for the Senate to pass a fix-it package to their flawed health care bill. When the fix would be passed by the Senate, the bill would magically be deemed passed by the House without our ever having a transparent up-or-down vote on the original bill.

Let's remind ourselves of a new direction for America, the document that then-Minority Leader Nancy PELOSI put forward, one promising transparency, disclosure, accountability, and the kind of openness that we all aspire to, but which tragically has deteriorated over the past 3 years.

The approach that we have with the Slaughter solution is a hopelessly cynical attempt to completely upend the democratic process. It also, Madam Speaker, I believe, creates the potential for a real backfire. For months, the Democratic majority has blamed the Senate for their own inability to provide leadership and decisive action on the pressing challenges that we face, and now they want to put the fate of their convoluted plan on the ability of the Senate to pass a clean fix-it bill.

Madam Speaker, the Senate has disappointed my Democratic colleagues yet again. We got the report just yesterday which seemed to undermine the Slaughter solution. It appears that the Senate parliamentarian will insist on the enactment of the Senate health care reform bill before he will recognize the fix-it bill as reconciliation, meaning that reconciliation can only be utilized to deal with existing law. That means, if the Democrats won't take a straight up-or-down vote on the bill, their only option is the light version of the Slaughter solution, having the bill deemed as passed by the rule and sending the Senate bill to the President for his signature. Now, that's what the lawyers call, Madam Speaker, a distinction without a difference.

The reality is that a vote on the rule will be a vote on the Senate health care bill, complete with all of the special interest provisions that it contains—the Cornhusker kickback, gator aid, the Louisiana purchase, these kinds of things that we have heard about. Then there are all sorts of hidden items in there which some friends of mine have been discussing with me, like promises that there won't be a middle class tax increase. What does the measure do? It slashes FSAs, Flexible Savings Accounts, which have been utilized by people who are trying to address their health care needs. By doing what they do in this bill, it will be a slap to the taxpayers of this country who are middle-income wage earners. Their problems don't end there. There will be, Madam Speaker, challenges to some proposed fixes and, therefore, changes to the Senate package.

Then there is the question of the Federal funding of abortion. If this cannot be banned through reconciliation, would the Slaughter solution be

further expanded to implement a fix on that issue as well? How would that fix make its way through the United States Senate?

Now, with serious unanswered questions like these, why would any Member of this House take the bait and support the Slaughter solution, even in its light version, by deeming a measure passed with the passage of a rule? There is a high probability that House Democrats would be forced into taking the tough votes they tried so hard to avoid after putting themselves on record as supporting an end run around a real transparent vote.

In the end, Madam Speaker, rank-and-file Democrats would be making themselves all the more vulnerable for having supported their leadership's egregious tactics. The Slaughter solution is bad policy, bad process, and bad politics. The fact that the Democratic leadership is pursuing this option exposes its unwillingness to abandon the most fundamental element of legislating. The most fundamental element of being a deliberative body is a transparent up-or-down vote, and they are doing that in order to achieve what everyone recognizes, based on public opinion polling. And I don't make my decisions based on public opinion polling; I make my decisions on what I think is right, but it just so happens that public opinion overwhelmingly has pointed to this as a very, very, very unpopular, unpopular proposal.

Today, on which I have just had an exchange with my colleague from North Haven, they are hiding behind blooming algae as they twist arms and try to work their backroom deals. But, Madam Speaker, your leadership cannot hide forever. If the Democratic majority proceeds with its plan to ram through their health care bill without actually holding a vote, it's going to take more than algae to protect them from the American public's outrage.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Madam Speaker, I had no idea that we were here to debate health care this morning, but I appreciate that the gentleman, my friend from California, has brought up the differences between us. I would like to make a couple of points.

First off, we are here today to take up this bill that could have been done under a suspension; but as I understand, my colleague voted "no" when this bill originally came to the floor, which is why we're back here today—to pass what is a relatively simple, I agree, piece of legislation but what is very important in coastal districts like mine.

Yes, we do have a disagreement on health care legislation, and I wish that your caucus were doing what my caucus is doing right now, which is going through the health care legislation that we hope to bring to this floor soon, line by line, to make sure that we are confident this is excellent legislation to move forward the cause of

health care reform, something on which he and I don't agree.

I support very strongly and am looking forward to the debate that we will have on this floor about that health care legislation, and I am thrilled with the year and a half that I have spent here and with the number of hours that the committees and Members on both sides of the aisle, Republicans and Democrats, have put in in crafting health care legislation. Now, we may not agree on the final product, and that will come down to a vote. You're right. It will depend on making sure that we have enough votes on our side of the aisle, and I am glad that we are making sure that everyone feels confident about that vote.

You know, it was interesting. I, as you know, am a freshman, so I wasn't here in previous years when you were. But when you talk about arm-twisting and about getting votes, I am reminded of the stories that I've heard about passing the prescription drug legislation, and about what it took for the other party, in the middle of the night and with a vote open for many hours, to pass a piece of legislation. I have to say, from my perch as a former State legislator from a State where the cost of prescription drugs is crippling the health care costs for many of our senior citizens, I was shocked to see what that final piece of legislation came to be. I am thrilled that our health care legislation, which I believe will be on this floor soon, will fix some of the problems in there, but, I'm sorry to say, not all.

I remember hearing about that legislation. Was it 2 hours or was it 3 hours in the middle of the night when people were convinced to change their votes so as to get the votes, and when every minute counted to get one more vote? That was the legislation that left us with this tremendous doughnut hole of which our senior citizens talk to me every day. Frankly, that's the public opinion polling that I hear about when I go back to my district.

Yet it's not a public opinion poll. It's senior citizens who come up to me and ask, Do you see what it costs me to buy my prescription drugs? Do you see what happens when I get into the doughnut hole?

Here is what they really ask me. They ask, How could the Republican Party, in the middle of the night and in twisting arms for every vote, pass a piece of legislation that doesn't allow us to negotiate with the pharmaceutical manufacturers for the price of prescription drugs? I can tell you, in my home State of Maine, this was an issue for years.

When I first got elected in 1992 to my State legislature, senior citizens came up to me and asked, Do you see what it costs me to buy my prescription drugs? Then, every year, it got worse and worse and worse as the pharmaceutical manufacturers, which are some of the wealthiest corporations and multinational corporations in this country,

were able to sell their drugs at the highest prices in the world to senior citizens in America. Those people had to pay cash for their prescription drugs. Those people had to decide whether to put heating oil in their tanks to keep warm or put food on their tables.

The Republicans came to the point where they could have changed the law like they've done in Canada or like they've done in virtually every other country in the world. They could have done what they're always telling us: Be like a good business, have good business practices. You know, I own a small business. I wouldn't think of buying something I didn't negotiate for. Well, that's what that bill said. It said we won't negotiate. In fact, we'll give them sweetheart deals. We'll say to our senior citizens, You know what? You're going to pay the highest prices in the world, so there will be no cost savings. These are the same Republicans who tell us now there aren't enough cost savings in our health care bill. They use it as an excuse, but that was what was done in the dark of the night, for 3 hours, in holding open a debate.

Do you know how I first found out about this? I got on a bus with senior citizens from the State of Maine. Let me tell you how it worked. We'd stop in Biddeford, Maine. Then we'd go to Portland, Maine. Then we'd go to Lewiston, Maine. We'd stop at places all along the State of Maine, and we'd drive all the way up to the Canadian border. We'd get all the way to the Canadian border, and we'd visit with a duly licensed physician so that they could have their prescriptions rewritten and they could take them across the Canadian border legally. So then we'd go to a Canadian drug store. This is a busload of senior citizens. We'd go into that Canadian drug store, and they'd buy their prescriptions. I want to tell you about one person I sat next to on one of the many bus trips.

I sat next to a person who had to take Tamoxifen, which is a wonderful drug that we're glad we have for breast cancer, but this person takes 30 pills a month. At that point, I think it cost her about \$150 a month for her 30 pills. When we got across the Canadian border, it was \$12.35. In my opinion, that was highway robbery. Do you know why that was? Because the Canadian Government, just like every other Western nation, requires that they negotiate for the best prices possible.

So, as far as I'm concerned, that's what should have been in that prescription drug plan that was decided in the middle of the night when arms were twisted to get every last vote. That is what should be: closing the doughnut hole and lowering prescription drug prices in the health care bill that we will debate soon.

□ 0945

As far as I am concerned, I am thrilled that members of my caucus are

here today to go through line by line, to make sure that we are getting the best possible health care plan we can get. And I will say, it is not going to be everything I want in a health care plan.

I come from the State of Maine. Our doctors think that single payer ought to be the health care plan in Maine, and I am right there with them, but I know that is not what we are going to get to vote on here on the floor. But I am anxious to make sure that we get the best possible compromise, and I would be thrilled if some of the members of your caucus would vote for that bill. I would be thrilled.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I would like to yield to my colleague to engage in a colloquy, if I might, so we might have a discussion.

I found it very interesting, very interesting, Madam Speaker, that she talked about that amazing drug that is used for breast cancer, and, unfortunately, the huge disparity in the cost that that woman she was riding on the bus had in Canada versus the United States of America. There is an important reason for that, Madam Speaker, and that is the fact that we want to make sure that there are more amazing drugs created.

There are many very serious ailments that exist out there today, and one of the things that we have as our great comparative advantage here in the United States of America is that we are the center for research and innovation. And, unfortunately, we have had to shoulder the financial burden for that research so that that woman riding on the bus with my friend from North Haven was able to have a drug that would never have been developed had it not been for the kind of innovation that exists here in the United States of America.

I would like to yield to my friend to see if she would recognize that the innovation and creativity that exists in the United States of America is what allowed that friend of hers on the bus to have.

I am happy to yield whatever amount of time my friend consumes from my time.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Well, thank you so much for yielding your time and for allowing me to address this topic, and even though we are here to address algal blooms, I appreciate the chance to go back and forth on this important topic.

Mr. DREIER. Let me just say, Madam Speaker, that I am very happy that we are here to address an issue that is of concern to the American people. With all due respect to the importance of algal blooms and hypoxia research, I believe what we are talking about today is much more important. And the thing we should be talking about is not something that happened 5 years ago, which, frankly, many, many

seniors are benefiting from, but what we should talk about is what is about to happen and what is happening behind closed doors throughout this Capitol at this moment.

I am happy to further yield to my friend.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Thank you. And just to answer your point, I, too, think it is essential that we continue our research and development here in this country. Frankly, much of it is done around the world on research and development. But I don't think that negotiating for a better price, that lowering the prices to our senior citizens, would cost us research and development. And, frankly—

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, if I could reclaim my time just to say to my friend that she is right. She is right, Madam Speaker, that there are other parts of the world where research and innovation are taking place. But it all pales, in comparison to the kind of research and development that takes place here in the United States.

I would like to ask my colleague, Madam Speaker, if she would support making permanent the research and development tax credit so that we could have the kind of incentive for our pharmaceutical industry and others out there who are creating these innovative new ideas to deal with Alzheimer's and cancer and diabetes and other ailments that exist. Madam Speaker, would she be supportive of the notion of our pursuing that kind of incentive to deal with these problems that can play a role in driving costs down?

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. First off, I would prefer to answer you on my own time, because it seems to me when you yield me your time, you usually answer for me. So I would rather wait until I have my time.

Mr. DREIER. I just asked the question on my own time. I am happy to yield to my friend. I asked a question, and I would welcome your answer.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I have to say I am unprepared to answer your question about the research and development tax credit for the pharmaceutical industry—I know that I have industries in my State that benefit from that tax credit—before I say yes or no about the solution that you are proposing.

But I do want to go back to one other thing—

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, let me just say, because I control the time—

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. See, I don't think you are letting me finish my answer, so you go ahead.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I am happy to yield to my friend further, but the gentlewoman has chosen to say she doesn't know whether or not she would support making permanent the research and development tax credit, when we all know that would play a critical role in driving costs down for our seniors and others.

Madam Speaker, the fact of the matter is we are here at this juncture dealing with a measure that may be important to some, but this measure was

considered, as I said, under an emergency structure upstairs in the Rules Committee.

Now, I ask the question, when the President made his decision to delay his trip to Indonesia and Australia from March 18 to March 21 or 22, was that so that he could deal with the emergency of signing legislation dealing with algal blooms and hypoxia research? I don't think so. But that is the measure, as my friend said, she wanted to discuss here on the House floor today, when in fact we know, we know that arm-twisting is taking place. And to liken, to liken the structure that is taking place with what happened 5 years ago is preposterous.

It is true, it is true that under the rules of the House that vote may have been left open, and as a by-product of that we have seen literally millions and millions of seniors have access to affordable prescription drugs.

Madam Speaker, I have to say that that pales in comparison to this unprecedented and outrageous structure that is being utilized, that is being utilized to ram down the throats of the American people something that they don't want.

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

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Madam Speaker, I will just say a couple of more things again.

I am thrilled that the President has decided to focus all of his energy on health care. I think that the people of this country have waited long enough for health care reform, and I am anxious to see it come to this floor. I am anxious to see us bring it to final passage.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Let me say that I was just reminded by my staff, Madam Speaker, and I have got a couple of articles that were just handed to me here today, about this process issue. I regularly argue that process is substance. And excuse me, I am not talking, by the way, about algal blooms or hypoxia research. I am talking about this convoluted process known as the "Slaughter solution."

For some strange reason, the Democratic leadership has said that, regardless of what the Senate is going to do, we are going to proceed with taking our action here, when reconciliation itself is a Senate process. That was designed, as we all know, it is called budget reconciliation, put into place in the 1974 Budget and Impoundment Act. It was put into place by Senator BYRD, and the goal of providing an opportunity for reconciliation, budget reconciliation, was so that there could be an opportunity to deal with tax increases or spending cuts.

I will say, the last time we dealt with meaningful spending cuts under this kind of structure was when we tried to tackle the issue of entitlement reform, and we were able to bring about a very,

very modest \$40 billion reduction. I think that we need to work harder on that and we need to utilize that process in doing it.

But what we are seeing right now and these reports that are out there, the confusion that exists in this House, and certainly with the American people, who are just casual observers of this, is that this is not what we were promised, Madam Speaker. It is not what we were promised.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I have no further requests for time, and I will continue to reserve my time.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, it looks like my friend from Texas is here and would like to be recognized. I am happy to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I appreciate so much the points my friend from California has been making. Here there have been discussions about health care and the White House wanting to take that over for the American people, and it really is highlighted by something that I ran into just this morning at the White House.

Now, we know from the prior hearings that were held that apparently the Social Secretary had a meeting with people at security at the White House and decided to change protocol so she wouldn't be there, and so some people got waved in that shouldn't have gotten waved in. As a result, what has happened now, with Members of Congress, it used to be that if you gave 24 hours' notice with Social Security numbers, date of birth, all that kind of thing, you could get six people into the White House at 8 o'clock, 7:45, something like that the next morning. Now, under this White House that was changed to where they want 48 hours. Okay, fine.

As a result of the incompetent handling over letting people into the White House that shouldn't have been, not by the Secret Service, not by the armed guards there—now they have doubled the number of guards that are out there—they now make both Members of Congress and those people who are obviously law-abiding and have had their security checked and double-checked with not one smudge on their record, now they have to go clear down a block away to 15th Street and go through security there.

The Member of Congress, like today in the rain, has to go down a block and then go through security there, with double the number of guards, and then come up and go through security again and go through guards again, all not because Secret Service messed up or the armed guards that are now doubled in number, but because somebody in the White House staff screwed up. Now they are deciding to punish Members of Congress and law-abiding citizens that normally just get in.

The point here is that this is a circus over there. Nobody seems to know

what is going on. When accountability was demanded and the Social Secretary was requested by Members of Congress to come testify, they said, "We are not going to let you come testify."

The same thing happened on the Auto Task Force. Could you have them at least come tell us about their secret meetings, these czars and all that stuff? "We are not going to be accountable."

It is a circus going on over there, and now the people in the circus want to be in charge of your health care. Good grief. It is time to say we don't want clowns in charge of something as important as our health care. I don't even want them in charge of algal blooms.

With that, I appreciate the time.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for his very thoughtful remarks.

Let me just close—I know my colleague is prepared to do the same—by making a couple of comments.

I began by pointing to the fact that in California we have a number of counties with an unemployment rate in excess of 20 percent. In part of the area I represent in suburban Los Angeles, we have an unemployment rate in excess of 14 percent. We have, obviously, tremendous numbers of home foreclosures and small business people are unable to gain access to credit.

I believe that we can get our economy growing boldly, strongly, and dynamically, with bipartisanship—and I underscore that term "bipartisan," Madam Speaker—by utilizing the John F. Kennedy-Ronald Reagan approach with marginal tax rate reduction which, during the 1960s under John F. Kennedy and the 1980s under Ronald Reagan, stimulated economic growth by reducing marginal tax rates and doubled, doubled the flow of revenues to the Federal Treasury.

Everyone is decrying the \$1.4 trillion deficit and the \$12 trillion debt that we have today. And what is it we are doing? We are sitting here with a discussion about algal blooms and hypoxia research, and we are witnessing arm-twisting to see the Federal Government take control of one-sixth of our economy, while the American people want us to focus on job creation and economic growth.

□ 1000

We can be doing that, Madam Speaker, if we can refocus our attention to where it is that the American people want us to be. And I urge a "no" vote on this rule.

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

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I thank my colleague from California.

We have had a lively debate this morning on a whole variety of issues. I had no idea I was going to have the pleasure of coming to the floor to talk about the bus trips with senior citizens, about the prescription drug debate in the middle of the night and many of the things that have been part

of our process for years before I was ever here. And I thank you for that opportunity to go back and forth on those issues.

I appreciate your thoughts and our differences of opinion on this issue of health care reform. I want to reiterate we are here today on the issue of algal blooms and red tide and a variety of things that are important to my constituents here in Maine.

The reason this bill is here on this floor today is because many of those on the other side of the aisle, including my Republican colleague, whom we have been going back and forth with today, Mr. DREIER, voted “no” on the bill when it first hit the floor and we are taking up again.

I would like to close and stick to the topic for a minute and let us move forward with our business today making sure that we continue to bring more bills around jobs here, and I hope that we have some Republican votes on our future jobs bill and certainly on our health care bill.

In closing, I just want to say that the 2009 red tide in Maine hit our coastal communities hard. Most shellfish harvesters are self-employed and make the majority of their living in the summer months. Every day, shellfish harvesters were calling the State agencies and asking for help with mortgages payments, utility bills, doctor bills, car payments, and even food. In my State and in many coastal States, these are jobs. These are jobs that keep families working through the summer and help them get through the winter.

The economic impact of closing much of the coast to shellfish harvesters, aquaculturists and related businesses was conservatively estimated to be between \$1.6 million and \$2.5 million each week. This is real money to coastal States in every corner of this country.

This bill will make a difference for coastal communities. With improved testing and tracking, scientists will be able to accurately identify localized areas. This means that smaller portions of the coast will be shut down instead of entire regions. In addition, it will build on so much of the good work that has already been done, improve our prediction and monitoring capabilities, and take steps to mitigate the impact of red tide and other HABs. We need a national program dedicated to coordinating and integrating Federal resources to minimize or even prevent HABs in both fresh and saltwater. Enhanced coordination will help resource managers make better decisions, and with better decisions will come less economic hardship in our coastal communities.

I urge a “yes” vote on the previous question and on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill, H.R. 3650.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Florida). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

HARMFUL ALGAL BLOOMS AND HYPOXIA RESEARCH AND CONTROL AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2010

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the resolution just adopted, I call up the bill (H.R. 3650) to establish a National Harmful Algal Bloom and Hypoxia Program, to develop and coordinate a comprehensive and integrated strategy to address harmful algal blooms and hypoxia, and to provide for the development and implementation of comprehensive regional action plans to reduce harmful algal blooms and hypoxia, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1168, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Science and Technology printed in the bill, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part A of House Report 111-439 is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Harmful Algal Blooms and Hypoxia Research and Control Amendments Act of 2010”.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENT OF HARMFUL ALGAL BLOOM AND HYPOXIA RESEARCH AND CONTROL ACT OF 1998.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Harmful Algal Bloom and Hypoxia Research and Control Act of 1998 (16 U.S.C. 1451 note).

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

(a) AMENDMENT.—The Act is amended by inserting after section 602 the following:

“SEC. 602A. DEFINITIONS.

“In this title:

“(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term ‘Administrator’ means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

“(2) PROGRAM.—The term ‘Program’ means the National Harmful Algal Bloom and Hypoxia Program established under section 603A.

“(3) STATE.—The term ‘State’ means each of the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, any other territory or possession of the United States, and any Indian tribe.

“(4) UNDER SECRETARY.—The term ‘Under Secretary’ means the Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere.”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 2 of the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1998 is amended by adding after the item relating to section 602 the following new item:

“Sec. 602A. Definitions.”.

SEC. 4. NATIONAL HARMFUL ALGAL BLOOM AND HYPOXIA PROGRAM.

(a) AMENDMENT.—The Act is amended by inserting after section 603 the following:

“SEC. 603A. NATIONAL HARMFUL ALGAL BLOOM AND HYPOXIA PROGRAM.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (d), the Under Secretary, through the Task Force established under section 603(a), shall establish and maintain a National Harmful Algal Bloom and Hypoxia Program pursuant to this section.

“(b) DUTIES.—The Under Secretary, through the Program, shall coordinate the efforts of the Task Force to—

“(1) develop and promote a national strategy to understand, detect, predict, control, mitigate, and respond to marine and freshwater harmful algal bloom and hypoxia events;

“(2) integrate the research of all Federal programs, including ocean and Great Lakes science and management programs and centers, that address the chemical, biological, and physical components of marine and freshwater harmful algal blooms and hypoxia;

“(3) coordinate and work cooperatively with State, tribal, and local government agencies and programs that address marine and freshwater harmful algal blooms and hypoxia;

“(4) identify additional research, development, and demonstration needs and priorities relating to monitoring, prediction, prevention, control, mitigation, and response to marine and freshwater harmful algal blooms and hypoxia;

“(5) encourage international information sharing and research efforts on marine and freshwater harmful algal blooms and hypoxia, and encourage international mitigation, control, and response activities;

“(6) ensure the development and implementation of methods and technologies to protect the ecosystems affected by marine and freshwater harmful algal blooms;

“(7) integrate, coordinate, and augment existing education programs to improve public understanding and awareness of the causes, impacts, and mitigation efforts for marine and freshwater harmful algal blooms and hypoxia;

“(8) assist in regional, State, tribal, and local efforts to develop and implement appropriate marine and freshwater harmful algal bloom and hypoxia response plans, strategies, and tools;

“(9) provide resources for and assist in the training of State, tribal, and local water and coastal resource managers in the methods and technologies for monitoring, controlling, mitigating, and responding to the effects of marine and freshwater harmful algal blooms and hypoxia events;

“(10) oversee the development, implementation, review, and periodic updating of the Regional Research and Action Plans under section 603B; and

“(11) administer peer-reviewed, merit-based competitive grant funding to support—

“(A) the projects maintained and established by the Program; and

“(B) the research and management needs and priorities identified in the Regional Research and Action Plans.

“(c) COOPERATIVE EFFORTS.—The Under Secretary shall work cooperatively and avoid duplication of efforts with other offices, centers, and programs within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and other agencies represented on the

Task Force established under section 603(a), States, tribes, and nongovernmental organizations concerned with marine and freshwater aquatic issues related to harmful algal blooms and hypoxia.

“(d) FRESHWATER PROGRAM.—With respect to the freshwater aspects of the Program, the Administrator and Under Secretary, through the Task Force, shall carry out the duties otherwise assigned to the Under Secretary under this section and section 603B, including the activities described in subsection (e). The Administrator’s participation under this subsection shall include—

“(1) research on the ecology of freshwater harmful algal blooms;

“(2) monitoring and event response of freshwater harmful algal blooms in lakes, rivers, estuaries (including their tributaries), and reservoirs;

“(3) mitigation and control of freshwater harmful algal blooms; and

“(4) an identification in the President’s annual budget request to Congress of how much funding is proposed in that request for carrying out the activities described in subsection (e).

“(e) NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION ACTIVITIES.—As part of the program under this section, the Under Secretary shall—

“(1) maintain and enhance existing competitive grant programs at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration relating to marine and freshwater harmful algal blooms and hypoxia;

“(2) carry out marine and freshwater harmful algal bloom and hypoxia events response activities; and

“(3) enhance communication and coordination among Federal agencies carrying out marine and freshwater harmful algal bloom and hypoxia activities, and increase the availability to appropriate public and private entities of—

“(A) analytical facilities and technologies;

“(B) operational forecasts; and

“(C) reference and research materials.

“(f) INTEGRATED COASTAL AND OCEAN OBSERVATION SYSTEM.—All monitoring and observation data collected under this Act shall be collected in compliance with all data standards and protocols developed pursuant to the National Integrated Coastal and Ocean Observation System Act of 2009 (33 U.S.C. 3601 et seq.), and such data shall be made available through the System established under that Act.

“(g) ACTION STRATEGY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of the Harmful Algal Blooms and Hypoxia Research and Control Amendments Act of 2010, the Under Secretary, through the Task Force established under section 603(a), shall transmit to the Congress an action strategy that identifies—

“(A) the specific activities to be carried out by the Program and the timeline for carrying out such activities; and

“(B) the roles and responsibilities of each Federal agency in the Task Force established under section 603(a) in carrying out Program activities.

“(2) FEDERAL REGISTER.—The Under Secretary shall publish the action strategy in the Federal Register.

“(3) PERIODIC REVISION.—The Under Secretary shall periodically review and revise the action strategy prepared under this subsection as necessary.

“(h) REPORT.—Two years after the submission of the action strategy, the Under Secretary shall prepare and transmit to the Congress a report that describes—

“(1) the activities carried out under the Program and the Regional Research and Action Plans and the budget related to these activities;

“(2) the progress made on implementing the action strategy; and

“(3) the need to revise or terminate activities or projects under the Program.”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 2 of the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1998 is amended by adding after the item relating to section 603 the following new item:

“Sec. 603A. National Harmful Algal Bloom and Hypoxia Program.”.

SEC. 5. REGIONAL RESEARCH AND ACTION PLANS.

(a) AMENDMENT.—The Act is amended by inserting after section 603A the following:

“SEC. 603B. REGIONAL RESEARCH AND ACTION PLANS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Under Secretary, through the Task Force established under section 603(a), shall—

“(1) identify the appropriate regions and subregions to be addressed by each Regional Research and Action Plan; and

“(2) oversee the development and implementation of the Regional Research and Action Plans.

“(b) CONTENTS.—The Plans developed under this section shall identify—

“(1) regional priorities for ecological, economic, and social research on issues related to the impacts of harmful algal blooms and hypoxia;

“(2) research, development, and demonstration activities needed to develop and advance technologies and techniques for minimizing the occurrence of harmful algal blooms and hypoxia and improving capabilities to prevent, predict, monitor, control, and mitigate harmful algal blooms and hypoxia;

“(3) ways to reduce the duration and intensity of harmful algal blooms and hypoxia, including in times of emergency;

“(4) research and methods to address human health dimensions of harmful algal blooms and hypoxia;

“(5) mechanisms, including the potential costs and benefits of those mechanisms, to protect vulnerable ecosystems that could be or have been affected by harmful algal blooms and hypoxia events;

“(6) mechanisms by which data, information, and products are transferred between the Program and State, tribal, and local governments and relevant research entities;

“(7) communication, outreach, and information dissemination methods that State, tribal, and local governments and stakeholder organizations can undertake to educate and inform the public concerning harmful algal blooms and hypoxia; and

“(8) the roles that Federal agencies can play to assist in the implementation of the Plan.

“(c) BUILDING ON AVAILABLE STUDIES AND INFORMATION.—In developing the Plans under this section, the Under Secretary shall—

“(1) utilize and build on existing research, assessments, and reports, including those carried out pursuant to existing law and other relevant sources; and

“(2) consider the impacts, research, and existing program activities of all United States coastlines and fresh and inland waters, including the Great Lakes, the Chesapeake Bay, and estuaries and tributaries.

“(d) DEVELOPMENT OF PLANS.—The Under Secretary shall develop Plans under this section with assistance from the individuals and entities described in subsection (f).

“(e) PLAN TIMELINE AND UPDATES.—The Under Secretary, through the Task Force established under section 603(a), shall ensure that the Plans developed under this section are completed not later than 24 months after the date of enactment of the Harmful Algal Blooms and Hypoxia Research and Control

Amendments Act of 2010, and updated once every 5 years thereafter.

“(f) COORDINATION AND CONSULTATION.—In developing the Plans under this section, as appropriate, the Under Secretary—

“(1) shall coordinate with State coastal management and planning officials;

“(2) shall coordinate with tribal resource management officials;

“(3) shall coordinate with water management and watershed officials from both coastal States and noncoastal States with water sources that drain into water bodies affected by harmful algal blooms and hypoxia; and

“(4) shall consult with—

“(A) public health officials;

“(B) emergency management officials;

“(C) science and technology development institutions;

“(D) economists;

“(E) industries and businesses affected by marine and freshwater harmful algal blooms and hypoxia;

“(F) scientists, with expertise concerning harmful algal blooms or hypoxia, from academic or research institutions; and

“(G) other stakeholders.”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 2 of the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1998 is amended by adding after the item relating to section 603A, as added by section 4(b) of this Act, the following new item:

“Sec. 603B. Regional research and action plans.”.

SEC. 6. NORTHERN GULF OF MEXICO HYPOXIA.

Section 604 is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 604. NORTHERN GULF OF MEXICO HYPOXIA.

“(a) TASK FORCE INITIAL PROGRESS REPORTS.—Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of the Harmful Algal Blooms and Hypoxia Research and Control Amendments Act of 2010, the Administrator, through the Mississippi River/Gulf of Mexico Watershed Nutrient Task Force, shall complete and transmit to the Congress and the President a report on the progress made by Task Force-directed activities toward attainment of the goals of the Gulf Hypoxia Action Plan 2008.

“(b) TASK FORCE 2-YEAR PROGRESS REPORTS.—After the initial report required under subsection (a), the Administrator, through the Task Force, shall complete and transmit to Congress and the President a report every 2 years thereafter on the progress made by Task Force-directed activities toward attainment of the coastal goal of the Gulf Hypoxia Action Plan 2008.

“(c) CONTENTS.—The reports required by this section shall assess progress made toward nutrient load reductions, the response of the hypoxic zone and water quality throughout the Mississippi/Atchafalaya River Basin, and the economic and social effects. The reports shall—

“(1) include an evaluation of how current policies and programs affect management decisions, including those made by municipalities and industrial and agricultural producers;

“(2) evaluate lessons learned; and

“(3) recommend appropriate actions to continue to implement or, if necessary, revise the strategy set forth in the Gulf Hypoxia Action Plan 2008.”.

SEC. 7. PACIFIC NORTHWEST, ESTUARIES, AND PUGET SOUND HYPOXIA.

(a) AMENDMENT.—The Act is amended by inserting after section 604 the following:

“SEC. 604A. PACIFIC NORTHWEST, ESTUARIES, AND PUGET SOUND HYPOXIA.

“(a) ASSESSMENT REPORT.—Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of the Harmful Algal Blooms and Hypoxia Research and Control Amendments Act of 2010, the

Task Force established under section 603 shall complete and submit to Congress and the President an integrated assessment of hypoxia in the coastal and estuarine waters of the Pacific Northwest that examines the status of current research, monitoring, prevention, response, and control efforts.

“(b) PLAN.—The Task Force shall include in the regionally appropriate Regional Research and Action Plan developed under section 603B a plan, based on the integrated assessment submitted under subsection (a), for reducing, mitigating, and controlling hypoxia in the coastal and estuarine waters of the Pacific Northwest. In developing such plan, the Task Force shall consult with State, Indian tribe, and local governments, and academic, agricultural, industry, and environmental groups and representatives. Such plan shall include incentive-based partnership approaches. The plan shall also address the social and economic costs and benefits of the measures for reducing, mitigating, and controlling hypoxia.”

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 2 of the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1998 is amended by adding after the item relating to section 604 the following new item:

“Sec. 604A. Pacific Northwest, estuaries, and Puget Sound hypoxia.”

SEC. 8. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Section 605 is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 605. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

“There are authorized to be appropriated—

“(1) to the Under Secretary to carry out sections 603A and 603B, \$34,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2011 through 2015, of which, for each fiscal year—

“(A) \$2,000,000 may be used for the development of the Regional Research and Action Plans and the reports required by section 604A;

“(B) \$3,000,000 may be used for the research and assessment activities related to marine and freshwater harmful algal blooms at research laboratories of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration;

“(C) \$8,000,000 may be used to carry out the Ecology and Oceanography of Harmful Algal Blooms Program (ECOHAB);

“(D) \$5,500,000 may be used to carry out the Monitoring and Event Response for Harmful Algal Blooms Program (MERHAB);

“(E) \$1,500,000 may be used to carry out the Northern Gulf of Mexico Ecosystems and Hypoxia Assessment Program (NGOMEX);

“(F) \$5,000,000 may be used to carry out the Coastal Hypoxia Research Program (CHRP);

“(G) \$5,000,000 may be used to carry out the Prevention, Control, and Mitigation of Harmful Algal Blooms Program (PCMG);

“(H) \$1,000,000 may be used to carry out marine and freshwater harmful algal bloom and hypoxia events response activities; and

“(I) \$3,000,000 may be used for increased availability, communication, and coordination activities; and

“(2) to the Administrator to carry out sections 603A, 603B, and 604, \$7,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2011 through 2015.”

(b) EXTRAMURAL RESEARCH ACTIVITIES.—The Under Secretary shall ensure that a substantial portion of funds appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) that are used for research purposes are allocated to extramural research activities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After 1 hour of debate on the bill, as amended, it shall be in order to consider the amendment printed in part B of House Report 111-439 if offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) or his designee, which shall be considered read, and shall be debatable for 10 min-

utes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

The gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

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

H.R. 3650, the Harmful Algal Blooms and Hypoxia Research and Control Amendments Act of 2009, as amended, is a good bipartisan bill. The bill represents a timely and necessary step to address the large and growing problems of harmful algal blooms and hypoxia. The Harmful Algal Blooms and Hypoxia Research and Control Act was first signed into law in 1998 and last reauthorized in 2004. Since the last reauthorization, there has been an increase in the number, frequency, and type of algal blooms and hypoxic events.

These events can terribly affect the marine and freshwater systems where they occur. Large fish kills, closed beaches, and poisoned seafood are all typical consequences of harmful algal blooms.

I listened to the debate on the rule prior to our debating the bill itself; and as far as the question of why are we debating this, the simple answer is, it can kill you. Indeed, it does kill some of our citizens every year. It kills countless numbers of fish life, it destroys tourism, and it costs hundreds of millions of dollars. That seems to me a pretty good reason to take something up.

In addition, as my dear friend and colleague from Florida will attest, his tourist industry, as mine, and as the gentlewoman from Maine who spoke earlier and indeed the gentleman from California and my colleague from Texas, all have beaches which are adversely affected. If the issue we are concerned about is jobs, harmful algal blooms are destroyers of jobs in addition to takers of lives.

In freshwater, harmful algal blooms present a toxin that is very, very difficult to remove; and let me clarify why. All the normal means we use to purify water don't work with harmful algal blooms. You cannot boil it because boiling separates the toxin from the algae and actually concentrates the toxin. Indeed, lab researchers use boiling as a way to concentrate the toxin when they are trying to study it. You can't filter it because filtering breaks down the bodies of the algae, and that also releases the toxin. Chlorine doesn't work because chlorine is designed to kill protozoa, and these are not protozoa. The toxin is not caused by a protozoa.

So we've got a very dangerous problem. And beyond that, it is a problem that is expanding in duration. Harmful algal blooms and hypoxic events are starting earlier in the season and lasting longer. They are growing in larger scale, and they are spreading around the country. We have some ideas about

why, and we have some ideas about how to control them, but we don't know for certain. And that is why this bill matters, and that is why my colleagues, Mr. MACK, Mr. EHLERS and others, have worked on it. We have taken some important steps since 1998 and 2004. And, again, I want to commend my colleague, VERN EHLERS, who has been instrumental on this issue for many, many years.

The bill before us would establish a National Harmful Algal Bloom and Hypoxia program within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration tasked as the lead in overseeing the development of these plans and the execution of this national program.

HABs, again, do not only affect our coastlines. From the waters and streams of Virginia and West Virginia to the Great Lakes, throughout this country, every single State in the Union, whether it is freshwater or marine ecosystem, has been affected by harmful algal blooms. My own State of Washington, the Puget Sound in Hood Canal, has a dead zone that expands every year. Off our coast, we have increasing dead zones, and red tides devastate the tourist industry when they stop the clamming season from happening.

Legitimate questions have been raised about the authorized funding levels in this bill. But the increased investment this legislation calls for is necessary to address the harmful economic impacts and health impacts that HABs pose to our country. Conservative estimates back in 2006 estimated a minimum impact of \$82 million per year.

This bill is the product of bipartisan collaboration and contains the input of both Democratic and Republican Members. And as I mentioned, Dr. VERN EHLERS, Dr. CONNIE MACK, as well as on our side Mr. KRATOVIL and Ms. CASTOR, have all offered very valuable input.

The bill you have before you today is the product of two hearings, a subcommittee markup, a full committee markup, post-markup negotiations with the three House committees with jurisdiction over the bill, as well as negotiations with the Senate Commerce Committee.

The bill represents a focused effort to address the specific issues of harmful algal blooms and hypoxia.

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

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

The bill before us today is the same bill that was before this body 3 days ago. As such, I don't have much to add today except to compliment the gentleman from Washington and tell him that he has made a difference in the time he has been here and he will be missed when he leaves in November. And it is tough to go against a bill that I'm in favor of the thrust that he has, but I have some concerns about it.

I will simply reiterate that I'm supportive of the underlying goals of this legislation. It fosters continued research into the causes of harmful algal blooms, explores ways to manage these events, and sets up mechanisms to potentially predict when they might even occur. While supportive of the goals of the measure, I and several of my Republican colleagues, and there is a difference among us on this side, have some concerns about the authorization levels in this bill as well as the potential for unfunded mandates on States and localities.

This bill authorizes funding that is almost three times the amount that had been appropriated in recent years and is 50 percent higher than the last reauthorization in 2004. In authorizing legislation, we must be mindful of fiscal constraints both at the Federal and the State level.

I look forward to continuing to work with Dr. BAIRD and my colleagues on the House Science and Technology Committee as this bill moves through the process.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BAIRD. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Before recognizing Ms. CASTOR, I would just point out, as he is aware—first of all, I want to thank him for his support of the underlying issue here. I think the recognition of the severity of this problem is much appreciated, as Mr. MACK will attest to in just a moment.

Regarding the issue of unfunded mandates, the Congressional Budget Office has looked at this legislation and determined specifically that it does not impose any unfunded mandates, so I respect the concern but would offer assurance that it is not considered a problem, at least by CBO.

Regarding the authorization levels, we discussed these levels at some length. Given the severity of the problem, we actually began with the higher number. In consult with our friends on the other side of the aisle, we actually lowered the number. And, furthermore, the number, of course, is an authorizing number; it is not an appropriated amount. Our premise is that the problem actually perhaps deserves substantially more money than we have been spending on it because it is a deadly threat and an economic loss. But we recognize that probably now actual appropriated levels will fall below authorization. Having a greater authorization allows us to up the effort should a situation arise that needs that.

With that, I'm happy to yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR), who has been a champion of this, as it affects so much of her State.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to rise in strong support of H.R. 3650. I call this the "red tide" bill. I would like to thank my colleague Mr. BAIRD for his great leadership on this initiative.

□ 1015

I've heard some discussion here in the Chamber and throughout the Capitol the last couple of days. Why are we taking up time with algae? Well, let's not diminish the issue because this is vitally important for jobs throughout the great State of Florida. I am very pleased that my colleague from Florida is in the Chair this morning to preside over this.

We simply can't go backwards when it comes to jobs in our economy, and red tide is a significant threat to the tourism economy in the State of Florida. We depend in Florida upon people coming from all over the country and all over the world to vacation, especially on the beautiful beaches of the west coast of Florida, where you have the warm waters of the Gulf of Mexico. There are no better beaches across the entire world than there are on the west coast of Florida. Now, also, on the Atlantic side it is quite lovely and the Florida Keys, but we face a significant threat from red tide.

The tourism industry in Florida employs over 1 million people, and it is estimated that tourism has a \$65 billion impact on our State's economy. Add on top of that recreational fishing, commercial fishing. What happens when this red tide washes in, it's awful. The tourists flee the beaches, and the folks that live and work and rely upon those industries really suffer. This happened just a few years ago in 2005. We had terrible red tide outbreaks on the west coast of Florida. And I can tell you because I had my family there at the beach with about a dozen other families where we go right after school is out. And what happens is that it causes you a lot of difficulty breathing. Your eyes start to water, the fish wash up on the shore, dead fish. And you can forget about it. Our economy took a real hit because of red tide. The tourists simply don't want to visit polluted beaches. We have beautiful, clean, crystal clear water most of the time. But when this red tide invades, it's absolutely awful. You can see where it's directly tied to jobs because then the word spreads. There were news stories over in England and Great Britain, where a lot of our tourists come from, and they decided not take their vacation. Now, if that happened in this economy, it would be very detrimental. So today's legislation will help us combat that threat.

And I would like to especially thank my colleague from Florida, Representative CONNIE MACK, who represents the Naples, Sanibel Island area. There is simply no more beautiful place to vacation than maybe up towards my district in Longboat Key and Anna Maria Island. But Congressman MACK and I have been working on this issue since 2007. He was working on it before I arrived in Congress, and we introduced the Save Our Shores Act to bring more attention to the research on red tide. That's why I am so gratified that the Science Committee, Mr. BAIRD and Mr.

BARTON, have really stepped up and promoted this. It's a bipartisan effort. And it's important because it comes on the heels of the tourism bill, the Travel Promotion Act that was signed into law by President Obama just last week. It's another good bolstering of the tourism economy and all those important jobs to the Sunshine State and across the country.

Now, this legislation will ensure that we learn more about harmful algal blooms so that we can protect our precious coastlines and the tourism-related jobs that come with having healthy beaches. According to the National Centers for Coastal Ocean Science, the national economic impact of the red tide, the harmful algal blooms, is at least \$82 million annually. So if we can pump in a little bit of research money and figure out what causes this—you see, that's the problem. We don't really know what causes the red tide and the algal blooms. If we're already suffering an \$82 million hit, then it is very cost-effective for us to put a little bit more money into research and coordination. There's a lot of good research out there, but I don't think that it's being shared widely. So this initiative will help do that. And I think we'll be able to avoid devastating losses to tourism, to recreation and to commercial fishing all across the country.

In 1971, Florida faced an exceptionally bad case of red tide, and then again in 2005, and we think that that caused Florida to take a hit of over \$100 million. So the level of concern about red tide's cost to tourism is still high even though it's been a couple of years since our last big outbreak. But like I said, if we had an outbreak today in this economy, it would severely hurt businesses at a time when we just can't take it anymore. The unemployment rate in my community is about 13 percent, and we rely on folks needing some relaxation time and vacations in the beautiful Sunshine State. So that's why I strongly support this initiative.

Again, I want to thank my colleagues, Representative MACK from Florida, Mr. BAIRD, the Science and Technology Committee, and I am pleased to urge all my colleagues to vote for H.R. 3650.

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

Mr. MACK. I want to thank the chairman, Mr. BAIRD, for his work on this important issue. I also want to thank the ranking member, Mr. HALL, for his hard work and dedication.

I also want to recognize that in this bill, there may be a lot of people who have concerns about the funding levels, and I'll just pick up where the chairman talked about that this is an authorizing bill. This is not the appropriations process. But it is important that we recognize that for our researchers around the country, they need to be able to plan looking forward, and if they constantly are relying on funding to be done through the

appropriations process once a year, whether or not they're going to have the research dollars or not, that is no way to conduct quality research, especially on an issue that's so important, and I too call this red tide.

This is an important issue for all of us, not just those that live along the coast, but for all of us. It used to be thought that red tide was only something that affected the marine life, but now we have seen that this has crossed over and is affecting not only the quality of life for people who live or vacation at the beach but also can cause death. So I commend the committee for this bill.

Passing this important legislation is the first step in increasing research on red tide while ensuring that scientists and experts in the field, and not politicians, determine where research money is spent. And this is an important fact because right now, all of my colleagues and I, we try to make sure that we bring some money home for our local research organizations, which we support. But in this legislation what we're saying is, let's have a peer review group look at the research projects that are out there, and let them decide. Let scientists decide what's most important, what research is to be supported and funded.

This is very important for everybody at home. For those people who want to make sure that we control spending, one of the best ways to control spending through this bill is to make sure that peer review groups are deciding where the money's going, not everyone and Members of Congress fighting for their own little project in their backyards. So I see this in that light as well. There are great organizations out there, whether it's Woods Hole, or Mote Marine, or Florida Gulf Coast University, and also Ocean Champions, who have been working hard on this legislation, and we need to support them as well.

So on a last note, growing up in southwest Florida, I have spent my whole life on the water in Sanibel and Fort Myers Beach and Captiva, and we would have red tide maybe 1 week out of the year.

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

Mr. HALL of Texas. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. MACK. So we would have an outbreak maybe once a year for 1 week. Not too long ago, we had 13 months of straight red tide off the coast of Florida in southwest Florida. Clearly something is changing, something is happening. And right now, frankly, I don't know that we can trust all the research that's out there. This bill will ensure that we can trust the research that's happening, that it's done through a peer review group, through NOAA, and that we will have reporting to the Congress on those findings so we can continue to monitor and hopefully eliminate or begin to control red tide so the

citizens of this great country can enjoy the beaches, our economies can grow, and the quality of life can improve.

Thank you for the time.

Mr. BAIRD. I want to commend the gentleman from Florida. His personal story is one we hear so often. But he knows it firsthand, from his time as a child, an occasional red tide where his parents probably said, No, you can't go swimming today, son, to a 13-month period of red tide. Earlier when I said we have seen an expansion in duration, in size, and in breadth across the country, that's precisely what I'm referring to.

I'm sure this is true of both of my colleagues from Florida. If you're a hotel owner, and you get notice that a red tide is forming off your beach, that's it. You basically can kiss your entire season of income—or at least a good part of it—goodbye. Where I'm from in the Pacific Northwest, clamming, razor clams are one of the great things that draws people to the coast. Our beaches just are covered with folks, and they get up in the wee hours of the morning when the tide is low and go out. It is a great family endeavor. It provides a wonderful delicacy to people, and people look forward to it year-round, and it is the high season at the coast. Except if a scientist is out there and says, We've got an algal bloom forming, and it is not safe for people to eat the shellfish or to swim in this water at this time.

Why isn't it safe? Well, first off, I want to underscore that most shellfish from around our country is safe, but during these periods, it is not. And here is why: The toxin that forms is a neurotoxin. It attacks your brain. It's called paralytic shellfish poisoning. In some areas, sometimes you will hear it as amnesic shellfish poisoning. Amnesic shellfish poisoning attacks the part of your brain that turns short-term memories into long-term memories. This is a bad thing. This means that you can't learn new information. So when people say, Oh, this is algae, what do we care about algae—I heard this a lot yesterday. Why are we coming back into session to talk about algae? Well, I hope people can remember that if they eat shellfish with paralytic shellfish poisoning, they can die. Their brain can be damaged. Their children's brains can be damaged. If somebody says, Oh, Mom and Dad, it's just red tide, I'm going swimming anyway, you can't let that happen. The kid will die. It's that serious.

Let me turn to the freshwater. A true story from my district. Imagine you take your family dog, your beloved favorite pet, to the water that you always take them to. You take the tennis ball and you fling it out into the water. And your retriever jumps in the water, swims out, grabs that tennis ball, swims back to the shore. You take the tennis ball out, you turn to throw it, and the dog is dying before your eyes. That really happened. It happened in my district in a lake that,

when there's not an algal bloom, people recreate in, they have sailboats, they have boat races, they swim in it, they take their dogs there. From one week when it was safe for that dog to go in the water, the owner comes back the next week, and through no fault of their own, the dog does everything it normally does, and it dies.

If I had a glass of clear water here, and someone were saying, Oh, what a waste of time, what a waste of time to work on this, and it had the toxin from blue-green algae, the person who drank that water would die. If it's in your freshwater system, a large reservoir for your municipality, and you get a blue-green algal bloom in that with toxin, I would ask my colleagues who are skeptical about this, Tell me how you get it out? There are mechanisms, but they're not easy, and they're very costly. How do you get it out of there? And more importantly, tell me how you're going to give the people who you represent clean drinking water if your water system is contaminated. If you depend on surface reservoirs, and you get a blue-green algal bloom, you are in deep, deep trouble, and you are looking at a lot of money and possibly some deaths of your constituents.

Mr. MACK talked a little bit about hypoxia, which is a huge problem in the Gulf. Let me put this in terms we understand: Hypoxic zones are areas where the algae has decomposed, and that decomposition has taken the air out of the water, basically taken the oxygen out. Imagine if you were walking your normal route to work or to your home, and suddenly, invisibly, you went into an area where there was no oxygen in the air. You're walking a route you normally take. No oxygen. What happens? You suffocate. You die. That's what dead zones do. Hundreds of thousands, millions of aquatic fish—the very fish that our fishermen in our coastal communities depend on, the very fish we eat and enjoy—they just flat die. They're swimming in their normal, maybe their migratory route, maybe their reproductive areas. They go into this area. They can't tell there is no oxygen in the water. They swim into it, they have no oxygen, and they die in enormous quantities. Then they wash up on the beaches as a pleasant attraction for our tourism industry.

In this body, we stick around to honor sports teams, we praise movie stars. This is something that can kill you, for goodness sakes.

I also want to make sure we thank the many scientists who have done the work on this legislation. Scientists around the world are trying to study the causes, trying to study the interventions. They literally evaluate our beaches around the country and our freshwater systems on a daily basis and give us the information we need to protect the public safety and health. And I want to make sure I commend them.

At this point I will reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1030

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

In closing, I just want to point out once again to be guarding against unfunded mandates on States and localities. This bill will reach probably a conference committee somewhere down the road. I would like to have that remembered.

In authorizing legislation, we have to still be mindful of fiscal constraints both at the Federal and the State level. The President's budget request for the NOAA program is \$12.7 million. Forty-one million dollars in authorization is significantly above the request. It is a good program, a great thrust. I support the thrust. I just ask those who vote upon it, for or against it, to remember the unfunded mandate danger and the fact that it is well above.

I now see my colleague from Michigan, Dr. EHLERS, here, who is probably going to disagree with me. I will yield him 5 minutes.

Mr. EHLERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I am sorry I arrived late for this debate, but I was speaking at the National Academy of Engineering.

I simply want to speak on the record in support of this bill. It is essentially the same bill that I introduced several years ago when we were in the majority, and it did pass then. The major change now is of course increased funding because of the increased need that has occurred.

The hypoxia and harmful algal blooms, also known as HABs, are nationwide problems that have grown tremendously in the last decade, not just in the Gulf of Mexico, but also in the Great Lakes, Chesapeake Bay, California, the Pacific Northwest, and elsewhere. This is a problem that just simply has to be dealt with. It is hurting the fishing industry tremendously.

I recognize that there is concern about the cost of the bill. First of all, I am sure we will not be appropriating as much money as is authorized. But secondly, you have to measure the effect on commerce of this bill, particularly the commercial fishing industry, but also the safety of the tourist industry. If we do not correct this problem and it continues to spread, we will soon find the tourist industry off the southern coast, particularly Florida and the Gulf States and also Texas, will be injured because people will simply not be able to use the waters and will vacation elsewhere.

This could create additional problems. I won't go into all the details on that. I do have a prepared statement which I will submit. But I just wanted to go on record as supporting this bill very strongly. I have worked with Mr. BAIRD. I was the sponsor a few years ago, and he helped me then. He is the sponsor now, and I have helped him. And I just want to encourage the body to vote for this bill and adopt it.

The cost issue is certainly a legitimate one. It always is. But I think that

is best addressed through the appropriations process. But certainly there is the need to go after this HAB problem scientifically and find out why the problem is becoming so much worse, and what we can do to stop it. I am hoping that through research we can stop it at far less cost than we are talking about in this bill. But we won't know until we do the research and get into the details of the problem.

I again thank the ranking member, Mr. HALL, who has done yeoman work on the committee this year. I thank him for yielding time to me, and thank him for all the good work he has done.

I urge the body to adopt this particular bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that today the House is considering H.R. 3650, the Harmful Algal Blooms and Hypoxia Research and Control Amendments Act of 2010.

Hypoxia and harmful algal blooms, also known as HABs, are nationwide problems that affect our coastal and Great Lakes communities. The damaging effects of HABs and hypoxia are felt in locations including the Chesapeake Bay, California, the Pacific Northwest, the Great Lakes, and the Gulf of Mexico. Less than two weeks ago, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) released a warning indicating the potential for a major bloom in New England this summer that may threaten the shellfish industry. These blooms have major economic consequences for our country, and must be prevented.

In 1998, Congress passed a three-year bill authorizing HAB and hypoxia research programs, with a focus on the "dead zone" in the Gulf of Mexico and Pfiesteria in the Chesapeake Bay. The Act was reauthorized in 2004, and added freshwater, such as the Great Lakes, as an important area for HAB and hypoxia research. It also increased the participation of local resource managers in developing HAB and hypoxia research plans; ensuring that the research was prioritized to address the questions facing people working with HABs and hypoxia on a daily basis. Also, the bill required that all research funding be administered through a competitive, merit-based, peer-reviewed process.

The amendments we are considering today strengthen the algal bloom research activities at NOAA and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and improve the communication and coordination between the many federal, state and local stakeholders. The bill would facilitate a clear national strategy for research in both marine and freshwater environments, and reauthorize activities through 2015.

One comment on the process; I am aware that modifications have been made to the legislation since it was considered by the Science and Technology Committee, and that some of these modifications fall within this committee's jurisdiction. While I understand there are necessary technical changes following markups, I do believe the consideration of substantive changes should take place in a manner that all committee members have the opportunity to voice their input. I understand that Subcommittee Chairman BAIRD will detail these changes on the floor, and I thank him for his efforts to share this information with all Members.

I am pleased that Chairmen BAIRD and GORDON and Ranking Member HALL have

worked diligently within the Science and Technology Committee and other Committees of jurisdiction to bring this bill expeditiously to the floor of the House. This bill will help us improve our understanding of these phenomena so that we can accurately predict their occurrence and develop tools for improved detection and mitigation of these problems. I urge the House to pass this bill.

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

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

I am so delighted that Mr. EHLERS is here for a number of reasons. First of all, the history of harmful algal bloom legislation really owes its existence to this gentleman. As a scientist, as someone who cares passionately about the people of his State and the Great Lakes, I will say without any hesitation the Great Lakes have had no stronger champion in the Congress than this gentleman here, Dr. EHLERS. And for that matter, I believe science itself has had no stronger champion.

If you look at his contributions on the Great Lakes, harmful algal blooms I just mentioned. Invasive species. He has been a champion in trying to fight the zebra mussel, which is also the kind of thing someone could look at with derision and say why are we trying to fight invasive species, a little tiny mussel? Well, it costs billions of dollars a year in property loss and economic loss. Just yesterday we were on a panel together and he was raising the very important issue of the possible invasion of carp into the Great Lakes system, which would devastate the sports fishing and other industries in the Great Lakes.

The other reason I think it is particularly appropriate that he is here is when we speak about red tide, inland communities may say, we don't have any marine waters, what do we care? The Great Lakes are a classic example of an area where harmful algal blooms can affect fresh waters as well as maritime waters. And so my hat is off to Dr. EHLERS, and he has my gratitude for his leadership on this over the years.

In closing, I would like to again thank my friend and colleague from Texas, my friend from Michigan, and Mr. MACK, Ms. CASTOR, and Mr. KRATOVIL. I am very grateful for the time, and urge passage of this.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3650, the Harmful Algal Blooms and Hypoxia Research and Control Amendments Act of 2010. I am pleased to cosponsor this bill, which would help us address one of the most underrecognized problems affecting our coastal communities, damaging aquatic environments, and threatening human health.

Harmful algal blooms can devastate commercial fisheries and tourism. Some blooming species produce potent neurotoxins that can kill marine organisms and cause human illness—or even death—when contaminated seafood is consumed. For this reason, blooms often necessitate fisheries closures. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration estimates that HABs cost the commercial fishing industry \$38 million per year. In cases

where the blooming organisms do not produce toxins, they can deplete the water column of light and oxygen, causing dead zones. These often drive off tourists at a cost of millions of dollars annually to our coastal communities. All together, NOAA estimates that HABs cost the United States economy \$82 million per year.

The bill before us today would establish and maintain a National Harmful Algal Bloom and Hypoxia Program to develop a national strategy to address this national problem. This would include a full analysis of our research, development, and demonstration needs and priorities and the creation of coordinated education programs. This is just the kind of action we need to take more often. We need to provide our federal science agencies the tools they need to gather the scientific data necessary to help us develop an effective solution to this problem. I am pleased to support this bill, and I urge my colleagues to do so as well.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3650, the Harmful Algal Blooms and Hypoxia Research and Control Amendments Act, will address a growing threat to the health of our aquatic environments and our coastal communities.

H.R. 3650 establishes a program, led by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, NOAA, to reduce the environmental impact of harmful algal blooms, HABs, and hypoxia.

Algal blooms, which are a rapid increase in the population of algae in an aquatic system, are typically not threatening to their environments. However, a growing percentage of algal blooms produce toxins that can kill fish, shellfish, marine mammals, and birds, and may cause illness in people. Non-toxic algal blooms may also have a hypoxic effect on marine ecosystems. For example, when masses of algae die and decompose, they can deplete oxygen in the water, causing the water to become so low in oxygen that animals either leave the area or die. HABs have been reported in almost every U.S. coastal state, and their occurrence may be on the rise.

H.R. 3650 authorizes \$41 million each year for the next four years for NOAA and the Environmental Protection Agency, EPA, to further research the complex causes of HABs. The program will develop a national strategy to address marine and freshwater HABs, hypoxia, and the protection of affected ecosystems. It will educate coastal resource managers and the general public with training and awareness programs. The program will also identify further research needs, and provide grant funding for research projects.

I strongly support this bill because it is a critical step towards the preservation of our coastlines for future generations.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

The Chair understands that the gentleman from Arizona will not be offering his amendment.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1168, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on passage of H.R. 3650 will be followed by 5-minute votes on the Speaker's approval of the Journal and the motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 4506.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 251, nays 103, not voting 76, as follows:

[Roll No. 109]

YEAS—251

Adler (NJ)	Eshoo	McCotter
Andrews	Etheridge	McDermott
Arcuri	Fallin	McGovern
Baird	Farr	McIntyre
Baldwin	Fattah	McMahon
Barrow	Finner	McNerney
Bean	Fleming	Meek (FL)
Becerra	Fortenberry	Meeks (NY)
Berkley	Poster	Melancon
Berry	Fudge	Michaud
Biggert	Garamendi	Miller (NC)
Bilbray	Gerlach	Miller, George
Bilirakis	Giffords	Minnick
Bishop (GA)	Gohmert	Mitchell
Bishop (NY)	Gonzalez	Mollohan
Blumenauer	Gordon (TN)	Moore (KS)
Boccieri	Grayson	Moore (WI)
Bono Mack	Green, Al	Moran (VA)
Boozman	Green, Gene	Murphy, Patrick
Boucher	Gutierrez	Nadler (NY)
Boustany	Hall (NY)	Neal (MA)
Boyd	Halvorson	Nye
Brady (PA)	Hare	Oberstar
Braley (IA)	Harman	Obey
Brown, Corrine	Hastings (FL)	Olver
Brown-Waite,	Heinrich	Ortiz
Ginny	Herseth Sandlin	Pallone
Butterfield	Himes	Pascarell
Capito	Hinchey	Pastor (AZ)
Capps	Hinojosa	Paulsen
Capuano	Hirono	Payne
Cardoza	Hodes	Perlmutter
Carnahan	Holden	Perriello
Carney	Holt	Peters
Carson (IN)	Honda	Peterson
Cassidy	Hoyer	Petri
Castle	Insee	Pingree (ME)
Castor (FL)	Israel	Platts
Chandler	Jackson (IL)	Polis (CO)
Chu	Jackson Lee	Posey
Clarke	(TX)	Price (NC)
Cleaver	Johnson (GA)	Putnam
Clyburn	Johnson (IL)	Quigley
Cohen	Johnson, E. B.	Rahall
Cole	Kanjorski	Rangel
Connolly (VA)	Kennedy	Rehberg
Conyers	Kildee	Reichert
Cooper	Kilroy	Richardson
Costa	Kind	Rooney
Courtney	Kissell	Ross
Crenshaw	Kline (MN)	Rothman (NJ)
Crowley	Kosmas	Roybal-Allard
Cuellar	Kratovil	Ruppersberger
Cummings	Kucinich	Ryan (OH)
Dahlkemper	Langevin	Ryan (WI)
Davis (CA)	Larsen (WA)	Salazar
Davis (IL)	Larsen (CT)	Sánchez, Linda
Davis (TN)	Lee (CA)	T.
DeGette	Levin	Sanchez, Loretta
DeLauro	Lewis (GA)	Sarbanes
Dent	Lipinski	Scalise
Dicks	LoBiondo	Schakowsky
Dingell	Lowe	Schauer
Doggett	Lucas	Schiff
Donnelly (IN)	Lynch	Schrader
Doyle	Mack	Schwartz
Driehaus	Maffei	Scott (GA)
Edwards (MD)	Markey (CO)	Scott (VA)
Edwards (TX)	Markey (MA)	Serrano
Ehlers	Matheson	Sestak
Ellison	Matsui	Shea-Porter
Ellsworth	McCarthy (NY)	Sherman
Engel	McCollum	Shuler

Skelton	Thompson (MS)	Watson
Slaughter	Tierney	Watt
Smith (NE)	Titus	Waxman
Smith (NJ)	Tonko	Weiner
Snyder	Towns	Welch
Space	Tsongas	Wilson (OH)
Spratt	Van Hollen	Wittman
Stark	Velázquez	Woolsey
Stupak	Visclosky	Wu
Sutton	Walz	Yarmuth
Tanner	Wasserman	
Taylor	Schultz	
Teague	Waters	

NAYS—103

Aderholt	Guthrie	Miller (MI)
Akin	Hall (TX)	Myrick
Altmire	Harper	Neugebauer
Austria	Hastings (WA)	Nunes
Bachmann	Hensarling	Olson
Bachus	Herger	Owens
Barrett (SC)	Hunter	Pitts
Bartlett	Inglis	Poe (TX)
Blackburn	Jenkins	Price (GA)
Boehner	Jordan (OH)	Radanovich
Bonner	King (IA)	Roe (TN)
Boren	King (NY)	Rogers (AL)
Brady (TX)	Kingston	Rogers (MI)
Bright	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Royce
Broun (GA)	Lamborn	Schmidt
Burton (IN)	Lance	Sensenbrenner
Camp	Latham	Sessions
Cantor	Latta	Shadegg
Coble	Lee (NY)	Shuster
Coffman (CO)	Lewis (CA)	Simpson
Conaway	Linder	Smith (TX)
Culberson	Luetkemeyer	Souder
Davis (KY)	Lummis	Stearns
Dreier	Lungren, Daniel	Sullivan
Duncan	E.	Thompson (PA)
Emerson	Manzullo	Thornberry
Forbes	McCarthy (CA)	Tiahrt
Fox	McCaul	Tiberi
Franks (AZ)	McClintock	Turner
Frelinghuysen	McHenry	Upton
Garrett (NJ)	McKeon	Westmoreland
Goodlatte	McMorris	Whitfield
Granger	Rodgers	Wilson (SC)
Graves	Mica	Wolf
Griffith	Miller (FL)	Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—76

Ackerman	Flake	Murphy (CT)
Alexander	Frank (MA)	Murphy (NY)
Baca	Gallely	Murphy, Tim
Barton (TX)	Gingrey (GA)	Napolitano
Berman	Grijalva	Paul
Bishop (UT)	Heller	Pence
Blunt	Higgins	Peromroy
Boswell	Hill	Reyes
Brown (SC)	Hoekstra	Rodriguez
Buchanan	Issa	Rogers (KY)
Burgess	Johnson, Sam	Rohrabacher
Buyer	Jones	Ros-Lehtinen
Calvert	Kagen	Roskam
Campbell	Kaptur	Rush
Cao	Kilpatrick (MI)	Rush
Carter	Kirk	Schock
Chaffetz	Klein (FL)	Shimkus
Childers	LaTourette	Sires
Clay	Loeb sack	Smith (WA)
Costello	Lofgren, Zoe	Speier
Davis (AL)	Lujan	Terry
Deal (GA)	Maloney	Thompson (CA)
DeFazio	Marchant	Walden
Delahunt	Marshall	Wamp
Diaz-Balart, L.	Miller, Gary	Young (FL)
Diaz-Balart, M.	Moran (KS)	

□ 1106

Messrs. SOUDER and WHITFIELD changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, March 12, 2010, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 109. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on passage of H.R. 3650, the Harmful Algal Blooms and Hypoxia Research and Control Amendments Act.

Stated against:
Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 109, had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 109, had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 203, nays 144, answered "present" 1, not voting 82, as follows:

[Roll No. 110]

YEAS—203

Andrews	Grayson	Neal (MA)
Bachmann	Green, Al	Oberstar
Baird	Green, Gene	Obey
Baldwin	Hall (NY)	Olver
Barrow	Halvorson	Ortiz
Bean	Hare	Owens
Becerra	Harman	Pallone
Berkley	Hastings (FL)	Pascrell
Berry	Heinrich	Paulsen
Bishop (GA)	Hereth Sandlin	Payne
Bishop (NY)	Hinchee	Perlmutter
Blumenauer	Hinojosa	Pingree (ME)
Boucher	Hirono	Polis (CO)
Boyd	Hodes	Posey
Brady (PA)	Holden	Price (NC)
Braley (IA)	Holt	Quigley
Brown, Corrine	Honda	Rahall
Brown-Waite,	Hoyer	Rangel
Ginny	Inslee	Richardson
Butterfield	Israel	Roe (TN)
Capito	Jackson (IL)	Rooney
Capps	Jackson Lee	Ross
Capuano	(TX)	Rothman (NJ)
Carnahan	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	Johnson (IL)	Ruppersberger
Castle	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Caster (FL)	Kanjorski	Ryan (OH)
Chu	Kennedy	Salazar
Clarke	Kildee	Sánchez, Linda
Cleaver	Kilroy	T.
Clyburn	Kind	Sanchez, Loretta
Cohen	Klein (FL)	Sarbanes
Conyers	Komas	Schakowsky
Cooper	Kucinich	Schauer
Courtney	Langevin	Schiff
Crowley	Larsen (WA)	Schrader
Cuellar	Larson (CT)	Schwartz
Cummings	Latham	Scott (GA)
Davis (CA)	Lee (CA)	Scott (VA)
Davis (IL)	Levin	Serrano
Davis (TN)	Lewis (GA)	Sestak
DeGette	Lipinski	Shea-Porter
DeLauro	Lowe	Sherman
Dent	Luetkemeyer	Skelton
Dicks	Lynch	Slaughter
Dingell	Maffei	Snyder
Doggett	Markey (MA)	Space
Doyle	Matheson	Spratt
Driehaus	Matsui	Stark
Edwards (MD)	McCarthy (NY)	Stupak
Edwards (TX)	McClintock	Tanner
Ellison	McCollum	Teague
Engel	McDermott	Thompson (MS)
Eshoo	McGovern	Tiberi
Etheridge	McIntyre	Tierney
Farr	McMahon	Titus
Fattah	McNerney	Tonko
Filner	Meek (FL)	Towns
Forbes	Meeks (NY)	Tsongas
Fortenberry	Michaud	Van Hollen
Foster	Miller (NC)	Velázquez
Fudge	Miller, George	Visclosky
Garamendi	Mollohan	Walz
Gonzalez	Moore (KS)	Wasserman
Goodlatte	Moran (VA)	Schultz
Gordon (TN)	Murphy, Patrick	Waters

Watson	Weiner	Woolsey
Watt	Welch	Wu
Waxman	Wilson (OH)	Yarmuth
NAYS—144		
Aderholt	Franks (AZ)	Miller (MI)
Adler (NJ)	Frelinghuysen	Minnick
Akin	Garrett (NJ)	Mitchell
Altmire	Gerlach	Myrick
Arcuri	Giffords	Neugebauer
Austria	Granger	Nunes
Bachus	Graves	Nye
Barrett (SC)	Griffith	Olson
Bartlett	Guthrie	Perriello
Biggett	Hall (TX)	Peters
Bilbray	Harper	Peterson
Bilirakis	Hastings (WA)	Petri
Blackburn	Hensarling	Pitts
Blackburn	Herger	Platts
Bocieri	Himes	Poe (TX)
Boehner	Hunter	Price (GA)
Bonner	Inglis	Putnam
Bono Mack	Jenkins	Radanovich
Boozman	Jordan (OH)	Rehberg
Boren	King (IA)	Reichert
Boustany	King (NY)	Rogers (AL)
Brady (TX)	Bright	Rogers (MI)
Brown (GA)	Broun (GA)	Royce
Burton (IN)	Burton (IN)	Scalise
Camp	Camp	Schmidt
Cantor	Cantor	Sensenbrenner
Cardoza	Cardoza	Sessions
Carney	Carney	Shadegg
Cassidy	Cassidy	Shuler
Chandler	Chandler	Shuster
Coble	Coble	Smith (NE)
Coffman (CO)	Coffman (CO)	Smith (NJ)
Cole	Cole	Smith (TX)
Conaway	Conaway	Souder
Connolly (VA)	Connolly (VA)	Stearns
Costa	Costa	Sullivan
Crenshaw	Crenshaw	Taylor
Culberson	Culberson	Thompson (PA)
Dahlkemper	Dahlkemper	Thornberry
Davis (KY)	Davis (KY)	Tiahrt
Donnelly (IN)	Donnelly (IN)	Tiahrt
Dreier	Dreier	Turner
Duncan	Duncan	Upton
Ehlers	Ehlers	Westmoreland
Ellsworth	Ellsworth	Whitfield
Emerson	Emerson	Wilson (SC)
Fallin	Fallin	Wittman
Fleming	Fleming	Wolf
Foxx	Foxx	Young (AK)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Gohmert

NOT VOTING—82

Ackerman	Gallely	Murphy, Tim
Alexander	Gingrey (GA)	Nadler (NY)
Baca	Grijalva	Napolitano
Barton (TX)	Gutierrez	Pastor (AZ)
Berman	Heller	Paul
Bishop (UT)	Higgins	Pence
Blunt	Hill	Pomeroy
Boswell	Hoekstra	Reyes
Brown (SC)	Issa	Rodriguez
Buchanan	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (KY)
Burgess	Jones	Rohrabacher
Buyer	Kagen	Ros-Lehtinen
Calvert	Kaptur	Roskam
Campbell	Kilpatrick (MI)	Ryan (WI)
Cao	Kirk	Schock
Carter	LaTourette	Shimkus
Chaffetz	Linder	Simpson
Childers	Loebsock	Sires
Clay	Lofgren, Zoe	Smith (WA)
Costello	Lujan	Speier
Davis (AL)	Maloney	Marchant
Deal (GA)	Marchant	Marshall
DeFazio	Marshall	Terry
Delahunt	Miller, Gary	Thompson (CA)
Diaz-Balart, L.	Moore (WI)	Walden
Diaz-Balart, M.	Moran (KS)	Wamp
Flake	Murphy (CT)	Young (FL)
Frank (MA)	Murphy (NY)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1114

So the Journal was approved. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, March 12, 2010, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 110. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on approving the journal.

Stated against:

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 110, had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 110, had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

BANKRUPTCY JUDGESHIP ACT OF 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. HALVORSON). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4506, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4506, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 345, nays 5, not voting 80, as follows:

[Roll No. 111]

YEAS—345

Aderholt	Cleaver	Gerlach
Adler (NJ)	Clyburn	Giffords
Akin	Coble	Gohmert
Altmire	Coffman (CO)	Gonzalez
Andrews	Cohen	Goodlatte
Arcuri	Cole	Gordon (TN)
Austria	Conaway	Granger
Bachmann	Connolly (VA)	Graves
Bachus	Conyers	Grayson
Baird	Cooper	Green, Al
Baldwin	Costa	Green, Gene
Barrett (SC)	Courtney	Griffith
Barrow	Crenshaw	Guthrie
Bartlett	Crowley	Gutierrez
Bean	Cuellar	Hall (NY)
Becerra	Culberson	Hall (TX)
Berkley	Cummings	Halvorson
Berry	Dahlkemper	Hare
Biggett	Davis (CA)	Harman
Bilbray	Davis (IL)	Harper
Bilirakis	Davis (KY)	Hastings (FL)
Bishop (GA)	Davis (TN)	Hastings (WA)
Bishop (NY)	DeGette	Heinrich
Blackburn	DeLauro	Herger
Blumenauer	Dent	Herseth Sandlin
Bocieri	Dicks	Himes
Boehner	Dingell	Hinchee
Bonner	Doggett	Hinojosa
Bono Mack	Donnelly (IN)	Hirono
Boozman	Doyle	Hodes
Boren	Dreier	Holden
Boucher	Driehaus	Holt
Boustany	Edwards (MD)	Honda
Boyd	Edwards (TX)	Hoyer
Brady (PA)	Ehlers	Hunter
Brady (TX)	Ellison	Inglis
Braley (IA)	Ellsworth	Inslee
Brown, Corrine	Emerson	Israel
Burton (IN)	Engel	Jackson (IL)
Butterfield	Eshoo	Jackson Lee
Camp	Etheridge	(TX)
Cantor	Fallin	Jenkins
Capito	Farr	Johnson (GA)
Capps	Fattah	Johnson (IL)
Capuano	Filner	Johnson, E. B.
Cardoza	Fleming	Jordan (OH)
Carnahan	Forbes	Kanjorski
Carney	Fortenberry	Kennedy
Carson (IN)	Foster	Kildee
Cassidy	Foxx	Kilroy
Castle	Franks (AZ)	Kinross
Castor (FL)	Frelinghuysen	King (IA)
Chandler	Fudge	King (NY)
Chu	Garamendi	Kingston
Clarke	Garrett (NJ)	Kirkpatrick (AZ)

Kissell	Moran (VA)	Scott (GA)
Klein (FL)	Murphy, Patrick	Scott (VA)
Kline (MN)	Myrick	Sensenbrenner
Kosmas	Nadler (NY)	Serrano
Kratovil	Neal (MA)	Sessions
Kucinich	Neugebauer	Sestak
Lamborn	Nunes	Shadegg
Lance	Nye	Shea-Porter
Langevin	Oberstar	Sherman
Larsen (WA)	Obey	Shuler
Larson (CT)	Olson	Shuster
Latham	Olver	Simpson
Latta	Ortiz	Skelton
Lee (CA)	Owens	Slaughter
Lee (NY)	Pallone	Smith (NE)
Levin	Pascarell	Smith (NJ)
Lewis (CA)	Paulsen	Smith (TX)
Lewis (GA)	Payne	Snyder
Lipinski	Perlmutter	Souder
LoBiondo	Perriello	Space
Lowey	Peters	Spratt
Lucas	Peterson	Stark
Luetkemeyer	Petri	Stearns
Lummis	Pingree (ME)	Stupak
Lungren, Daniel	Pitts	Sullivan
E.	Platts	Sutton
Lynch	Poe (TX)	Tanner
Mack	Polis (CO)	Taylor
Maffei	Posey	Teague
Manzullo	Price (GA)	Thompson (MS)
Markey (CO)	Price (NC)	Thompson (PA)
Markey (MA)	Putnam	Thornberry
Matheson	Quigley	Tiahrt
Matsui	Radanovich	Tiberi
McCarthy (CA)	Rahall	Tierney
McCarthy (NY)	Rangel	Titus
McCaul	Rehberg	Tonko
McClintock	Reichert	Towns
McCollum	Richardson	Tsongas
McCotter	Roe (TN)	Turner
McDermott	Rogers (AL)	Upton
McGovern	Rogers (MI)	Van Hollen
McHenry	Rooney	Velázquez
McIntyre	Ross	Vislosky
McKeon	Rothman (NJ)	Walz
McMahon	Roybal-Allard	Wasserman
McMorris	Royce	Schultz
Rodgers	Ruppersberger	Waters
McNerney	Rush	Watson
Meek (FL)	Ryan (OH)	Watt
Meeeks (NY)	Salazar	Waxman
Melancon	Sánchez, Linda	Weiner
Mica	T.	Welch
Michaud	Sanchez, Loretta	Whitfield
Miller (FL)	Sarbanes	Wilson (OH)
Miller (MI)	Scalise	Wilson (SC)
Miller (NC)	Schakowsky	Wittman
Miller, George	Schauer	Wolf
Minnick	Schiff	Wu
Mitchell	Schmidt	Yarmuth
Mollohan	Schrader	Young (AK)
Moore (KS)	Schwartz	

NAYS—5

Bright	Brown-Waite,	Duncan
Broun (GA)	Ginny	Westmoreland

NOT VOTING—80

Ackerman	Frank (MA)	Murphy (CT)
Alexander	Gallegly	Murphy (NY)
Baca	Gingrey (GA)	Murphy, Tim
Barton (TX)	Grijalva	Napolitano
Berman	Heller	Pastor (AZ)
Bishop (UT)	Hensarling	Paul
Blunt	Higgins	Pence
Boswell	Hill	Pomeroy
Brown (SC)	Hoekstra	Reyes
Buchanan	Issa	Rodriguez
Burgess	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (KY)
Buyer	Jones	Rohrabacher
Calvert	Kagen	Ros-Lehtinen
Campbell	Kaptur	Roskam
Cao	Kilpatrick (MI)	Ryan (WI)
Carter	Kirk	Schock
Chaffetz	LaTourette	Shimkus
Childers	Linder	Sires
Clay	Loeb sack	Smith (WA)
Costello	Lofgren, Zoe	Speier
Davis (AL)	Luján	Terry
Deal (GA)	Maloney	Thompson (CA)
DeFazio	Marchant	Walden
Delahunt	Marshall	Wamp
Diaz-Balart, L.	Miller, Gary	Woolsey
Diaz-Balart, M.	Moore (WI)	Young (FL)
Flake	Moran (KS)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1126

Mr. MANZULLO changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. HELLER. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 111, had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 111, had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, on Friday, March 12, 2010, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 111. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 4506, the Bankruptcy Judgeship Act of 2010, which will authorize the appointment of additional bankruptcy judges into the courts.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I was unable to attend several votes today. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on final passage of H.R. 3650 and “aye” on final passage of H.R. 4506.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, on March 12, 2010, I was unavoidably unable to cast my votes for rollcall 109, rollcall 110 and rollcall 111. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, yesterday, I debated the impeachment resolution, H. Res. 1031, but I was delayed in a health care discussion and meeting, which caused me to miss rollcall vote 102 of article I of H. Res. 1031, the impeachment resolution. I ask unanimous consent to place my vote in the RECORD. If I were present, I would have voted “aye.” I ask it to be placed in the RECORD in the appropriate place.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.R. 562

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the first sponsor of H.R. 562, a bill originally introduced by Representative Neil Abercrombie of Hawaii, for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.R. 3333

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the first sponsor of H.R. 3333, a bill originally introduced by Representative Neil Abercrombie of Hawaii, for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. CANTOR. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland, the majority leader, for the purposes of announcing next week’s schedule.

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend, the Republican whip, for yielding.

Madam Speaker, on Monday the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning-hour debate and at 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Tuesday the House will meet at 10:30 a.m. for morning-hour debate and 12 p.m. for legislative business. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business. On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business.

We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules, including a number of bills focused on improving government operations: the Plain Language Act, H.R. 946, by Representative BRALEY; H.R. 4720, Taking Responsibility for Congressional Pay Act, by Representative KIRKPATRICK of Arizona. A complete list of suspension bills will be announced by the close of business today, as is the custom.

In addition, we will consider further action on H.R. 1586, the FAA Air Transportation Modernization and Safety Improvement Act. Further action on the jobs agenda is possible, and further action on health care legislation is also possible.

□ 1130

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, I think it has been well reported that the majority plans to try to use the reconciliation process to ram a health care bill through this House and the one across the Capitol, and we also know from the reports that it is imperative that this House and the House majority and members of the majority must first pass the Senate’s health care bill before any other action on a reconciliation measure is taken. The gentleman has announced, Madam Speaker, that all this will take place next week.

I wonder if the gentleman could give us a little bit more clarity as to the schedule and perhaps the need for Members to keep their schedules flexible through the weekend.

Mr. HOYER. First, let me say that no matter how often the gentleman and his colleagues want to say so, that we are going to “ram through” something, no matter how many times the press and public may be misled by that assertion, we are not ramming through anything, I tell my friend.

We are following the rules of the House and following the rules of the Senate that have been decades in existence, which, when they have been used, 72 percent of the time they have been used, 72 percent of the time they have been used, I tell my friend, your party used them. They are the rules, and we are going to follow the rules.

Both bills that are pending before the Congress of the United States have been passed with a majority, and, in fact, the Senate bill was passed by a 60 percent majority, I tell my friend, not rammed through, after a full year of debate and discussion, scores of hearings, hundreds of witnesses, and thousands of hours of consideration.

I tell my friend that you can say we are ramming something through as much as you want and it will not make it true, no matter how often it is said by your side of the aisle, who, in my opinion, wants simply to stop the legislation in its tracks.

I tell my friend that we are going to be in the regular order, as we have been on these bills since they were introduced. We are going to be in the regular order in terms of considering the passage of bills that have received majorities in both Houses. As I say again, the Senate bill has received a 60 percent majority in its House.

Now, the American public, frankly, I expect when we vote on bills, they expect things to pass by majority vote. They do here. They unfortunately don't in the other body. So you can have 59 percent, as we had in the House, to give children health care, and children don't get health care.

So I say to my friend, as I said, the expectation is we will consider passing health care legislation this coming week. We think it is long overdue. We expect the Budget Committee to mark up a reconciliation bill, as the committee did when the Republicans were in charge on 16 occasions out of the 22 that reconciliation has been used, 72 percent of the time, as I want to reiterate; because I, frankly, get a little impatient with this assertion that somehow a process that you utilized 72 percent of the times it has been utilized, which means we used it 28 percent, that somehow now when we are using it, it is somehow now not consistent with the rules. My friend knows it is consistent with the rules, and we are pursuing that process.

The committee, I expect, will mark up on Monday. I expect thereafter the Rules Committee to meet, as is con-

sistent with the rules, to prepare a reconciliation bill and to report it to this floor. I expect them to report a rule to consider that reconciliation bill, and I expect that reconciliation bill to be considered.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, all I asked was whether the Members should be prepared to be here over the weekend.

Mr. HOYER. No, you said a number of things before that which I was responding to. But, yes, Members should prepare to be here next weekend.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, without having to delve back into the debate on what makes this health care bill different than the other times reconciliation was used, I think the American people are those that see the obvious.

But I would ask the gentleman, since he says we will be employing regular order here in response to the President's request that there be an up-or-down vote in this House, could the gentleman give us some enlightenment as to the suggestion surrounding something called the “Slaughter solution” and whether, in fact, Members can have an up-or-down vote, clean up-or-down vote on this bill, or whether there will be some procedural maneuvering, self-executing rule deeming the Senate bill passed? If he could give us some indication of what we may be able to expect next week.

Mr. HOYER. Of course, as the gentleman knows, the gentleman's party has used that process as well, as I am sure the gentleman knows. But, in any event, we will follow the rules. We will have a vote on the rule, consistent with the rules.

I have not talked to the chairwoman of the Rules Committee at this point in time, so that I cannot give you a specific response and have not heard—this is the first I have heard something referred to in the terms you have just referred to it as. But we will provide for a rule for consideration of the Senate bill for reconciliation, and the process of doing so will be consistent with the rules.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, I would like to ask again, consistent with the President's request that there be an up-or-down vote on the Senate bill itself, can we expect an up-or-down vote on the Senate bill itself?

Mr. HOYER. What the President was referring to, of course, in terms of an up-or-down vote, was a majority vote. One of the problems we have had in the Senate, as the gentleman knows and experienced as well when his party was in the majority, it is difficult to get an up-or-down vote when the majority of the Senate is for something. They have to get an extraordinary majority, some 60 votes, before they can bring a bill to the floor.

That process, obviously, thwarts, does not facilitate, a vote by the majority. In fact, a minority in the Senate on a regular basis thwarts the will

of the majority. That is what the President was referring to, that he wanted an up-or-down vote on that, and I expect we are going to get an up-or-down vote in the Senate. Why? Because in the Senate they have rules that we are going to follow, as you did in 16 out of the 22 times, that allow for an up-or-down majority vote in the United States Senate.

We have to have, as you know, a majority vote in the House, and we consistently do have measures that can fail or succeed, depending upon the will of the majority, as opposed to the thwarting by the minority.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, I know the gentleman would like to speak to the Senate. We are trying to focus on the House here and what the vote will look like. Since the gentleman has indicated that the President and he and all of America would like to see a vote up or down in this House as well, I would ask the gentleman whether we can expect an up-or-down vote on the health care bill itself or not.

Mr. HOYER. I tell the gentleman that nothing will pass here without a majority vote.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

I take that to mean that there is a likelihood that we will not see an up-or-down vote on the Senate bill itself and that perhaps these reports of a concept called the Slaughter solution in which the majority will deem it passed, the Senate bill, in some type of procedural move, that maybe the public can expect that to happen. I know that the gentleman does not think that that represents the kind of vote that the American people expect, but I take that to mean that that certainly is a possibility.

Madam Speaker, I would ask the gentleman whether he expects the House to have 72 hours to review whatever legislation comes to the floor next week.

Mr. HOYER. I expect the House to have very significant time to consider the proposals that come out of the Budget Committee and/or the Rules Committee. And this bill, of course, either bill, the House bill or the Senate bill, as proposed, have been online for some 2½ months, otherwise known as about 75 days. So there has been ample time to review the bill, whether it is the Senate bill or the House bill. So my friend is, I am sure, well aware of what is in the Senate bill and what is in the House bill.

In addition to that, the President put online his proposed compromises between the Senate and the House, which have been the subject of great discussion, including the bipartisan meeting that the gentleman and I attended at the White House, an extraordinary, historical meeting at which the President invited leaders from both parties and both Houses to come and discuss what he believed to be a historic opportunity to provide health care accessibility to all Americans.

So I say to my friend that we will certainly give as much notice as possible, but I am not going to say that 72 hours is going to be the litmus test, *per se*, because that which we have voted on already in the House and the Senate have given Members months of notice and the American public months of notice on the substance of the propositions that are pending before us.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Again, I am a little bit taken aback that now the 72-hour rule has been completely cast aside, since no one in this House has had an opportunity to see what is in the reconciliation bill, at least I speak for the Members on our side of the aisle that have not had an opportunity to see what is in the reconciliation bill, and I imagine would have some of the provisions that the President in his plan, not the legislation, put up online prior to the Blair House meeting.

Again, it is rather disturbing, Madam Speaker, that the 72-hour rule has now been completely cast aside.

Mr. HOYER. First of all, the 72-hour rule, I didn't say that we were casting aside any rule, nor did I say that we may not have more than 72 hours' notice. You may well have more than 72 hours' notice. What I said to you was I am not going to commit myself and then have 70 hours as opposed to 72 hours and think that I have violated some representation that I made. We want to give as much notice as we possibly can.

This has been a very difficult discussion, as you know, and as you well know, the Members on your side of the aisle in the other body have indicated they are going to do everything in their power to stop the passage of this legislation. So we need to get about this business and engage, if you will.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

I guess the gentleman may begin to understand why it is some on our side of the aisle, including yours truly, depict this as ramming the bill through. I mean, if we can't even get a commitment from the gentleman, as well as the Speaker had indicated prior, that we would have 72 hours to review any piece of legislation that comes to the floor, I think that that is consistent with the depiction that perhaps there is a ramming through going on.

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman has had 72 days, I tell the gentleman, to review the bill that he refers to—72 days, not 72 hours—72 days in final form to review the bill.

Now, you can keep saying this. You can keep telling the American public that somehow we are ramming something through. You have had, I tell the gentleman, and you know you have had, 72 days, at least, to review the bill as it stands today.

Mr. CANTOR. Madam Speaker, I tell the gentleman again, we are expecting, as he said, to see a new bill, a reconciliation bill on the floor next week. That bill, no one on our side of the aisle has had an opportunity to see. Perhaps the

Congressional Budget Office has had 72 hours to see it, but we haven't. No one, I believe, has had 72 hours in this body to see the reconciliation bill. That is the bill that I am speaking to.

□ 1145

Mr. HOYER. Let me repeat the process that I'm sure the gentleman knows well. The Budget Committee will meet. They will report out the bills that are to be reconciled. The Rules Committee will then take them under consideration shortly thereafter and will present a reconciliation bill. We will all see it at that point in time. It will obviously do exactly what the instructions that we adopted in the budget a year ago instructed it to do, and that is to reconcile these bills.

And it will have a fiscally positive effect, in my view. I haven't seen it yet finally, but my expectation is it will have a positive fiscal impact, and we will all see that. But it will be simply following the instructions that the Budget Committee in the budget passed. I don't think the gentleman voted for it; but, nevertheless, the majority of the House did vote for it.

I know that the other body doesn't like majority will. Maybe that is not the case here. But I will tell the gentleman that, yes, he is going to see the reconciliation bill. And as I said, the reconciliation bill, which will be drafted by the Rules Committee after the Budget Committee reports to it, the process that you followed on a regular basis when you utilized reconciliation. We will hope to have as much notice of that particular piece of legislation as possible.

But I tell my friend, again, when he refers to the health care bill, the Senate bill or the House bill, you have had months to review the substance of that bill. You don't like it. We understand it. You're going to oppose it. We understand that as well. But the fact of the matter is you cannot say that you have not had notice of each and every one of its provisions for over 2 months.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman, Madam Speaker.

And, again, it seems as if we are not going to get an up-or-down vote on the Senate bill in the House, but we will be voting on a reconciliation measure. And the instructions that were included in the budget bill are not legislative text. That is my point, Madam Speaker.

But since we are not going to, since we cannot be guaranteed a 72-hour period for review, Madam Speaker, nor can the American people realize their right to know during the 72-hour period, I would ask the gentleman whether the reconciliation package will contain the House language referred to as the Stupak-Pitts language.

I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I don't have knowledge of that at this point in time; so I can't give my friend a definitive answer. But as my friend does know, that language, or any other alternative language, may not qualify for reconciliation.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

I would just like to, Madam Speaker, read a recently reported statement by the gentleman in which he said, it is clear that the matter of abortion cannot be dealt with *per se* in the reconciliation bill; so we are pretty much going to have to deal with it as is at this point in time.

I ask the gentleman if that is a correct translation of his remarks today.

I yield.

Mr. HOYER. It wasn't a translation. It was an accurate reporting of what I said.

Mr. CANTOR. So, Madam Speaker, I would take that to mean the Stupak-Pitts language will not be in the reconciliation package.

Mr. HOYER. As I said, we don't believe that any change in that language—because the gentleman is well aware reconciliation needs to deal with budgetary impact—we don't believe that can be dealt within reconciliation.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

I would say to the gentleman that I'm sure he has seen a letter that has been signed by 41 Senate Republicans in which they indicated they would oppose any effort to waive the so-called Byrd rule during the Senate's consideration of the reconciliation bill, which means to me, Madam Speaker, it is far from certain that the Senate will actually pass the bill when the House sends it to the Senate. And, in fact, I would just call that to the gentleman's attention that we stand ready to continue to work in another direction, but it seems to me very much in doubt with this bill.

Mr. HOYER. Will my friend yield on that issue?

Mr. CANTOR. I will yield.

Mr. HOYER. That is an interesting letter. I'm glad you brought it up, because you brought it up in juxtaposition to the issue of the Stupak amendment. What the letter essentially said is, even if you send over the Stupak language and we agree with the Stupak language, we will not waive the Byrd rule.

So even though they agree with the policy, they won't waive the Byrd rule. Why? They want to defeat the bill. We understand that. That is what that letter said. And I think Americans probably, if they knew enough about the process and could take the time to do what you and I do to follow this very closely, they know what is going on.

And, very frankly, it is ironic that 41 Senators will say, notwithstanding the fact that they may agree with the proposition that we put in the bill and sent over to them, that they would not waive the rule to adopt the proposition with which they agree for procedural purposes of defeating the bill.

Mr. CANTOR. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I would indicate that in that letter there is no specific language that directly relates to an abortion provision or any other. And the gentleman I know agrees that this country has had

a longstanding tradition of denying government funding for abortion services. That is the very important issue behind the Stupak-Pitts language. In fact, 45 Senators voted in favor of that language, just as a majority of this House voted for that language. That is why it is so important, I think, that the Members, as well their constituents, understand that you will not be including the Stupak-Pitts language with the protection that will guarantee no government funding goes toward abortion services, which is why I bring the point up, Madam Speaker.

Mr. HOYER. As the gentleman knows, the language in the Senate bill specifically provides for no government funding. I know there is a dispute because there is a contribution towards policies. But, as you know, the Senate drew language very carefully to ensure that no public funds were spent for or participated in purchasing insurance for abortion services.

In fact, as the gentleman, I'm sure, well knows, the Senate language specifically provides that if those protections are going to be purchased, they must be purchased by separate payment with none, either subsidy dollars or government dollars, that they must be spent out of an individual's personal pocket.

Mr. CANTOR. Madam Speaker, I say to the gentleman, if that is his interpretation and belief that this language in the Senate bill protects that longstanding tradition, that may be. However, the U.S. Catholic Bishops as well as Right to Life have strongly, strongly opposed the language in the Senate bill as not having the adequate safeguards to deny government funding of abortion services.

I yield.

Mr. HOYER. This is an extraordinarily difficult issue not only for the Congress but for Americans generally and for individuals. There is a dispute on this language, he is correct. As he knows, neither side likes the language in the Senate bill. One side, the pro-choice side if you will, for simplification, believes that the language goes beyond the Hyde language. The Catholic bishops believe it is short of the Hyde language. There is a difference of opinion on that. I think the gentleman understands that well. There are other groups which believe that, in fact, the language that is in the Senate bill does, in fact, as I have projected it does, preclude any public dollars from being spent, which is consistent with the Hyde language.

I tell my friend that from our perspective on this side of the aisle, there is no intent nor objective of changing the Hyde language in any health care legislation that is adopted. The President has indicated that is his intent. That is our intent. And that is why we are proceeding in the manner we are.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman for his clarification of his intent. I would just say again the Catholic bishops, as well as the right-to-life or-

ganizations, stand very much in opposition to this language. I stand with them.

I would say to the gentleman, Madam Speaker, that the Parliamentarian in the Senate has ruled that the Senate cannot take up the reconciliation package until the Senate-passed health care bill is signed into law. That is the bill, Madam Speaker, that contains provisions such as the Cornhusker kickback. And I would ask the gentleman if it is his position that that would be the case that this House must pass the Senate bill first, it must be signed into law before the Senate can even take up the reconciliation package.

I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I think the gentleman correctly states the Senate Parliamentarian's position, and therefore I think the gentleman is correct on that observation. I might say to him, while I do not know the entire thrust of the reconciliation bill, I can guarantee him this: The reconciliation bill will take out that Nebraska provision which offended him, offended me, and I think offended people across America, not because it advantaged Nebraska, but because it advantaged Nebraska unequally.

I think the gentleman is going to be pleased that Nebraska will be treated like every other State; and, in fact, every other State will be advantaged to the same extent that the Senator wanted to make sure that Nebraska was advantaged. But the Nebraska provision to which the gentleman speaks, and which all of us have felt was inappropriate, will be changed.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

In closing, Madam Speaker, I look forward to working with the gentleman in trying to refocus the issue of this House on getting Americans back to work. And the gentleman did indicate that there will be further action in what he is calling a "jobs agenda." Certainly that didn't happen today, as we are here already having finished the legislative business of the day and only having considered a bill dealing with algae.

I only mention this because 52 percent of Americans do think that jobs and the economy are the Nation's top issue; and, by contrast, only 13 percent of Americans think that health care is our Nation's top priority. This was according to a CBS-New York Times poll.

So I do thank the gentleman for his willingness, hopefully, to get back to the question of how we get America back to work.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANTOR. I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First of all, let me say to the gentleman from Virginia that Maryland and Virginia and a lot of other States think the bill we passed through this House on algae is critically important to the health of the Chesapeake Bay.

I'm sure the gentleman shares that view with me, a critically important bill for the health of our bay and its estuaries. I happen to live on a river, the Patuxent River, and the gentleman's State feels the Chesapeake Bay is a major asset of his, as well and of his State. So I know that he is pleased that we passed that bill. It was an important bill.

We are here trying to make sure that we have the time to get ready to pass a major historic piece of legislation that Teddy Roosevelt set us on the path to accomplish over a century ago so that we have accomplished, I think, a significant piece of legislation today.

Let me say that in addition to that, we believe the jobs agenda is very important. We passed a bill through here last week. The Senate passed a bill over to us. We are in the process of considering those bills. And I want to say to the gentleman that I share his view, that we look forward to working together to try to get Americans back to work.

I won't go through the litany of how we got here. The gentleman has heard it before. But I will tell the gentleman this part of it, that in 4 months of the last administration, as he well knows, we lost over 700,000 jobs per month. During the last 4 months here, we have lost 27,000 jobs per month. That is a 95 percent reduction in the loss of jobs. Surely anybody who is fair-minded will say that is progress. It is not success. We need to create jobs. We have lost 8 million jobs over the last 2 years.

People are hurting in America. Families are hurting in America. We need to get people back to work. We are going to keep continuing to make sure that when they can't find a job because they are not available that they don't go hungry, that they can support themselves and their families, not to the level that they would if they were working, but certainly support themselves in a way that we think is humanitarian. So those are included in those bills, as the gentleman knows.

I will tell the gentleman that we feel keenly the pain of the American public confronting this historic great recession, the deepest recession that we have seen in 75 years. The gentleman knows that in the decade of the 1990s, we saw the best economy that you and I have seen in our lifetime, and I, of course, am very substantially older than you are. That is an admission against interest, but it nevertheless is true. So I will yield back to the gentleman saying we share your view. We want to continue to work on this jobs agenda.

□ 1200

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman for his view of history. I also would like to say to the gentleman, Madam Speaker, I share his commitment to the preservation of the Chesapeake Bay. I do, however, think that the American people are most interested in seeing us get back to the business of focusing on the economy. That is why I

raised the issue of our being here today, not doing anything today to promote job creation.

And as far as any quarrel we may have with history as to why we got or how we got to where we are today, I would just like to quote to the gentleman in closing Winston Churchill's speech to the House of Commons June 18, 1940. And he said, "Of this I'm quite sure, that if we open a quarrel between the past and the present, we shall find that we have lost the future."

And with that, Madam Speaker, I yield back.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MARCH 15, 2010

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning-hour debate.

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

There was no objection.

VIRTUAL COLONOSCOPIES AND MEDICARE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, the President just had a physical and is apparently very healthy. Among the tests he had was a virtual colonoscopy to screen for colorectal cancer. A virtual colonoscopy employs x ray technology that produces a three-dimensional image of the entire colorectal structure. However, it is much less invasive and does not require sedation that is often needed for a standard colonoscopy.

I bring this up because the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services have denied coverage of this procedure for seniors enrolled in Medicare. Colorectal cancer is the third most diagnosed cancer among men and women in the United States and the second leading cause of cancer death, despite having a 90 percent cure rate when detected early. Many insurers like Anthem Blue Cross-Blue Shield and CIGNA cover this virtual procedure but not Medicare.

The National Cancer Institute Colorectal Cancer Progress Review Group predicts that the minimal invasiveness and lower cost of this procedure could attract more people to be screened, with the possibility of saving 20,000 lives annually. The President has set an example. The American Cancer Society recommends it. Medicare should cover it as a provided procedure.

RESPECT FOR OUR DIPLOMATIC GUESTS

(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. Madam Speaker, I have served on the Homeland Security Committee, tragically, since the occurrences of 9/11, and I want to congratulate this Nation for moving toward securing its people in a way that balances civil liberties and as well recognizes our responsibilities.

As the chairwoman of the Transportation Security Committee, I want to acknowledge that in looking at how we treat our guests that come from other countries, we should always continue to review those circumstances. Just a few days ago, our guests from Pakistan, Pakistani parliamentarians, were traveling through our airport and were detained and asked a number of questions even though they were traveling with State Department escorts, as we understand it. I believe it is important to always remain secure but to remain balanced as well. I think it is appropriate that we look again at our procedures to ensure that our international diplomatic guests receive the kind of responsible treatment that is appropriate. We thank those who serve us on the front lines, but I will be looking forward to a full report by the Department of Homeland Security, and I offer to those dignitaries our respect because we do believe in international diplomacy.

HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. TURNER. Madam Speaker, it is irresponsible for Congress to continue debating an increasingly unpopular and costly health care bill at a time of record-breaking deficits and uncertainty about our economy. We should be focusing on reducing spending and creating jobs. In Tuesday's New York Times, columnist David Brooks editorialized that the majority's "passion for coverage has swamped their . . . commitment to reducing the debt. The result is a bill that is fundamentally imbalanced." Brooks wrote that "they've stuffed the legislation with gimmicks and dodges designed to get a good score from the Congressional Budget Office but that don't genuinely control runaway spending." He points out that the bill appears deficit-neutral because it immediately collects revenues but doesn't pay for benefits until 2014. It also doesn't include \$300 billion in additional costs because it assumes Congress will cut Medicare reimbursements by 21 percent.

Unfortunately, this proposed government takeover of health care has blocked the path to reasonable reform. We can and must work together on a bipartisan basis to achieve real reform that will bring down costs and increase access for all Americans without increasing the national debt.

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.

HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Speaker, if I might, we heard just a moment ago from one of our esteemed colleagues from the Republican side that there were no savings in the health care bill. In fact, there are substantial savings, at least according to the Congressional Budget Office, and over time, the American deficit would be substantially reduced. Let me just tell you some of the reasons why. First of all, by extending coverage to most all Americans, you eliminate one of the most pernicious and most difficult cost increases in the system, and that is that the uninsured wind up in the emergency room, usually very, very sick, and that gets to be a very, very expensive matter. That cost is in the system and is passed on to both the Federal Government as well as to those people that are buying private insurance.

Also there is a major effort in the legislation to extend the medical technology information systems. We know that that will reduce errors and omissions, and create not only better care but reduced cost. We know that the system will also have a Medicare panel look at ways of reducing the costs in the Medicare system. Finally, there are programs in the system and in the legislation to promote wellness. Healthy people are not expensive. If you are well, you are not going to be increasing the cost of the systems. There are many, many parts of this bill that will significantly reduce the cost, and therefore, this is a good piece of legislation.

Finally, I want to speak to one of the issues that our Republican colleagues constantly put before us as a way of reducing costs, and this is the ability of the insurance companies to sell products across State lines. Now, I was the insurance commissioner in California for 8 years, 1991 to 1995 and again from 2003 to 2007. During that period of time, we had insurance companies that were not licensed for business in California, selling products illegally in the State of California. There was a reason why we had a procedure to make sure that insurance companies that were selling health insurance in California were licensed. We wanted to know that they were legitimate companies, that they actually would have the financial strength to pay claims, that their policy actually provided benefits, and that they were able to carry out the contract that they had made with people.

All too often, we found that companies that were selling policies illegally in California without the proper license were selling junk to the public.

I remember a case in San Diego, a woman who was working, a lawyer, had lost her employment with a law firm. She went out and purchased an individual policy. It was cheap. It was actually too good to believe. She got sick, and she wound up with an enormous expenditure, and she had to actually file bankruptcy in order to cover that cost.

So we know that if companies are simply selling across State lines without the proper underlying strength and without the proper regulation, it will not solve the problem. In fact, it will create a whole set of other problems. That is not the solution. What we need is a national program and, in fact, we have such a program in the proposal that will hopefully be before us next week. That proposal establishes a national benefit program. It establishes a mechanism for the pooling of risk and pooling of companies in what are called exchanges, either State, regional exchanges, or a national exchange. That is a procedure that is in the bill and does provide the kind of protections that every consumer needs and also provides some competition. Because one of those companies that will be operating in the exchange—at least the national exchange—will be a nonprofit company that will have a national reach and be able to have the actuarial strength of being able to spread the risk across the entire Nation and all parts of it.

So I'm looking forward to next week. It's going to be a terrific week. We will finally deal with something that the Nation has wrestled with for a century, and that is how to expand health insurance to the entire population. We're well on the road.

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

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

CONGRATULATING DETROIT CATHOLIC CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL

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

Mr. MCCOTTER. Madam Speaker, today I rise to acknowledge the Division I State Champion wrestling team from my alma mater, Detroit Catholic Central High School. On February 27, 2007, the Catholic Central Shamrocks defeated Rockford 39-24 to hoist their first State championship trophy since 1988. Third-year Head Coach Mitch Hancock, an individual State final winner for the Shamrocks in 2000, saw all 14 of his wrestlers earn a berth to the

Individual State Finals. This is the first time in recent Division I history that an entire team has qualified for the Individual State meet. Three Shamrock grapplers brought home State titles to complement the team championship. Following in the remarkable tradition of legendary Catholic Central Coach Mike Rodriguez, who was both coach and mentor to current coach Mitch Hancock, the Shamrocks brought home their eighth State wrestling team title and earned Coach Hancock the Division I honors for Wrestling Coach of the Year.

Madam Speaker, with a season record of 27-4, the 2010 Catholic Central Shamrocks deserve to be recognized for their determination, achievement, and spirit, and we are all very proud of their determination and effort.

Equally, Madam Speaker, I also rise today to acknowledge the Division I State Championship bowling team from my alma mater, Detroit Catholic Central High School. This has been a noteworthy year for the gentlemen at Catholic Central, as the championship marks the fourth State title for the school during the 2009-2010 year. The Michigan High School Athletic Association recognized bowling as an official sport in 2006. Thus, it is impressive how the Catholic Central team has risen to State prominence in a very short time.

Two members of the State championship bowling team qualified for the individual finals, and although they did not ultimately win, they represented C.C. High admirably and honorably. This year, after defeating Salem 1,856-1,824 pins in the quarterfinals, the Shamrock bowlers outdueled Flint Carman-Ainsworth 1,855-1,747 to earn a berth in the finals, setting them up to take on Macomb Dakota. On March 5, 2010, the Catholic Central Shamrocks rolled over Macomb Dakota 1,834-1,565 to earn their first State championship trophy.

□ 1215

Coach Al Bridges saw his bowlers in seventh place after the morning qualifying round, yet in true Shamrock fashion the team kept fighting and refused to give up. As the day wore on, CC kept moving up in the standings, leading by 143 pins after the Baker games. From that point on, the Shamrocks never looked back.

Coach Al Bridges credits good conditioning and a lot of practice for the payoff of winning a championship. In earning their first bowling title, the 2010 Catholic Central Shamrocks deserve to be recognized for their determination, achievement, and spirit.

In conclusion, Madam Speaker, the hard work and dedication of each of these State championship teams epitomizes what it means to be a Shamrock. By the teaching of our Basilian fathers, through goodness, discipline, and knowledge, the entire Catholic Central family, including this alumnus, share in their accomplishments.

In recognition of their effort, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Detroit Catholic Central Shamrocks for achieving these State titles and for honoring their devotion to Mary, alma mater. Live and die for CC High.

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

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. JONES 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 Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

NUCLEAR WASTE

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to discuss an issue that I think very few people in America are aware of. It relates to the very important topic of nuclear waste and the impact that that has upon our Federal policy and its effect on our energy needs and our Federal debt.

Most Americans support nuclear power as a major source of our electricity. Today it provides 20 percent of all the electricity produced in America. Now, we know that over the next 15 or 20 years our demand for electricity is going to double what it is today. I might also remind everyone that coal is providing 51 percent of all the electricity produced in America. As I said, nuclear power provides about 20 percent.

The administration and many people are focused on alternative forms of energy, particularly solar and wind power. Now, all of the experts will tell you that while, yes, some energy can be produced from solar and wind power, it will never come close to meeting the demands of the American people in energy.

I might add on the nuclear power front, today in America we have 109 nuclear power plants located in 39 States across the country. At each one of those sites nuclear waste is being stored today. It does have a major impact on our environment, it has major concerns for security, and it has major costs for the American people.

The solution that Congress came up with many years ago was to build Yucca Mountain as a deep repository to store this waste indefinitely. Now, unfortunately last week President Obama withdrew the license application for a high-level nuclear waste repository at Yucca Mountain. This application was before the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to look at from a scientific standpoint of could this repository at Yucca Mountain safely take care of this waste for the American people for hundreds of years in the future? And I might also add that the American taxpayer has already spent billions of dollars trying to build this repository at Yucca Mountain.

Well, not only did President Obama jerk back the application so that it cannot be considered anymore, but now the Department of Energy is asking the Appropriations Committee for approval to reprogram all of the money that was going to Yucca Mountain in 2010, which in essence would stop all movement in the development of Yucca Mountain and the solution for storage of this high-level waste.

So the question that I would have for President Obama and his administration today is this. Very simply, what are we going to do with all of the waste currently being stored at the 109 nuclear sites around the Nation? Now, the President has appointed a blue panel commission to come up with a solution to this problem. As I said, we have already spent billions of dollars on Yucca Mountain. In fact, in the very near future it was getting ready to open.

Why is it important as to what are we going to do with this nuclear waste that is stored at these 109 sites around the country? It is important for this reason. Number one, in 1982 Congress passed the Nuclear Policy Waste Act. It in essence said that the Federal Government was going to be responsible for taking care of this. Well, as a result of the policies we have adopted so far today, here is our situation. The utility companies who are now depending upon the Federal Government to store this waste for them are now filing lawsuits against the Federal Government, and have already obtained judgments in excess of \$11 billion against the Federal Government. Experts are saying that additional lawsuits will cost the Federal Government \$56 billion.

I want to raise this issue with the American people and make them aware that this decision on Yucca Mountain not only is a security issue for America, but it also is a costly decision for the American taxpayer at a time when we already have a Federal debt of \$14 trillion.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss a very important topic facing our nation—Nuclear Waste and the impact our Federal Policy on this issue will have on our energy needs and our Federal Debt.

I support nuclear power as a major source of electricity for our nation, which currently accounts for twenty percent of our electricity supply.

In Kentucky, we do not have any nuclear power although some of my District receives electricity from the Tennessee Valley Authority, which does have nuclear power plants. Of course, Kentucky is not uninvolved with nuclear power because in Paducah, Kentucky the gaseous diffusion plant enriches all the uranium for reactors around the nation.

Today, we have 109 nuclear power plants in the United States in 39 states across the country. At each one of these sites, nuclear waste is being stored that creates a major environmental security and economic challenge for our nation.

Mr. Speaker, the solution that was being proposed was to build Yucca Mountain as a deep repository to store the waste indefinitely. However, last week President Obama withdrew the license application for a high-level nuclear waste repository at Yucca Mountain with prejudice.

Additionally, the Department of Energy asked the Appropriations Committee for approval to reprogram the money from the project for Fiscal Year 2010, essentially stopping all movement on the project.

I might also add that there was an article in Energy Daily today where the former chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission said the Obama Administration's decision to terminate the Yucca Mountain nuclear waste repository does not appear to be based on "factual findings" and its "unfortunate" handling of the issue will delay resolution of the nation's nuclear waste disposal problems for years.

Some have said that President Obama is pushing forward with Nuclear Power because of the loan guarantee money he has proposed for building nuclear plants.

My question to the President is—What do we do with all the waste currently being stored at the 109 nuclear sites around the nation? This blue label commission the President has created is going to take years to develop a process and a path forward, when we've already spent billions of dollars and many years developing a state of the art facility that could accept waste in the next few years.

Because the government's plan was to take care of the material after the Yucca Mountain facility was completed, the utility companies paid the federal government to care for this waste, but as a result of the government's failure to take the waste, the utilities have recently been filing lawsuits against the government to recoup costs associated with having to store the waste at their own plant sites.

Additionally, two attorney generals—Washington State and North Carolina—have filed lawsuits against the federal government.

A number of court cases have ruled that the Department of Energy is liable for the cost of keeping the waste because of a breach of contract. How much is at stake is anyone's guess, but the industry has put the number as high as \$56 billion.

Nuclear power is essential to our energy portfolio, which at this point in time is very important to Americans. We simply cannot afford to do without nuclear power.

I urge the House of Representatives to tell President Obama to stop playing politics with our nation's energy future and finish Yucca Mountain to ensure that Nuclear Power continues to create jobs and provide electricity.

TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSMAN JACK MURTHA

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a fallen hero, my friend, the late Congressman John Murtha. During the time of his memorial services and the special order hour that was rendered on this floor, my statements were not able to be submitted because I wanted to speak directly on the floor in his honor.

John Murtha was of course a husband, a father, a loved one, a Marine, and a patriot. What we loved most about John Murtha was his love for the United States military, unwavering and always steadfast. He was a family man that loved his family, and a Congressperson that loved his people. Those he represented were so very important in his mind and in his heart.

He came to this floor and to this House tall and recently from battle, having served in the Vietnam war on several occasions, knowing what it is to have been shot at and to be in battle on behalf of your Nation. That true lesson gave him a cause for life, and the cause for life was to be able to fight for the men and women of the United States military.

But he did not stop there. As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense on the Appropriations Committee, he fought for the families of the United States military, the wives and husbands and the children. He fought for a better quality of life in health care and housing. He fought for better standards, if you will. And yes, he recognized the importance of leave time, R & R coming out of battle. And there was no greater champion during the midst of the Iraq war, the most recent war, who fought to give relief to the soldiers on the battlefield who were doing tours of duty one after another.

He was a man of courage. He didn't step away from a fight. But he also was a friend. And if he gave you his word, he would fight on behalf of your constituents as he would fight on behalf of his. In fact, Mr. Speaker, he was an American's American, all-American. And if it had something to do with bettering the lives of Americans, you can be assured John Murtha was there.

He took a very tough stand just a few years ago. The eyes of those who knew him as a champion of the military fighting for their cause, standing alongside of them, wondered what happened when he stood up with his eloquent voice, steady voice, and spoke about the Iraq war, calling for the soldiers to come home. That is courage,

because he had been a supporter of that war. But he saw it crumbling before his eyes.

Oh, yes, there has been an election over the last couple of days, but we always wonder what direction and how we could have handled it differently so that the lives that were laid down did not have to be laid down in a war in Iraq. The champion for the military saw that there was a crack in the system, and he chose to speak eloquently about it.

I miss John Murtha. This body misses John Murtha, Democrats and Republicans. America misses John Murtha. But the one good news about John Murtha's life is that his legacy will live on forever and ever and ever. I thank him for serving, for living. And to his family, God bless you, and may he rest in peace.

Mr. Speaker, I will submit a statement into the RECORD next week that will also speak to the qualities and the honor of John Murtha, the late Congressman from Pennsylvania.

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.)

YUCCA MOUNTAIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. BERKLEY. I was in the doctor's office a moment ago, and I had the opportunity to be watching C-SPAN and listen to what the gentleman from Kentucky said about Yucca Mountain. I just thought I better come down here and set the record straight, because obviously my esteemed colleague from Kentucky doesn't know the Yucca Mountain issue very well. So with this 5 minutes I would like to help enlighten him and the rest of my colleagues.

The State of Nevada is opposed to storing this Nation's nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain, Nevada. President Obama pulled the plug because, and only because there is no scientific evidence, and there never has been, that Yucca Mountain can safely store thousands and thousands of tons of toxic radioactive nuclear waste within the Yucca Mountain complex. And let me tell you why, Mr. Speaker.

At Yucca Mountain we have discovered there are groundwater issues, seismic activity, volcanic activity. To refresh everybody's memory, the EPA, Environmental Protection Agency, had a radiation standard of 10,000 years, where they wanted to be able to safely store this Nation's nuclear waste, thousands and thousands of tons of radioactive material, for 10,000 years.

□ 1230

The U.S. Court of Appeals overthrew that radiation standard, and let me

share with you why: Because they determined, based on scientific evidence, that the radiation standard should be 300,000 years because that is when radiation reaches its peak. So the 10,000-year radiation standard was thrown out by the U.S. Court of Appeals, and they could never figure out how to come up with a radiation standard that tracks with the scientific evidence.

There is no way to safely transport radioactive nuclear waste across 43 States in order to be buried in a hole in the Nevada desert where, I remind you, we have groundwater problems, seismic activity, and volcanic activity. There are no canisters that currently exist—they do not exist—that can safely transport and store nuclear waste; not in Yucca Mountain, not anywhere.

We had better figure out as a Nation, before we start building more nuclear power plants that create more nuclear waste, what we are going to do with the by-product of nuclear energy, which is the nuclear waste.

This country has been single focused, and the people of Nevada have said year after year, decade after decade, we are not the answer. We don't want to be this Nation's garbage dump for this Nation's nuclear waste.

We do not produce one nanogram, not one speck of energy using nuclear in the State of Nevada, so why should we be accepting everybody's nuclear waste. If you have a nuclear power plant in your district, in your State, then that is fine. You figure out what you are going to do with the nuclear waste that is produced by creating nuclear energy.

The idea that Nevada should be the repository, and some people call it the suppository, for nuclear waste in this country is an absolute absurdity. We will fight this.

We thank the President of the United States for standing with the people of the State of Nevada. We do not want the nuclear waste. It is dangerous, and we join with everyone else in trying to come up with a solution. But this myth that we are going to have one repository instead of 43 or 33 or however many nuclear power plants we have in this country is preposterous, because these power plants are going to keep creating nuclear waste. So we are not eliminating nuclear dump sites; we are creating an extra one. Can't do it. Shouldn't do it. Won't do it.

I urge my colleagues to join with me and come up with a suitable method of dealing with our nuclear waste. Yucca Mountain just is not that answer, and it never will be.

NO GOVERNMENT TAKEOVER OF HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, Republicans have been talking for over 3 years about the problem of the debt and def-

icit facing our Nation. We, as well as average Americans, have realized that these problems are a threat to our existence as the greatest and freest Nation on Earth. But what the Democrats are proposing to do in passing a health care bill that Americans do not want is an even more immediate threat to the future of this Nation. Let me explain just a little bit about that.

What the Democrats are proposing to do is a government takeover of health care that the American people do not want. Because they have a political problem, because there is no support for this bill among Americans, they are going to use a procedural mechanism to avoid an up-or-down vote on the bill that the Senate passed on Christmas Eve. They are going to create a reconciliation bill that meets the Senate test for reconciliation. As the majority leader said out here a few minutes ago, we are not the Senate. We don't have reconciliation rules. He kept making that point over and over again. But they are going to create a mechanism to pass a bill in the House to match reconciliation rules over in the Senate.

What they want to do is to develop mechanics to hide a vote on the Senate bill and create a scheme to pass a bill in the House that will then pass muster in the Senate. It is a cram-down; and despite what the majority leader keeps saying about the fact that we have seen the bill, we know what is in the bill, we have not. Bills have to be developed in bill language, and we have to see specifically what it is we are going to vote on.

The President has never presented a bill to the American people. What the President did present about 3 weeks ago was an 11-page proposal. That is exactly what it is called on the President's Web site: The President's proposal, February 22, 2010. It is really 10 pages with one line on page 11. It has general language. It makes insurance more affordable. It sets up competitive health insurance markets, ends discrimination against Americans with preexisting conditions, and it says that it bridges the gap between the House and Senate bills and includes new provisions to crack down on waste, fraud, and abuse. This is not legislative language. We cannot vote on something like this.

In addition, one of my colleagues just pointed out to me that there is a 19-page summary of the 11-page proposal on the White House Web site. You know, if you haven't read "1984," I ask you, read it. If it has been a long time since you've read it, read it again.

Now let me give you an example of specific legislative language. This is a page out of the Senate bill that passed. I don't know the section before, but this starts out with (1). It is page 35.

"(1) Requirement to provide value for premium payments. A health insurance issuer offering group or individual health insurance coverage shall, with respect to each plan year, provide an annual rebate to each enrollee under

such coverage, on a pro rata basis, in an amount that is equal to the amount by which premium revenue expended by the issuer on activities described in subsection (a)(3) exceeds," and then it has an (A) and a (B) and a (2). That is specific language that is used in bills that we pass here every day.

What the President has proposed is not legislative language. What they want to do is use something called the "Slaughter sleight of hand," and the American people don't want it.

HONORING REVEREND DAVID CRUMP

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend to this House the memory of one of my constituents, the Reverend David Joshua Crump, who, at the age of 42, died suddenly on February 20 of this year.

Rev. Crump was a young man of strong personal faith, coming from a long line of leaders in America's faith community, including Bishop Alexander Waymon. His parents, the Reverends Izell and Elaine Crump, are also well-regarded ministers in my hometown of Baltimore.

At a time when so many of America's young people are struggling to come of age without strong and loving fathers in their lives, Rev. David Crump's commitment to their upbringing was a beacon of personal and social responsibility for us all.

I had the occasion to attend the funeral of the late David Crump, and his foster children, a number of them, came forward and talked about how he had touched their lives and how he had opened so many doors for them and what a wonderful parent he was.

Not only that, David Crump excelled in his mastery of that most valuable kind of wisdom: the insights that help us to remain focused squarely upon what is truly important in our lives.

In 1998, I invited the Congressional Black Caucus to Baltimore for a field investigation hearing of our local responses to illicit drug use and HIV/AIDS. We chose Micah's Cafeteria as the primary site for our hearing. David Crump's family owned Micah's, and David was the master chef and maitre d' at the restaurant. During our field hearing there, he made a very favorable impression on all of my CBC colleagues. Our positive response went beyond the positive quality of the restaurant's food. We were heartened by how well David worked with Micah's staff, and especially with the young people who worked with him. These young men and women were competent and polite, building better lives for themselves, and a lot of that had to do with David's leadership and compassion for them. It soon became apparent that David Crump was at the heart of a transformation that was worth our understanding.

In the years that followed, I would often find David reaching out to the young and giving them an opportunity to find themselves in life-affirming settings. His calling was at the center of his faith.

So often, people go to church and prayer meeting, and when they come out the door, they forget their faith. But he never forgot. Not only was he a great foster parent, but he was a very loving husband.

With his wife, Theresa Mina, he built a home full of love and laughter for the children who came into their lives. He was a man of good humor and a gentle spirit. He was a good father and husband who was devoted to his God and to his family.

One of the things that I said at his funeral was, if I ever met someone who tried to walk in the path that God had laid out, it was David Crump.

Mr. Speaker, recently I was thinking about Rev. Crump's example as I read comments that Attorney General Eric Holder made during a recent speech. Encouraging men to take more responsibility for our children and homes, Attorney General Holder observed that, "I have held many titles in my life, but the title I am most proud of is father. A father's role in the life of a child is irreplaceable."

Stressing that we must do more to create a culture of mutual respect, our Attorney General went on to emphasize that we hold the future in our hands. He said, "We as men need to spend more time with our sons and daughters. We need to teach our sons to have respect for women and daughters to demand respect for themselves."

This same wisdom was at the heart of David Crump's ministry and personal life. His vision and commitment are examples that we all would be well advised to follow.

I strongly believe that government has important roles to play in rebuilding America's communities, yet I also understand that we, as individual citizens, are the critical element in the social transformation that this Nation needs to undertake. Rev. David Crump understood this, both in his ministry and in his personal commitment to the young people in his life. He was, indeed, a wonderful role model.

HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate this opportunity to speak here on the floor. The topic again will be health care because, even though most of Americans are more concerned about the economy, as am I, and jobs, because the President keeps trying to shove this thing into the lap of Americans—actually, it will control

the lap of Americans—we have to deal with this until we can start over, start fresh, get the special interest groups, the unions, AARP, those people who have been meeting in the last few weeks behind closed doors, away from C-SPAN cameras, getting special deals for themselves, we start over and start fresh. And the number one most important aspect is not the unions. It is not AARP. It is retired people. It is seniors. It is Americans across the country. It is the poor. It is the wealthy. It is everybody.

□ 1245

Those people who are United States citizens, those are the number one concern, should be, under a newly negotiated bill.

I just got sent a copy of an e-mail that has gone all over the country apparently from a group called Organizing Against America—I'm sorry, Organizing for America, it just sounds like they're organizing against America—and it has an individual's name, first name. It says: "President Obama has called for the House to vote to move health reform forward as early as next week. Your representative"—in this case, LOUIS GOHMERT—"voted last fall to allow insurance companies to continue to jack up rates, drop coverage when folks need it the most, and discriminate against people with pre-existing conditions." You know, the rules of the House do not prevent me from calling this what it is: that's a lie; that's simply not true.

But it goes on to say: "We're in the final margin, one last chance to do the right thing." It says: "Call Representative GOHMERT today," and it says: "Let them know"—that's not correct grammar, but that's not the only thing that's not correct—"know that there is a political price to favoring big insurance companies over the American people.

"Organizing Against America"—I'm sorry, "Organizing for America" supporters in Texas have pledged 506,830 volunteer hours to fight for candidates who support reform."

So, anyway, what they're not apparently aware of is that the vast majority of Americans, the vast majority in my district, they know what this bill—I've got four volumes to get it all, that's the bill that was passed in the House—they know what this represents. It's a government takeover not just of health care, but a whole lot more than that. Anyway, that's the stuff that's going out in this hour of desperation to try to cram this bill through, cram it down on America.

I heard our valiant Speaker PELOSI, I saw and heard the video of the Speaker saying we've got to pass this bill so that we can find out what's in it. I understand that she was talking about apparently there's a big fog around the bill and we really won't see what's in the bill until we pass it and then the fog is lifted; but some of us have been concerned that we need to look at this

bill, and everybody needs to know what's in it now and not wait until later.

We also know that secretly negotiated—I saw an AARP rep and union rep saying that before this summit the President was going to have his health care bill that would be discussed at the summit between Republicans and Democrats. I know my friend, ERIC CANTOR, brought a copy of the bill, and it seemed like that made people mad. I suggested that they have a copy of the Senate bill and the House bill there so that when somebody made a representation that wasn't accurate as to what was represented in the bill, you could immediately turn to the bill during the summit and correct whatever inaccuracy was painted.

Well, one of the problems with the President's health care bill, like my friend, Ms. FOXX, pointed out earlier, is that there is still no President's bill. He came in here and spoke from the second level up there and kept referring to "my bill," "this bill," "my plan," "this plan"; but as I asked Secretary Sebelius later, I said, I've been trying to find a copy of the President's bill; he keeps referring to it, said he was going to call us out if we misrepresented it, and I just want to know where I get a copy of it. And that's when she told us, Well, actually, I think he was talking about a set of proposals or principles.

Well, I was told by CBO that they could not score my plan until I had it in a hard and fast bill. So we did, we got it in bill form. And that took a lot of work because legislative counsel, who prepares the bills in legislative form, were so tied up with all the Democratic bills that were being filed and being shoved to the front so quickly. But we finally got it done. It took, I think, around 6 weeks or so. And then we got it filed. And then we couldn't get a CBO scoring. We were finally told in August, well, you know, you don't have the request from the highest-ranking Republican on the committee of jurisdiction, Energy and Commerce. So I talked to Republican JOE BARTON, and JOE said, yeah, it sounds great; let's get it done. He said to send a request that my bill be scored.

Then, about 1 month later, we were told, well, we haven't scored it. You still don't have the approval of the highest-ranking Republican on the Joint Tax Committee. So I got DAVE CAMP, told him about the bill, showed him what I had. He said, sure. He sends over a letter saying, Please score GOHMERT's bill. That was in September, I think September 19, something like that, 20th, somewhere around there.

In the meantime, anytime a Democratic leader doesn't have a bill, just has an idea, a plan, wow, they can rush that in to CBO. Every now and then CBO will say, you know, you just don't give us enough to work from, we're making presumptions, but here's a score usually is what they get to any-

way. That is something that is so grossly unfair.

There is a summary of 70 health care bills in this document here that have been filed by Republicans to help reform health care. So if someone bothered to read that before they sent out a false e-mail saying we don't want to do anything to reform insurance, they would find out they're wrong. We've got all kinds of good proposals because the truth is, and I'll say it again, all the people I know want health care reformed. They don't want insurance companies between us and our doctors or between any American and their doctors. And they don't want government in between them and their doctors. That's what we're trying to get to.

And even though CBO hasn't been kind enough to, after all these months—and we have the data here that shows what CBO has done. There have been 50 total health care bills formally scored in the 111th Congress, and six of them—six—have been Republican plans. We've got 70 others we'd like to get scored, but they're not going to get to those, they're not even going to get to mine. In the 111th Congress there have been a total all together of 530 bills that have been scored by CBO: 442 were for Democrats, 88 were from Republicans. But we didn't even get that good of odds as far as the health care scoring. So we are obviously working at a severe disadvantage here.

I know that there are so many things the President said that even though they're inaccurate, he has no intent to deceive. It's just that when you're President of the United States, obviously you can't have all the facts at your fingertip. You have to rely on people who work for you to give you accurate information. Unfortunately, our good President has not been given all the accurate information he needs in order to address things properly.

I've been joined by my good friend from Georgia, and I would like to yield such time as Mr. LYNN WESTMORELAND might need.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Well, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for taking this Special Order to come talk about the health care bill that, regardless of what anybody says, is actually being rammed through the process. And the reason it's being rammed through, as I think my friend from Texas mentioned, the American people are not in favor of this health care bill. It also, I believe, is unconstitutional that we're going to require our citizens to buy health care. That should be a choice that every individual makes on whether they buy health care or don't buy health care. They may be in an economic situation to where they don't need it, or they may be young and they may be doing health savings accounts. We need to be promoting the health savings accounts and other ways that young people can do things to provide health care for themselves without their government forcing them to buy a health insurance program.

The other thing that I think is interesting is the unions get a special break out of this. You know, I thought that everything that we did in this body was supposed to be fair to everybody, but what they're doing is they're making a difference in this health care proposal that if you have neighbors living beside one another and one is a union employee and the other is a nonunion employee and they're making the same amount of money, their health benefits are going to be taxed differently. Now, why should that be? I mean, I think that's one of the disservices that has come about through this bill is there is so much inequity between individuals. It all depends on how much money you make, where you live.

There is also going to be a czar that we don't know who that's going to be and we don't really know what his or her full capability is going to be and what they're going to regulate. But I would say to my friend from Texas that they may tell you that the current health care plan that you have that you're happy with does not meet the Federal requirements.

This plan also establishes about 111 new commissions, boards, and agencies that we have no idea what their responsibility or what their rules or what their regulations are going to be and what other type of impact they're going to have on our freedom and our privacy.

The interesting thing is that the leadership continues to talk about how many jobs this is going to create. If it creates any jobs, they will be government jobs. We need to create private sector jobs. We need to be concentrating on the economy. All the political capital that has been spent on health care—and not only on health care, this most open, honest, ethical Congress that we were promised by then-Minority Leader NANCY PELOSI, now Speaker PELOSI, is the fact that they've been tied up with ethics investigations of Congressman RANGEL. We've had the tickle wrestling controversy that just came up lately about young people being allowed to be subject to sexual harassment.

Now, we need to be concentrating on jobs. Most of my constituents are calling me saying, look, where are the jobs? You passed a \$787 billion stimulus package that was supposed to keep unemployment from going from 8 percent any higher, well, it's at 9.7. The only jobs that have been created have been government jobs. We created about 5,000 jobs with Cash for Clunkers. We have created over 120,000 government jobs since this President has been in office. We need to be concentrating on our economy and on creating jobs from the private sector. We need to be freeing up credit. We need to be making it so small business has an initiative to hire people.

The jobs bill that we passed through here was really a joke. And my friend from Texas, I'm sure you talk to many of your small business people who said,

Congressman, do they really think that I'm going to go out and hire somebody for \$30,000 or \$35,000 a year to get a \$1,000 tax credit? Do they not understand that you can't survive in small business doing something that silly? I said, well, the problem is only about 7 percent of the people in the President's administration have ever even had a private sector job, and I don't know how many or what percentage of that ever created any jobs or actually was responsible for job creation.

What we have got to do is remove the uncertainty that's out there to the small business world, to that employer that is ready to create, to expand, to put infrastructure in our communities. We've got to make sure that he has some certainty. The small business people I talk to go, look, I'm not going to do anything until I have some certainty, and the one thing that the 111th Congress has brought to the American people and to the people that create jobs in this country is uncertainty. They don't know what their energy cost is going to be; they have no idea. Is cap-and-trade going to pass that would raise, just on individuals, energy costs of about \$3,200 a year? Is that going to pass? I don't know.

□ 1300

Are we going to raise taxes on the small business people? Are we going to raise taxes on the people who make over \$250,000 or over \$200,000 or over \$150,000? Most of these subchapter S corps that create the jobs are under those individual guidelines.

They ask, Am I going to end up paying more taxes? I don't know.

I can't answer that for you.

What are our health care costs going to be? Are you going to mandate these health care prescriptions on us?

I don't know. I can't answer that.

We don't know about any free trade agreements. This administration has refused to act on free trade agreements. We need to remove the uncertainty for business in this country. We need to crank up our economic engine without starving it for the fuel that it needs to stand and to create those jobs that we so desperately need.

So this health care plan is going to be rammed through regardless of what you say. The rules are going to be adjusted to fit what they need to do. But I've got something to tell the majority: The American people are not that stupid. They understand smoke and mirrors and hocus-pocus when they see it. I promise you they're not just going to hold the majority accountable; they're going to hold every Member of this body and every Member of the body across this Capitol accountable for taking this country in a direction that the majority of people does not want to see it go.

With that, I yield back my time to the gentleman, my friend from Texas.

Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate so much the insights from the gentleman from Georgia. You make such good points.

Madam Speaker, I've heard people say before, Well, you know, I see you go down to the House floor and just pour your heart out, and you're really trying to convince people of what's right. I wonder. It has got to be pretty frustrating when there's not more than a handful of people around on the House floor.

I think what a lot of people don't realize is, since C-SPAN came about, every Member of Congress whom I know has a television in his or her office, and they watch C-SPAN. A lot of folks will have more than one so that you can monitor C-SPAN and watch the news. You can monitor what is being said, and you can monitor debate. We've been told there may be 200,000 or there may be many more people watching on C-SPAN. Yet this is a chance, under the Constitution, under the Speech or Debate Clause, to come in and to try to bring light. Light is the best disinfectant to any kind of infection. That's what we're trying to do, to shed some light on this.

We have been joined by my dear friend, Ms. VIRGINIA FOXX. When you're talking about someone who has been the president of a university before—and I know her work hours as they're not unlike my work hours—I know that she comes to the floor informed.

I yield such time as Ms. FOXX may need.

Ms. FOXX. Well, I want to thank both of my colleagues, my classmates, actually—my colleague from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND) and my colleague from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for their insights and for their sharing of information in this Special Order today.

Instead of going home to be in our districts, we stayed in town today to vote on a bill on algae, which we could have voted on yesterday, but our colleagues across the aisle are twisting arms every minute of every day in order to get votes. They understand that the American people don't want this health care bill that they're trying to ram through and pass. They're trying to be responsive to their constituents, but they're being forced, in many cases, to vote for something by their leadership.

I want to talk for just a minute about two problems here. We have a problem with the bill, and we also have a problem with the process, or the rule, that is going to be governing this bill.

I serve on the Rules Committee. Up until this year, people have always said, Oh, we shouldn't try to talk about process because the public's eyes glaze over. They don't really want to know about that.

Yet more and more Americans have awakened and are paying attention to what is going on in Congress, and I find that people are concerned about the process here because they understand the process is sometimes as important as the substance of what we're doing.

The Rules Committee is the committee here that establishes the rules for debate and the procedure on legisla-

tion that's being considered by the House. Unfortunately, our colleagues will not allow the Rules Committee to be covered by C-SPAN, so very few people have seen the Rules Committee in action. We meet in a tiny room up here. Really, there are no seats for the public, or almost no seats for the public. There are seats for Members; there are seats for the press, and there are seats for staff, but there are almost no seats for the public. So very few people have observed the Rules Committee, but it is doing extremely important work in the House.

The Rules Committee establishes the length of the debate and which amendments, if any, will be allowed to be debated. It has nine Members of the majority and four Members of the minority, so they have it stacked pretty good against the minority. We meet at all times of the day and night, lots of times in the middle of the night. Last year, on the cap-and-trade bill, we got the manager's amendment at 3 a.m., an almost 400-page amendment at 3 o'clock in the morning. Then we voted on that bill just a little later on that day.

Well, what is being talked about to get a health care bill passed some people are calling "the Slaughter solution," but I call it the Slaughter sleight of hand. Ms. SLAUGHTER, from New York, is the Chair of the committee, and she has come up with a really, really clever way of having the Members of this body not vote on a bill but say that the bill has passed.

I said a few minutes ago that we are facing a major crisis in this country, a crisis with our debt and deficit, but the more immediate crisis is this very cynical attempt to pass a bill without having the Members vote for the bill. That has never happened in this House before. This is a complete cynical approach to this, and they have to do that because their Members don't want to vote for it because they know their constituents don't want them to vote for it.

They believe they're going to be able to send their Members home to say, Oh, I didn't vote for that horrible bill. I didn't vote for that bill you don't want. I only voted for the rule, or I only voted for this reconciliation bill, and I didn't vote for that bill.

Now, folks, they're trying to go from passing bills they haven't read to passing bills they haven't voted on. I think any high school youngster in this country who has taken civics knows how a bill becomes law. You pass a bill in one House, and you pass exactly the same thing in the other Chamber. It then goes to the President. The President can veto it or sign it. Yet that's not what the majority party is about here. They want a procedural vote that would simply declare the measure to have passed at the moment the Senate passes what they are calling a reconciliation bill.

As I also pointed out earlier, we have no reconciliation process here. We have

straight up-or-down votes. The majority rules. Because there are four vacancies in the House, and because nobody is in the House of Representatives unless he or she is elected, as you don't appoint people to the House of Representatives, the Speaker only needs 216 votes. So what we have again is a sleight of hand going on.

You know, I've seen a lot of cartoons representing the President as the Wizard of Oz, and I think that's a pretty apt description. The President and the people in charge here have been talking a lot about this reconciliation bill because they want people's attention on that. They don't want people to pay attention to the bill that has to be voted on in order for it to become law, which is the Senate bill.

Now, a few minutes ago, the majority leader said, Oh, everybody knows what's in these bills. They've been out there for months. We've discussed them for thousands of hours.

That is not true.

What's going to happen next week is the Budget Committee is going to meet on Monday. They're going to pass what amounts to an empty vessel, which is going to come to the Rules Committee. Sometime next week—and we don't know what time of day or night—we're going to execute an amendment in the Rules Committee that will be seen for the very first time by anybody in a position to vote on it. The staff will have seen it, and perhaps those in charge will have seen it, but my guess is they will not have seen it either. We'll be asked to vote on that immediately in the Rules Committee. That's going to be the first time anybody will have seen it.

As my colleague from Texas talked about, and as I mentioned earlier, we don't have a bill from the President. He presented an 11-page set of principles, which he called a proposal, and he has got a 19-page summary of the 11-page proposal on the Web site. There is still no legislative language, and we have to have legislative language.

The Democratic majority is engaging in such extraordinary legislative chicanery to get this bill passed that it is a clear indication they cannot pass the bill without doing that. They don't have the votes within their membership to pass that bill, so they've got to do all this sleight of hand to get it passed.

These people have exposed themselves as willing to abandon the most fundamental element of legislating, a transparent up-or-down vote, in order to achieve an unpopular, partisan objective.

This is very disturbing, and it should be an alarm to every American. This is what banana republics do. This is not what the greatest Nation in the world does. This is not what the greatest deliberative bodies in the world do. The American people do not want this health care bill, and they don't want their democratic process turned on its head to pass it over their objectives.

I said it before: I was ridiculed. I was ridiculed for saying that I feared this health care bill almost more than anything else. I want to tell you the American people need to fear it because it undermines our entire system of laws. It takes us from being a nation of laws to being a nation of people who will do anything to pass their ideological program, and they will go out to attempt to destroy what is great about this Nation, and that is our Constitution and our rule of law.

With that, I yield back.

Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate the comments of the gentlelady, Ms. FOXX. They were really on target. Thank you so much.

When she mentions banana republics, I actually had the experience in 1973 of being an exchange student to the Soviet Union for a summer, and I got to see firsthand how the former Soviet Union operated before, of course, it went broke. It couldn't borrow enough money. It couldn't print enough money, so it went broke.

□ 1315

In looking at the President's comment in his speech on March 3 of this year, it was after the so-called health care summit, and I am quoting: "My proposal would give uninsured individuals and small business owners the same kind of choice of private health insurance that Members of Congress get for themselves, because if it is good enough for Members of Congress, it is good enough for the people who pay their salaries." And there was applause on that.

But apparently he hasn't read the bill that was passed in the House that he is trying to join and mesh up in his so-called proposal. This is in the first volume. Let me get over here to that, the benefit package levels. It says, "The commissioner," this is another czar-type person he will appoint, "shall specify benefits to be made available under the exchange participating health benefit plans."

Then subparagraph B, "Limitation on health benefit plans offered by offering entities." I haven't seen anything in the President's proposal that changes this. It says, "In every area of the United States," and it will be cut up into different service areas, it says, "the entity only offers one basic plan."

The commissioner will designate what has to be in the health care insurance policy. Then their idea of that is you will have a slew of insurance companies that will offer the same policy, one basic plan. And then you could, if you wanted to, as an insurance company, offer an enhanced plan. But the big deal is the same exact plan will be offered by different insurance companies.

I had an experience that this reminds me of so much when I was in a city stay in Moscow. We had read and heard that the largest department store in the world was in Moscow, and the Russian letters in the English equivalent

are GUM, which stood for governmental universal store or department store.

I needed some 110 film for my little camera. There were probably a dozen camera stores on three or four different levels, and there were several different sections. It was enormous. I went to every one of them, and every single one had the exact same products, the exact same prices. And that is what we are talking about in this plan. There is no choice. And it won't be long, there will only be one insurance company, and that will be the Federal Government.

We have been joined by my good friend from California, former attorney general, former Member of Congress before coming back, who has always terrific insights. I yield to Mr. LUNGREN.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I actually came down because I was listening to the debate and I wondered whether there would be room for someone who spoke with the absence of an accent on this floor.

Mr. GOHMERT. There is nobody talking with an accent that I have heard.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I appreciate that. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would just say that there is a fundamental proposition that is before the House that is often forgotten in the discussion of the procedure, as strange as the procedure might be for consideration of this bill, and that is, if this bill were to be brought to the floor, the Senate version, or the House version that already passed, and it were ultimately to be signed by the President, it is my understanding that for the first time in the history of the United States we will condition your legal status in the United States, that is, your ability to remain a legal citizen in good standing in the United States, on the mandated purchase of a product provided by a private entity, but as determined by parameters established by the Federal Government.

Is that the gentleman's understanding as well?

Mr. GOHMERT. That is indeed my understanding.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. It is sometimes easily called an individual mandate, but no one really talks too much about that, where we have the authority to mandate your continued legal presence in the United States. There has been a lot of debate, some even engendered by comments during the President's speech before a joint session, on whether or not people who are here illegally will be covered by all of the government health programs that will be established by law. In fact, that has been at least a matter of contention, whether or not the language contained in the versions would have any meaningful limitation on the provision of health care to people who are in this country illegally. The gentleman is aware of that debate.

But here we have a situation where those who are born in the United States would be rendered an illegal status if, in fact, they did not purchase a product mandated by the Federal Government. Of course, in the House provision, that mandate is enforced by way of criminal sanction, first by way of a fine, and then failure to pay the fine could bring one a criminal sanction.

In fact, in one way, they are attempting to get around this question of whether or not the Federal Government has the authority to mandate this. They have introduced it by way of a section of the Internal Revenue Code. We know that if one commits fraud in terms of not paying a tax, and they are trying to qualify the definition of the fine as a tax, that you can go to prison for committing fraud on the government in your failure to pay the tax. So it is not a reach, as some have suggested, that the penalty would be, in fact, a criminal penalty, which includes incarceration for failure to follow this mandate.

Is that the gentleman's understanding as well? I know the gentleman is a former judge of the State of Texas.

Mr. GOHMERT. A judge, and was briefly chief justice of an intermediary court filling an unexpired term. And that is my understanding. But I also know the gentleman from California was the highest ranking legal officer in the State of California and very articulately has set out his, as well as my, understanding.

But I am curious as to the gentleman's opinion of whether or not this really meets constitutional muster. Nobody knows what the Supreme Court would do. Some project maybe 5 or 6 years before it got there, since we were unsuccessful in getting any fast track in the House version or the Senate version.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. In other words, an expedited consideration of the legal matters up to the Supreme Court, which we have done on other legislation in the past.

Mr. GOHMERT. I am curious about the gentleman's opinion.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Here is my concern. There are those who say these bills are justified under the expansive reading of the commerce clause, and it is true in the past the Supreme Court has found a rather expansive view of the commerce clause. But if one suggests that one's own health and the decision on how one provides for one's own health is, in fact, a part of interstate commerce, which then grants the authority to the Federal Government to act, then the question I would ask is: What is left that is not covered by Federal authority? What part of your life is not covered by the Federal authority?

In other words, if we can do this for the purpose, admittedly a good purpose, of ensuring that people have health care in this country, but if we can extend the reach of the Federal Government in this way, would it be

out of the realm of possibility that one could argue it would be constitutional for the Federal Government to say, in light of the impact of obesity on certain health conditions, and in light of the fact that when one develops those health conditions one has a call on medical care in this country, and that impacts all of us, because that is the argument that is being made, would it not then be logical that we, on the Federal level, could mandate that you must belong to a federally approved fitness program? Is that so much of a reach?

Wouldn't that be less of an interference in one's life than to mandate precisely how one has to prepare for one's own health and pay for one's own health, and then dictate exactly what coverage one might have, even though you might not want to have that particular coverage?

So I think it goes beyond just the health care question. It goes to the question—and I have had this discussion in my town hall meetings as recently as this last Monday, where I had 250 people in Rancho Cordova. It goes to the question of what is the proper relationship between the individual and their Federal Government, and the greatness of our Founding Fathers was to say that would be a limited relationship; that is, the Federal Government's call on us, because we recognize that government did not extend rights to us. Those rights were God-given rights. And we the people—those are the words that are found in the Constitution. We the people formed a United States of America, but we decided what authority we would give that government, and they should not go beyond that.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Would the gentleman yield? I thank the gentleman from Texas.

This argument about the commerce clause and the Federal Government being able to regulate interstate commerce, I take this to the other side of the scenario that Mr. LUNGREN has laid out and take it down to the assumption that is in this bill that everybody in America is engaged in interstate commerce is relevant to health insurance.

I would submit that in Texas or California or Georgia or Iowa, there is likely to have been, I will say certain to have been, and likely to still be, individuals born in those particular States that never participated in a health care program of any kind, lived within the State, didn't cross the State line to get an aspirin, and died, and never engaged in health care that could be even described as interstate commerce in any way. Yet this commerce clause would be broadened to the point of being so inclusive that not only would that, by inference, give Congress the authority to require a person to join a health club, but also to show up and exercise, tell us what we can and can't eat, and the commerce clause then would have no limits whatsoever.

I am going to say that the individual that is born in one of those States, or

any State in America that doesn't participate in a health care program that links the interstate commerce, is completely exempt under the commerce clause, and therefore that is one of the bases for which I believe this is an unconstitutional bill.

Mr. GOHMERT. We have a friend from Georgia, Mr. WESTMORELAND. Do you have anything to add on that point?

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Well, I don't have anything to add on the constitutionality of the legislation, because I have already expressed I think it is unconstitutional, but I did want to make one comment before I had to go to my friend from Texas.

I believe you said the President had put out an 11-page summary and then had put out a 19-page summary of the 11-page summary, so I wanted to quote from the 19-page summary of the 11-page summary. And anybody within the sound of my voice, Madam Speaker, if they believe this, then they need some help and some counseling.

This is the new affordable choices where the 19-page explanation of the 11-page explanation says, "paper reduction and simplified forms will begin to reduce costs."

Anybody that has ever dealt with the government knows they do nothing to reduce paperwork.

"A new Web site to help consumers compare different insurance coverage options, along with State-by-State consumer health care assistance and assistance for any of their health insurance questions."

To my friend from Texas, you can't call a government agency now and even talk to a real human being, and now they are going to answer questions for 300 million people?

Here is the final one. "Clear and easy-to-understand insurance documents to help Americans make decisions when shopping for health insurance."

The government has never had any documents that were clear and simple to understand. The majority of Americans today cannot even fill out their own 1040 personal income tax.

This is a sham, and I hope that the American people will wake up and understand that what is fixing to happen to them is not only unconstitutional, but will be something that will not be easily undone.

□ 1330

Mr. GOHMERT. I want to yield more time to my friend from California.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I think the gentleman from Georgia made a point about a summary of a summary being larger than the original summary, and we're talking about a 2,000-page bill at least in both the House and the Senate, which will then spawn thousands, tens of thousands, of pages of regulations which will then be interpreted by thousands of people employed by the Federal Government, which will then finally get to

you and your doctor. And I think that is one of the problems that we have.

I would just cite the Speaker of the House who recently said in a press conference: We must pass the bill so we can find out what is in it. Now, I don't make that stuff up. It almost sounds like a comedy routine from "Saturday Night Live." But that was essentially the statement: We must pass the bill to find out what was in it.

I used to think that good legislation was you knew what was in it before you voted on it, and if you had problems with it, you didn't vote on it until you fixed the problems, and you didn't say, well, we know we have problems in the bill, but we are going to reconcile those problems later on. And particularly when "reconcile" is a special term of art in the United States Senate, and it allows you to fix some things but not others, and those that you cannot fix in the arcane notion of the reconciliation process in the Senate, you will then have to take to the floor of the House, and that will be then subject to the possibility of filibuster, which means essentially you will have to get 60 votes to pass it.

So I would ask the gentleman on an issue that is of immense importance to the American people, as they have expressed at town hall meetings, in polling and everything else, there has been a 30-plus-year consensus in this Congress and in this country about the limits of Federal funding for the procedure called abortion. That law, that line of laws, has been encapsulated in what was known as the Stupak amendment in the House of Representatives.

We know that the Stupak amendment is not in the Senate bill. There is another provision which Mr. STUPAK and others have said is insufficient to maintain the current law, therefore meaning that it will establish a new law allowing Federal funding of abortions for procedures that have not been allowed that is paid for by the taxpayers for over 30 years.

Is the gentleman aware of whether the history of the voting pattern in the Senate would lead one to conclude that there are 60 votes for the Stupak amendment in the Senate?

Mr. GOHMERT. I think the gentleman for the question. It's a great question because we know when SCOTT BROWN was elected, he said, I'm the 41st vote against this. There are not 60 votes to do what they are saying, which as you're pointing out, the Stupak amendment—if our pro-life friends across the aisle were to get talked into voting for the Senate bill as is, on the promise that, oh, gee, we will bring that amendment up, and we are sure it will pass—I just don't see how anybody can make that claim because it has already been made clear at the other end of the Hall that they are not getting 60 votes to do it.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. If you have an animal control officer come to your house and say that your dog or cat hasn't been

neutered or spayed, and you say, well, wait a second, I'm going to let my dog or cat out for the next month, but I will get him fixed, do you think the animal control officer would trust you?

Mr. GOHMERT. No, they don't. And there is no reason to believe that anything could happen other than what we've already seen. They're not going to have 60 votes to do it, which is why they are trying to do it on a reconciliation gimmick.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Is the gentleman aware of whether or not the language that articulates the Stupak amendment or the language that would articulate something close to the Stupak amendment would be allowed under the tight controls of reconciliation?

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, it is hard to know; but I believe if the Speaker tells BART STUPAK, we are going to get the amendment, your Stupak amendment passed in the House through reconciliation, we'll get it done, and we should get it done in the Senate, I'm sure if she tells him that she will get it done in the House, then she probably will. But there is no way on this Earth that she can guarantee what will happen in the Senate because it's not going to happen.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. In other words, if one were to preserve the Stupak amendment, it would be to take the House bill over to the Senate, have the Senate accept the House bill, and then perhaps try and reconcile it later on if you were going to preserve the intent of the Stupak amendment and thereby preserve 30 years or 35 years of the consensus of this Congress and the consensus of the courts and the consensus of the American people.

Mr. GOHMERT. The gentleman is exactly right.

And I want to emphasize how important the Stupak language was. We did hear our friends across the aisle say, look, there is no money that will be allowed under the House bill for abortion. And I know they believe that when they said it or they really wouldn't have said it. The trouble is one of the problems in this body is we have ended up having such massive bills come so fast that people do not read the bills, because on page 110 of the very bill that was under debate that the Stupak amendment was to address, this is page 110, subsection 4b, the subsection titled, "Abortions For Which Public Funding is Allowed," then it goes on to say the services described in this subparagraph are abortions for which expenditure of Federal funds appropriated for the Department of Health and Human Services is permitted, and then it goes and sets out conditions.

The point is they hadn't read that bill or they would never have gotten up and said, there is no money in this bill for Federal tax dollars for abortion. It was there, and it is there if you don't have the Stupak amendment.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. If I might ask the gentleman to yield again, the point we're making is this has nothing to do with Roe v. Wade. This has nothing to do with a woman's right to choose. It has to do with the question of whether Federal taxpayers are required to pay for the procedures, and there has been a consensus in this country with a limitation on federally funded abortions except for the life of the mother, rape and incest. There have been those kinds of limitations on that. And this changes that, changes the consensus that has existed for 30-some years.

Again, if you wanted to protect that consensus that was repeated on this floor in the nature of the Stupak amendment, you would take that up in the Senate and you would pass that. Now, why are they not doing it? We hear they are not doing it because they couldn't pass it in the Senate.

Mr. GOHMERT. That is exactly right.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. So we are supposed to believe that if they can't pass the Stupak amendment in the Senate, we should pass the Senate bill here because then there is a promise that they will pass a virtual Stupak amendment with a requirement of 60 votes.

Mr. GOHMERT. That they can't get on any other bill itself. It makes no sense.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. So people should understand the conundrum we are in, not of our own making, but precisely because of the bill that was brought to this floor and the bill that was brought to the Senate. And those are basically the two options that are out there. And the question is, How can you get a majority vote in either body while finessing that issue?

I would suggest you cannot do that if, in fact, that issue is as important to people as they stated it was during the consideration of the bill both in the House and the Senate.

And of course that goes far beyond the question we had before, which is, What about the constitutionality of the underlying principle that we will now mandate that you must purchase a product, in this case, a health care policy, or if you do not, you will find yourself in illegal status in the United States? We are not talking about you having entered the United States illegally. We are not talking about you having overstayed your visa. We are not talking about you committing some fraud on the United States to come here.

We are talking about you already being an American citizen, someone with legal status in the United States, and now you are going to be rendered illegal because you will not purchase a product imposed by the Federal Government for the first time in our Nation's history.

Mr. GOHMERT. That is such a great point. I was talking with some of my

constituents this past weekend who are scared to death this thing is going to pass. Some of them work for lower wages, and they are on their spouse's insurance with their employer.

There are companies that exist only because they are able to hire people who don't need health insurance, and so they are able to hire them without providing health insurance. Under the bill, they are going to get hit with an 8 percent tax. And I'm hearing employers say, we can't pay the 8 percent tax. They've either got to take an 8 percent cut or lay people off.

There's been one estimate confirmed by a number of people that if this bill passes, if this bill becomes law at the worst time conceivable, more Americans out of work than ever in history, it will put 5½ million people out of work. This is incredible. I have heard friends across the aisle talk about how important it is to help the working poor, the lower middle class, that is who we really want to help. Under the bill, if they can't afford the mandated type of insurance, then they are going to get hit with an additional tax, the very people that can't afford it. In addition to that, they are going to be hit with other taxes to help pay for this bill. It is not a friend of the working poor in America.

I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

I point out an additional 5½ million people resulting unemployed over this bill, but it provides access, according to calculations from the Congressional Budget Office, to health insurance policies for as many as 6.1 illegals. So there's your trade-off: 5½ million unemployed Americans, 6.1 million illegals having access to their own health insurance policy.

Additionally, picking up on the point of the gentleman from California, not only does it render an illegal status to someone who wouldn't, could not perhaps or would not, purchase health insurance policies that are mandated by the Federal Government. It levies a fine against them, as we have said, and it takes us into the realm of what I think is a definition of debtor's prison. You levy a fine against someone, and if you don't pay the fine, and when it gets to \$250,000, then the original bill adds a prison penalty in there.

And it would be for the first time in the history of this country that the Federal Government had either produced a product or certified a product to be produced by the private sector, required every American citizen to purchase that product; and if they didn't do so, levy a fine against them and then have them facing a jail term. That's the kind of debtor's prison that our Founding Fathers rejected. I use stark terms, but that's where it takes us up in our logic.

I will say, Mr. Speaker, that we are at this point now where the nuances of these bills, we know what's in them, that anything that is likely to pass

this House and go to the President's desk, he will be sitting there with pen in hand to sign. He is salivating to sign something that is called national health care that he can call ObamaCare and does call ObamaCare. He is for single-payer. He is for socialized medicine. He has said that he is for single-payer. So has the Speaker, and so has HARRY REID. So this is about whether we keep our freedom, whether we keep the Federal Government from nationalizing and taking over our bodies like they did at General Motors and Chrysler.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I think a very, very basic question is this. There is a notion of healthy skepticism within our government and our view of government. We grow up with that. That is part and parcel of the Constitution. But if you move from healthy skepticism to destructive, not skepticism, but cynicism, then you have really ruptured the relationship between the American people and their government.

And if we were to ignore the voices of the American people as they have been articulated in town hall after town hall after town hall throughout this country, not just in August—I had my last town hall meeting this Monday; 250 people in one of my communities, overwhelming opposition not to some changes in health care—they are not arguing for the status quo—they are arguing against these two visions of health care reform. And they ask me, they beg me to bring a message here from them directly: scrap what you're doing, start over, give us the right medicine, not the wrong medicine.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank the gentlemen. My time has expired.

□ 1345

HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, we've heard a lot about health care today and for the past month and, actually, for the past year as this issue has been debated as one of the most important things facing this country and the people in all our districts. We know that we need better access to health care. We need more affordable health care. We need to protect Medicare as we move forward with meaningful reforms. These reforms need to include issues involving the insurance companies, the insurance companies that are today advertising on television against reform, are sending their lobbyists to the Hill against reform, who are resisting any kind of meaningful reform in hopes of protecting their bottom line. I welcome additional comments from some of my colleagues.

I will reserve my time for a few minutes.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) is recognized for 54 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under the rules of the House on a Special Order, is it appropriate for a Member to yield to someone else when they've been recognized for 60 minutes?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Speaker's announced policy allows for the leadership hour to be subdivided among designees.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend our time to 1 hour. Do I have 54 minutes?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has 54 minutes.

Ms. WATSON. Fifty-four. Thank you.

Madam Speaker, I would like to yield time to Congressman GARAMENDI from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you very much, Congresswoman. As you recall, you and I have had a long, long history of dealing with health care issues. In the late 1970s, I was chairman of the California State senate health committee, and when I left that post, you took it over. And over those many, many years that you and I worked on health care, we are now approaching the final moment in which this Nation will take up an extraordinarily important task, and that is moving towards providing health insurance and health care for all of the citizens in this country.

It's going to be a very, very busy week next week. Over the last hour or so, I've heard from our esteemed colleagues on the Republican side talk about a rush to judgment. It was not a rush to judgment if you consider the 30 years that you and I have been spending, trying to provide health care services for all the people in California, and now we have this opportunity to deal with this issue here for the entire Nation.

It certainly wasn't a work to rush to judgment in the early part of the 20th century when, in California and across the Nation, men and women were being injured on the job, and to deal with that, the Workers' Compensation programs were created. Even Teddy Roosevelt back in those periods said that we needed to have a health care system for all. It didn't happen then. During the World War II period and before it, the Blue Cross-Blue Shield programs were developed by the medical community to provide services. But again, it

wasn't universal, and it wasn't available to all.

Later during World War II, I remember in California and on the west coast, Kaiser Industries found that their workers were getting sick. Actually, it was during the Depression when they were building the dam on the Colorado River. And so they started what has become known as Kaiser Permanente to provide health care to their workers beyond just the Workers' Compensation program. In the 1960s, we made a major step forward here in America with Medicare and then following it with Medicaid. An enormous debate erupted, but progress was made, and a universal program was made available to every person—every legal citizen, legal person in this Nation who attained the age of 65.

And I noted with some humor that at the President's summit, just I think about 10 days ago, men and women were sitting around the table, nearly all of whom—excluding the President and I think just two others—actually belong to a single-payer universal health care program called Medicare. Yet many of those people said they wouldn't want anything to do with a single-payer universal health care system, but yet they were participating in such a system.

So we have been at this a long, long time, and in this House, the debate on how to finish the process began 1 year ago. So there's no rush to judgment here, nor is there a rush to judgment. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Ms. WATSON. One of the things I would like to make perfectly clear in this debate. I was listening to the former hour from my office, and I heard over and over and over again how we are cramming the unknown through. Now prior to this whole new concept of reconciliation, I remember the other side coming down with 2,700 pages and talking about what was in those pages and also mentioning to us, Madam Speaker, that they had their staff reading through every single word. Now I heard them say, Congressman GARAMENDI, that we're cramming the unknown through. This is highly, highly unreasonable and a misstatement. We intended and we set out to address the 38 million uninsured. If you have insurance—and I want the public to hear this—the original intent was to cover the 38 million uninsured. And by the way, Congressman GARAMENDI, 8 million of that 38 million is in California, our State, and 6 million of those are children. Would we not want to cover health care for our children?

Mr. GARAMENDI. If I might for a moment, Congresswoman WATSON—absolutely. It would seem to be the fundamental compassion of a human being to make sure that their children and the community's children, indeed our Nation's children, have health care. And we should extend that well beyond to all of us. It is not in our interest as human beings who presumably have

compassion to leave people without health care.

□ 1400

We are not rushing to judgment here. We have been at this in America for more than a century. And this House has been at it for a year, heavily debated. I was just elected to Congress back in November, came here 3 days later, and voted on a bill that you and others had worked on for the previous 10 months.

So here we are with the House having passed its bill, the Senate having passed a bill back Christmas Eve, I think 72 days ago. That bill has been available. It is my understanding that next week we may have an opportunity to vote on the Senate bill and send that to the President and then follow up with corrections to the Senate bill that are desired by both Houses, such things as eliminating that little advantage that was given to Nebraska and other corrections to the bill.

So this is not something that is being rushed to judgment. In fact, it has been debated for a century. It has been debated in this House. Back in the Clinton period, there was a major debate going on during that period of time.

Ms. WATSON. This is not mystery content. What we are going to be considering are the issues that both sides can agree on. We should have health insurance that is affordable, health insurance that is accessible, and with the great expanse of land in California, where you go to get your health care needs to be accessible to you, and not in another town like it is in so many areas of our districts.

Mr. GARAMENDI. One of the things that was in both the Senate bill and the House bill was an effort to expand access to care, not just with an insurance policy, but also with facilities. There were major improvements and significant sums of money available to expand community clinics, where most poor people, where many young children and people that are moving from one town to another are able to get their care. That is an enormous expansion of services. So what is wrong with providing a facility, community care? It happens to be good care, and it happens to be very well priced.

Ms. WATSON. I think of your district, over an expanse of land. I have gone to other districts in Colorado with DIANA DEGETTE, and we drove for miles all within her district, town to town. So the community clinics will be accessible to people who live in remote areas. Then we all agreed that we wanted to cover preexisting conditions.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Let's talk about that. I was the insurance commissioner in California 1991 to 1995, 4 years, and then again in 2003 to 2008. And in that 8-year period I saw horrible things being done by the health insurance industry in the way in which they discriminated. There are many lessons I learned, but one of the principal ones is for the private health insurance com-

panies it is profit before people; do whatever you need to do to enhance your profits. And you just mentioned one of the ways, which is various mechanisms to discriminate, preexisting conditions.

Let me give you an example. I know of a young woman that had been on her family's health insurance program for 23 years. She turned 23, and under the current law a 23-year-old can no longer be on their parents' care. Under the bills that will be before us for final review hopefully next week is a proposal to extend that to 26 years.

But for her that wasn't yet law, so she went out searching for insurance. It turns out she went back to the company that had insured her for 23 years. And the company said, oh, we can't insure you. She asked why. You have a preexisting condition. It turns out the condition was acne. The list of conditions that would exclude you from coverage called preexisting conditions is about three pages long for most insurance companies, which basically say if you are a woman in the child-bearing age group you are not going to get coverage. Why? Because you might actually have a child. My goodness, that is expensive. We are not talking about family friendly policies here, are we? But that is reality. For this young woman she was excluded on the excuse of a preexisting condition.

Now, I happen to have been familiar with this woman and I said let me see, let me get on the computer and see what this is all about. So I entered her name, came out she was excluded. I went back and entered her name as a male, and she got coverage. Something seriously wrong. And the bills before us next week will eliminate that kind of discrimination, preexisting conditions, as well as discrimination because you happen to be a woman. Those days will be over.

Ms. WATSON. I am so appreciative of your knowledge. You live in an area that is a valley in Sacramento, California. I went up to Sacramento, and I spent 20 years there; and I inherited the health committee, as you have already mentioned, from you. I had it for 17 years. And I found out that I had allergies. I spent years and years trying to find out why I had these allergies. Then I found that in this valley the allergens collect. And I found out that I was allergic to grass, tree bark, cat hair, the CBCs, that material on the wall.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I am sorry, Congresswoman, but you are uninsurable. You cannot get a health care policy.

Ms. WATSON. Exactly. Exactly.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Unless you happen to live until you are 65. When you are 65, you will automatically be eligible for a single-payer universal health care program called Medicare. People want to live long enough to get into that system. And at that White House meeting most of the graybeards there were 65, and they belonged to that system.

Ms. WATSON. Well, I finally made 65 and went beyond.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I don't believe it.

Ms. WATSON. I did. Way beyond. But the point I am trying to make here is that Americans deserve health care. If you have an insurance company that covers you and your family and you like it, you keep it. And I want to make this perfectly clear to the public that many meetings were held.

Many meetings were held here in Congress. No bill gets out of committee that has not been voted on. And a majority vote will get the bill out of committee. We hold our meetings in front of the public. When a bill goes to a committee, it is held, and it is spoken to, it is marked up in front of the public. So I want to make that perfectly clear to the viewing audience and the listening audience out there.

We did nothing in a closed smokey room. We don't really smoke in all of our rooms. Some people do. In California, we have a policy that you cannot smoke in any enclosure or outside. You can smoke in your own homes, however.

So everything that was in the bill that we are going to consider has been discussed in the public. You were not here for all of those discussions, but you follow policymaking because you served with distinction in the California legislature. You served as a statewide officer, and you know something about this. And thank you for tuning in to what we were doing here.

But our premise was we ought to have a single-payer so that every American can feel that they are covered. If we want to keep costs down, we are going to keep people healthy. And we even have a provision that allows medical students to be able to get grants and scholarships if they then commit to becoming a general practitioner so that people can go, particularly to these clinics or to their hospitals, their doctors' offices, and stay healthy. That is what is going to save money.

We are not doing this, Mr. Speaker and Congressman GARAMENDI, to increase the deficit. It is just the opposite. We are doing it to save Americans money. Because if you don't have good health care and coverage and you have a sick child and that child has a fever, what are you going to do? You are going to take that child into where you see that flashing light, that neon light. That is emergency. That is a costly area in a hospital. And if that child is acutely ill, the next stop will be in the surgical suite. And that is where the cost goes up.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Congresswoman WATSON, you are very, very aware of all of these, having served those many years in the California legislature, here, and also as an ambassador. And you understand what apparently our colleagues on the other side tend to miss, and that is that the cost is in the system. And because there are so many uninsured who do wind up in the emergency room, the cost actually goes up.

Now, for a variety of reasons I was at an emergency room in Sacramento

over the weekend, and it was plain to see that there were a variety of people there. Most of them did not have a true emergency from perhaps an auto accident. They were there with a cold, with the flu; and they were waiting.

Now, America has been waiting. And they are in a waiting room that is extraordinarily expensive, as you said. The bills, the Senate bill as well as the House bill, address this in two ways. First of all, they provide the health insurance so that a person can go to the doctor before they become seriously ill and go to the clinic, go to the doctor's office rather than to the expensive emergency room. That is one way they save money. The second way is there are a variety of elements in the Senate bill as well as the House bill specifically designed to reduce the cost in the system. You mentioned one: stay healthy. Smoking: we know that if we can keep people healthy we reduce the overall costs.

There are provisions in the bill to advance wellness. Great. There are also provisions in the bill to deal with the extraordinary administrative costs in the system. One of them, which I heard our colleagues on the other side of the aisle demean, is a national benefit package, a uniform benefit package across the Nation.

Now, I know from my experience as insurance commissioner doctors, insurance companies are faced with hundreds of different kinds of policies, different deductibles, different copays. The result of that is extraordinary administrative cost. One way of dealing with it is to have a national benefit available through what are called exchanges, which are pools which insurance companies can get involved in, creating a large actuarial, a large group so the actuarial cost, the actual cost is reduced per person. And also allowing competition to exist, which is the other third way. There will be competition within the pools.

So you have got a uniform benefit, you have competition, you have a national nonprofit company operating within those exchanges. So that would provide additional competition. So you have got competition keeping prices down.

And on this floor 2 weeks ago we passed a major change in the antitrust laws applying the antitrust laws to the health insurance. So within this area of legislation that will be voted on next week are major efforts to reduce the costs. And I have only begun. I have gone through three of what I think are half a dozen different ways to reduce the costs in the system. So much so that the Congressional Budget Office estimates that the reforms that will be before us will actually reduce the national deficit in the decade ahead and in the out-years, more than a trillion-dollar reduction in the national deficit as a result of these reforms.

Ms. WATSON. Congressman, we have been waiting for the CBO to then give us some idea of what these reforms will

cost and how they will reduce the costs of health care here in America. We were hoping that we would have gotten that information today. We do have to give everyone 72 hours to look at the bill before we can bring it up. So we are waiting to get the cost estimate on this new proposal, and we do expect it to come in lower than anticipated. Thank you for giving that information.

□ 1415

Mr. GARAMENDI. The figures I was giving you are based on the Senate bill. Now, the additional changes that are going to be made, corrections to the Senate bill, will provide, we are quite confident, additional reductions in the cost of the total bill and reductions in the national deficit in the years ahead.

The other thing that needs to be understood is that these cost reductions will be real, and many will be available in the near term, others as we learn how to implement the medical technology so that we have records that are readily available. So we will be able to see significant reductions in cost, as we have already discussed.

One of the things that will also be available as a result of this legislation is the availability of medical providers. You touched on this and hit it hard, and we need to emphasize it once again. There is a lot of discussion like the bill has too many pages, some say. Well, many of those pages specifically deal with making sure that the medical providers are there, extending the availability of loans and programs for primary care doctors, for nurses, for nurse practitioners. And I recall, years ago you carried the nurse practitioner legislation in California.

Ms. WATSON. One of the misstatements I hear over and over again is that government that doesn't do anything right will be running the system, and that is a misconception, and I want everyone to hear me. We do cover the conversation between the patient and the doctor to determine end-of-life care. It will be covered for the first time. They called it death panels. It is just the opposite.

You know, you ought to have a right to discuss with your practitioner, with your doctor, what your quality of life should be.

Mr. GARAMENDI. How to deal with what will inevitably be the final days for all of us. We would want that to be in the interest of the individual and the individual's family. Right now, many doctors cannot do that.

Ms. WATSON. We allow you to tell your doctor, and it will be covered, who has the durable power of attorney; where your will is; do you want to be resuscitated; do you want to have these kinds of treatments or not. This is a discussion that will be covered. Government does not have this discussion. The patient and the doctor will have that discussion.

Mr. GARAMENDI. That is the way it should be, but the way it often is, it is the insurance company that makes the

decision. I cannot begin to count the number of times when I was insurance commissioner that complaints would be brought to me that the insurance company decided that this young girl was going to die because she was not going to get treatment for her leukemia. This is not unusual.

In California last year, the statistics collected by the Department of Managed Health Care showed that the five largest insurance companies that cover most everybody in California, the denial of claims and the denial of services ranged from 25 to 40 percent. So it is the insurance company, not the doctor or the patient, that is making the decision. It is the insurance company.

Now, on the other side of it, in Medicare and in Medi-Cal, you don't see those kinds of denials. There are denials for things that are inappropriate.

So we know in the reforms that are coming before us, we open the door for the patient and the medical practitioner, the doctor, the nurse, to have that relationship to make the decision on what is the appropriate care. That is not the case today. It is the insurance company, all too often, that is making the judgment on whether a treatment will be available.

Ms. WATSON. Congressman GARAMENDI, you know this, a few weeks ago, Anthem Blue Cross, the California Blue Cross program, announced to its consumers that they will have a 39, almost a 40 percent raise in their fees. If we did nothing in the State of California, it would cost a family \$1,800 annually for coverage.

Now, we had a series of community forums.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I think that is \$1,800 a month.

Ms. WATSON. It would raise their coverage up \$1,800.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Yes, additional cost.

Ms. WATSON. We had a series of town halls and so on, and I will never forget this man. He had a heavy accent, but he was an American citizen. He said he worked three jobs, and he said, My 2-year-old became ill, and even with my three jobs, I was not able to afford an insurance policy and could not get coverage for her, and she died. We should never get that testimony in the United States of America.

Mr. GARAMENDI. That is yet again an example of what is seen every day in every community in this Nation. There is a denial of coverage by the insurance companies. And for those who have no insurance, they face a situation of death, bankruptcy, and the loss of their jobs. It is not necessary.

Now, we have talked about the cost in the system, and perhaps this is where we will let this discussion end today. This Nation is spending 17.5 percent of its total wealth on health care. Our competitors around the world, not including China, which is completely different, but the other industrialized nations of the world, Japan, Korea, the European countries, spend 10 percent

or less of their wealth on health care. In all of those countries, they have universally available health care, different kinds of systems, but it is universally available. We are spending 17.5. They are spending 10. You would think with that additional expenditure we would be healthier. Unfortunately, we are not. We don't live as long. Our children die earlier. Our women die in childbirth more often. Our health care statistics rank us in the range of the nation of Colombia. This is a tragedy for America, and it is a blot on our reputation in America.

The legislation before us will begin to address that by providing better health care services, as we have discussed with the clinics and other reforms that are taking place; access to health care, because of the expansion of insurance to some 30 million Americans that don't presently have it; and control of the insurance companies. So no more preexisting conditions, no more game playing and discrimination and post-event underwriting, which is you get sick and suddenly your insurance is cancelled. Those things are gone.

We are also, in this legislation, controlling the cost of health care in America so that our Nation can once again revive its competitiveness, so we spend our money on education and manufacturing and the things that create a strong economy and a strong society with health care. That is our goal.

And the great opportunity that you and I have, and all 432 Members of this House and the 100 Members of the Senate and the President have, is to finally close the gap—finally, after a century of effort—to provide a system that covers Americans with a health insurance program that has the quality and the benefits that they need.

I know you have been there. You have been there since I first met you in 1976 in California and the years you have been here. So, Congresswoman WATSON, it is a great privilege to engage in this dialogue with you.

Ms. WATSON. I would just like to conclude by saying I serve on the International Relations Committee. We travel the globe. I served as an ambassador. I taught school in my twenties in the Far East and over in Europe. And so I have been around this world many, many times. Our status has dropped among other nations. My intent is to continue to lift the status of the most wonderful country in the world, and we are only as strong as our weakest link.

It amazes me to hear the criticism, to hear people rant over delivering health care rather than reason over delivering health care, when I know that they happily nodded their heads to spending \$15 billion a month on a war that has not really benefited the United States much, and that is the war in Iraq. And no one complained about adding to the deficit then. And now we come up with a health care re-

form that we want to strengthen America's children, America's adults, all Americans. And to think that would be the cause for these tirades we hear is beyond reason.

So I really appreciate you enriching this House with your experience and your knowledge. And I am a little prejudiced because you are from California, but I think your background helps to give understanding to our audience, Americans, that we are doing this for the benefit of all Americans.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Mr. JONES (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. WALDEN (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of attending a memorial service in the district.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of illness caused by food poisoning.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PERLMUTTER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GARAMENDI, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. FOX) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WHITFIELD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, March 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19.

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, March 19.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, March 19.

Mr. DREIER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. FOX, for 5 minutes, today and March 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19.

(The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. BERKLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 15, 2010, at 12:30 p.m., for morning-hour debate.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Speaker-Authorized Official Travel during the third and fourth quarters of 2009 and the first quarter of 2010 pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO KUWAIT AND AFGHANISTAN, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 15 AND JAN. 18, 2010

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. Loretta Sanchez	1/15	1/18	Kuwait/Afghanistan		245		229.50		5,143.77		5,618.27
Hon. Jean Schmidt	1/15	1/18	Kuwait/Afghanistan		245						245.00
Hon. Suzanne Kosmas	1/15	1/18	Kuwait/Afghanistan		245						245.00
Hon. Laura Richardson	1/15	1/18	Kuwait/Afghanistan		245						245.00
Hon. Dina Titus	1/15	1/18	Kuwait/Afghanistan		245						245.00
Hon. Judy Chu	1/15	1/18	Kuwait/Afghanistan		245						245.00
Debra Wada	1/15	1/18	Kuwait/Afghanistan		245						245.00
Lynn Williams	1/15	1/18	Kuwait/Afghanistan		245						245.00
Committee total					1,960.00		229.50		5,143.77		7,578.27

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. LORETTA SANCHEZ, Feb. 18, 2010.

(AMENDED) REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 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. Gus M. Bilirakis	8/4	8/5	Turkey		300.00		(³)				
	8/5	8/6	Afghanistan		26.00		(³)				
	8/6	8/7	Qatar		341.00		(³)				
	8/7	8/8	Kuwait		416.60		(³)				
	8/8	8/9	Iraq				(³)				
Hon. Sheila Jackson Lee	8/9	8/10	Germany		310.00		(³)				
	8/16	8/17	Liberia		420.00		(³)				
	8/17	8/19	Ghana		694.00		(³)				
	8/19	8/20	Nigeria		1,027.28						
							4,528.20				
	8/27	8/30	Tunisia		1,111.97		(³)				
	8/30	9/2	Rwanda		625.00		(³)				
	9/2	9/3	Zimbabwe		317.00		(³)				
	9/3	9/4	Senegal		393.00		(³)				
	Committee total				5,981.25		4,528.20				

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.

⁴ One-way Airfare.

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN, Chairman, Feb. 19, 2010.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, 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. Bob Filner	11/21	11/28	Philippines		1,337.00						1,337.00
Tony Buckles	11/21	11/28	Philippines		1,337.00						1,337.00
Jian Zapata	11/21	11/28	Philippines		1,337.00						1,337.00
Committee total											

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. BOB FILNER, Chairman, Feb. 26, 2010.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, 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
Behnaz Kibria	9/30	10/02	Haiti		482.00		1,250.80				1,732.80
Angela Ellard	9/30	10/02	Haiti		482.00		1,250.80				1,732.80
Hon. Sander Levin	11/10	11/12	Singapore		1,459.00		10,098.70		929.00		12,486.70
Hon. Kevin Brady	11/11	11/12	Singapore		1,459.00		8,391.20				9,850.20
Jason Kearns	11/10	11/12	Singapore		1,203.00		9,890.70				11,093.70
David Thomas	11/12	11/14	Singapore		1,254.00		10,439.80				11,693.80
Hon. Ron Kind	11/11	11/14	Pakistan		1,267.00		11,901.10				13,168.10
	11/14	11/15	England		458.00						458.00
Angela Ellard	11/30	12/03	Switzerland		1,947.00		6,144.90				8,091.90
Evan Alexander	11/30	12/03	Switzerland		1,947.00		6,144.90				8,091.90
Vijaya Rangaswami	11/30	12/02	Switzerland		1,332.61		8,020.90				9,343.51
George York	11/30	12/03	Switzerland		1,670.31		6,144.90				7,815.21

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 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. Brian Higgins	12/27	12/28	United Arab Emirates		387.72		7,755.10				8,142.82
	12/28	12/29	Afghanistan		75.00						75.00
	12/29	12/30	United Arab Emirates		748.13						748.13
Committee total					16,161.77		87,433.80		929.00		104,524.57

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. CHARLES B. RANGEL, Chairman, Feb. 22, 2010.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6549. A letter from the Regulatory Analyst, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Registration, Five Year Terms (RIN: 0580-AB03) received February 17, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6550. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Acetamidrid; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0289; FRL-8809-9] received February 16, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6551. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance; Technical Amendment [EPA-AQ-OPP-2008-0923; FRL-8809-4] received February 16, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6552. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Inert Ingredients; Extension of Effective Date of Revocation of Certain Tolerance Exemptions with Insufficient Data for Reassessment [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0601; FRL-8812-3] received February 16, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6553. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Acquisition Strategies to Ensure Competition throughout the Life Cycle of Major Defense Acquisition Programs (DFARS Case 2009-D014) (RIN: 0750-AG61) received February 17, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6554. A letter from the Chair, Congressional Oversight Panel, transmitting the Panel's monthly report pursuant to Section 125(b)(1) of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008, Pub. L. 110-343; to the Committee on Financial Services.

6555. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Turkey pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

6556. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Requirements for Consumer Registration of Durable Infant

or Toddler Products; Final Rule received February 5, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6557. A letter from the Administrator, Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "Emissions of Greenhouse Gases in the United States 2008", pursuant to Public Law 102-486, section 1605(a); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6558. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Georgia: Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference [GA-200922; FRL-9097-5] received February 16, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6559. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Louisiana; Baton Rouge 1-Hour Ozone Non-attainment Area; Determination of Attainment of the 1-Hour Ozone Standard [EPA-R06-OAR-2009-0014; FRL-9113-5] received February 16, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6560. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Control of Carbon Monoxide Emissions from Basic Oxygen Furnaces [EPA-R03-OAR-2010-0010; FRL-9111-7] received February 16, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6561. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia; Removal of NOx SIP Call Rules [EPA-R03-OAR-2009-0706; FRL-9111-5] received February 16, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6562. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of Air Quality Implementation Plans; New Mexico; Albuquerque/Bernalillo County [EPA-R06-OAR-2006-0569; FRL-9112-1] received February 16, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6563. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Delegation of National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Source Categories; State of Arizona, Maricopa County Air Quality Department; State of Nevada, Nevada Division of

Environmental Protection, Washoe County District Health Department [EPA-R09-OAR-2010-0044; FRL-9111-2] received February 16, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6564. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Policies to Promote Rural Radio Service and to Streamline Allotment and Assignment Procedures [MD Docket No.: 09-52] received February 17, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6565. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Review of the Commission's Program Access Rules and Examination of Programming Tying Arrangements [MB Docket No.: 07-198] received January 29, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6566. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Legislative and Public Affairs, Agency for International Development, transmitting the agency's response to the GAO's report "UN OFFICE FOR PROJECT SERVICES: Management Reforms Proceeding but Effectiveness Not Assessed, and USAID's Oversight of Grants Has Weaknesses" GAO-10-168; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6567. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting report on proposed obligations of funds provided for the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6568. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 3(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, certification regarding the proposed transfer of major defense equipment to Turkish Aerospace Industries (Transmittal No. RSAT-09-1973); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6569. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Communications and Legislative Affairs, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting the Commission's Annual Sunshine Act Report for 2009; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6570. A letter from the Chairman, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting the Board's FY 2010 — FY 2015 Strategic Plan; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6571. A letter from the Chairman, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting the Board's report entitled "Fair & Equitable Treatment: Progress Made and Challenges Remaining", pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 1204(a)(3); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6572. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's annual accomplishments report during Fiscal Year 2009; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6573. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Regulation: Areas of the National Park System, National Capital Region; Correction [Docket No.: E8-27047] (RIN: 1024-AD71) received February 17, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6574. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Species; Designation of Critical Habitat for North Pacific Right Whale [Docket No.: 070717354-8251-02] (RIN: 0648-AV73) received February 5, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6575. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Species; Final Threatened Listing Determination, Final Protective Regulations, and Final Designation of Critical Habitat for the Oregon Coast Evolutionary Significant Unit of Coho Salmon [Docket No.: 071227892-7894-01] (RIN: 0648-AW39) received February 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6576. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Commercial Shark Management Measures [Docket No.: 0906221072-91425-02] (RIN: 0648-AX95) received January 16, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6577. A letter from the Director, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's report on the activities of the Community Relations Service (CRS) for Fiscal Year 2009, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2000g-3; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6578. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Regulatory Products Division, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Professional Conduct for Practitioners: Rules, Procedures, Representation, and Appearances [Docket No.: DHS-2009-0077] (RIN: 1601-AA58) received February 22, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6579. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Criminal and Civil Penalties Under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act [Docket ID: FEMA-2009-0007] (RIN: 1660-AA01) received February 5, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6580. A letter from the Administrator, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Federal Aviation Administration's Capital Investment Plan (CIP) for fiscal years 2011-2015, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. app. 2203(b)(1); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6581. A letter from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Amtrak, National Railroad Passenger Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's FY 2011 General and Legislative annual report, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 24315(b); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6582. A letter from the Director, of Regulations Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — VA Veteran-Owned Small Business Verification Guidelines (RIN: 2900-AM78) received February 5, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

6583. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's "2010 Annual Plan for the Ultra-Deepwater and Unconventional Natural Gas and Other Petroleum Resources Research and Development Program"; jointly to the Committees on Science and Technology and Natural Resources.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. OBERSTAR: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. House Resolution 1125. Resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Public Works Week, and for other purposes (Rept. 111-440). 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. WHITFIELD:
H.R. 4835. A bill to allow an employer to pay an H-2A worker the Federal minimum wage or the prevailing wage in a case where the employer pays either wage to United States citizens similarly employed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER:
H.R. 4836. A bill to amend part D of title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide grants to schools for the development of asthma management plans and the purchase of asthma inhalers and spacers for emergency use, as necessary; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:
H.R. 4837. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CASTLE (for himself, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. HOLT, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. COURTNEY, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. PASCRELL):
H.R. 4838. A bill to make the Northeast Corridor eligible for high-speed rail corridor development grants under section 26106 of title 49, United States Code; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Mr. ROSKAM, and Mr. TIBERI):
H.R. 4839. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income contributions to the capital of a partnership, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIBERI (for himself, Mr. DRIEHAUS, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. TURNER, Mr. JORDAN of Ohio, Mr. LATTA, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. LATOURETTE, Ms. KILROY, Mr. BOCCIERI, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SPACE, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. AUSTRIA, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KUCINICH, and Ms. FUDGE):
H.R. 4840. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1979 Cleveland Avenue in Columbus, Ohio, as the "Clarence D. Lumpkin Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:
H.R. 4841. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax relief for

small businesses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROUN of Georgia (for himself, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Ms. FOXX, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. HARPER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mrs. BACHMANN, and Mr. CONAWAY):

H. Res. 1175. A resolution expressing support for designation of the first weekend of May as Ten Commandments Weekend to recognize the significant contributions the Ten Commandments have made to shaping Western civilization and the vital role they played in the development of the institutions and national character of the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. HODES:
H. Res. 1176. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to ban congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, and limited tariff benefits; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MINNICK (for himself and Mr. SIMPSON):
H. Res. 1177. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to prohibit congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, and limited tariff benefits; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:
H. Res. 1178. A resolution directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to compile the cost estimates prepared by the Congressional Budget Office which are included in reports filed by committees of the House on approved legislation and post such estimates on the official public Internet site of the Office of the Clerk; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:
H. Res. 1179. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that biotechnology firms meeting small business standards are critical to the United States, its people and its economy because they create new medicines, services, and jobs and meet unmet needs related to populations and patients with infectious and chronic diseases, including those of medically underserved populations; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (for himself, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. FALBOMVAEGA, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ):

H. Res. 1180. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the policy of the United States on wild animals at the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MCCOTTER (for himself and Mr. POE of Texas):

H. Res. 1181. A resolution calling on the United Nations General Assembly to reject the Islamic Republic of Iran's bid to join the United Nations Human Rights Council; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

241. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of New Mexico, relative to Senate Memorial 30 urging the Congress to expedite the passage of legislation to provide funding to reclaim abandoned uranium mines; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

242. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 1001 supporting the prompt enactment of a well-funded, multi-year federal surface transportation program; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

243. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Resolution No. 27 urging the Congress to revise the requirements for federal guardianship assistance funding; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

- H.R. 43: Mr. BARROW, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. GRIFFITH.
- H.R. 197: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
- H.R. 213: Mr. UPTON.
- H.R. 275: Mr. ROONEY.
- H.R. 391: Mr. INGLIS.
- H.R. 442: Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. CHANDLER.
- H.R. 444: Mr. OWENS.
- H.R. 618: Mr. SIRES.
- H.R. 636: Mr. UPTON.
- H.R. 816: Mr. KLINE of Minnesota.
- H.R. 1020: Mr. MAFFEL.
- H.R. 1024: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
- H.R. 1177: Mr. BOCCIERI, Mr. MURPHY of New York, and Mr. PETERSON.
- H.R. 1310: Mr. QUIGLEY.
- H.R. 1410: Mr. KISSELL, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. RICHARDSON.
- H.R. 1458: Mr. ROSS and Mr. SCHAUER.
- H.R. 1585: Mr. COLE.
- H.R. 1695: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
- H.R. 1755: Mr. MINNICK.
- H.R. 1806: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. LIPINSKI.
- H.R. 2000: Mr. TONKO, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. TERRY, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. SCHWARTZ, and Mrs. BIGGERT.
- H.R. 2275: Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. JONES, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. PITTS, Mr. EHLERS, and Mr. HOLT.
- H.R. 2296: Mr. WELCH and Mr. PETRI.
- H.R. 2361: Mr. WU and Mr. GRJALVA.
- H.R. 2373: Mr. SOUDER.
- H.R. 2406: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.
- H.R. 2421: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. ELLISON.
- H.R. 2565: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
- H.R. 2568: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
- H.R. 2597: Mr. KENNEDY.
- H.R. 2676: Mr. MARSHALL.
- H.R. 2737: Ms. NORTON and Mr. KISSELL.
- H.R. 2866: Mr. PITTS, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. TIAHRT.
- H.R. 2882: Mr. SCHIFF.
- H.R. 3131: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
- H.R. 3140: Mr. TIAHRT.
- H.R. 3188: Mr. SOUDER.
- H.R. 3240: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.
- H.R. 3431: Mr. COLE.
- H.R. 3623: Mr. COHEN.
- H.R. 3670: Mr. FILNER.
- H.R. 3680: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
- H.R. 3734: Mr. FILNER.
- H.R. 3904: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
- H.R. 3922: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
- H.R. 3934: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.
- H.R. 3990: Mr. QUIGLEY and Ms. NORTON.
- H.R. 4005: Mr. CAPUANO.
- H.R. 4014: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
- H.R. 4054: Mr. CHANDLER, Ms. DELAURO, and Ms. ROS-LEHTNEN.
- H.R. 4114: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
- H.R. 4132: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. ROONEY.

- H.R. 4148: Mr. TONKO.
- H.R. 4150: Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CARTER, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. HALL of Texas.
- H.R. 4196: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey and Mr. MCINTYRE.
- H.R. 4202: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SESTAK, and Mr. HINCHEY.
- H.R. 4229: Ms. NORTON, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.
- H.R. 4241: Mr. ROE of Tennessee and Mr. SALAZAR.
- H.R. 4255: Mr. TONKO and Mrs. CAPITO.
- H.R. 4274: Mr. SERRANO and Mr. SESTAK.
- H.R. 4278: Mr. POLIS.
- H.R. 4306: Mr. SCHOCK.
- H.R. 4320: Ms. BORDALLO and Mr. HEINRICH.
- H.R. 4324: Mr. LUJÁN.
- H.R. 4371: Mr. OLSON, Mr. YARMUTH, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
- H.R. 4420: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
- H.R. 4533: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. PAYNE.
- H.R. 4545: Mr. DEFAZIO.
- H.R. 4557: Mr. CONYERS.
- H.R. 4596: Mr. COHEN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. HARE.
- H.R. 4629: Mr. CARNAHAN.
- H.R. 4656: Mr. ROONEY.
- H.R. 4662: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
- H.R. 4663: Mr. KAGEN and Mr. POLIS of Colorado.
- H.R. 4683: Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. CHAFFETZ, and Mr. FLAKE.
- H.R. 4720: Mr. MICA.
- H.R. 4732: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
- H.R. 4733: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. STARK, and Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.
- H.R. 4753: Mr. WALZ, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, and Mr. MELANCON.
- H.R. 4755: Mr. LEE of New York.
- H.R. 4785: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
- H.R. 4788: Mr. HARE and Mr. SIRES.
- H.R. 4790: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
- H.R. 4812: Mr. OLVER and Mr. TONKO.
- H.R. 4820: Ms. CHU.
- H.J. Res. 74: Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.
- H.J. Res. 78: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. SPACE.
- H. Con. Res. 16: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.
- H. Con. Res. 192: Mr. SOUDER.
- H. Con. Res. 201: Mr. STEARNS, Mr. JONES, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. COLE, and Mr. RADANOVICH.
- H. Con. Res. 232: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
- H. Con. Res. 244: Mr. SOUDER.
- H. Con. Res. 252: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. QUIGLEY.
- H. Res. 173: Mr. PAYNE and Ms. BORDALLO.
- H. Res. 236: Mr. SHERMAN.
- H. Res. 486: Mr. SHERMAN.
- H. Res. 870: Mr. INGLIS.
- H. Res. 919: Mr. KAGEN.
- H. Res. 929: Mr. PAYNE.
- H. Res. 947: Ms. KILROY, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, and Mr. HINCHEY.
- H. Res. 982: Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. THORNBERRY, and Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.
- H. Res. 1034: Mr. SESTAK.
- H. Res. 1053: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Ms. BALDWIN.
- H. Res. 1058: Mr. SHERMAN.
- H. Res. 1063: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.
- H. Res. 1089: Mr. RUSH, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. BEAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KIRK, Mrs. HALVORSON, Mr. COSTELLO, Mrs. BIGGERT,

- Mr. FOSTER, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. SCHOCK, and Mr. SHIMKUS.
 - H. Res. 1099: Ms. RICHARDSON.
 - H. Res. 1103: Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Ms. FOXX, Mr. BOREN, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. DENT, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MACK, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. BONNER, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.
 - H. Res. 1116: Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. PETERS, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. MURPHY of New York, and Mr. SESTAK.
 - H. Res. 1148: Mr. UPTON, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. INSLER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. TANNER, Mr. DREIER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. KIRK, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. HOLT, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WALZ, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. FILNER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Ms. CHU, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. WELCH, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Ms. HARMAN.
 - H. Res. 1155: Mr. WAXMAN and Ms. WOOLSEY.
 - H. Res. 1157: Mr. BAIRD, Mr. WATT, and Mr. BOYD.
 - H. Res. 1174: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. FILNER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. MAFFEL, Mr. FARR, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. CAO, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mrs. BIGGERT, and Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN.
- CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS
- Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:
- The amendment to be offered by Representative FLAKE, or a designee, to H.R. 3650, the harmful Algal Blooms and Hypoxia Research and Control Amendments Act of 2009, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9(d), 9(e), or 9(f) of rule XXI.
- PETITIONS, ETC.
- Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:
107. The SPEAKER presented a petition of City of Kansas City, Missouri, relative to Resolution No. 100112, as amended, urging the President and the Congress of the United States to repeal the "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy; to the Committee on Armed Services.
108. Also, a petition of City of North Miami Beach, Florida, relative to Resolution No.

R2010-8 urging the President and the Congress of the United States to automatically waive all application fees for Haitians apply-

ing for Temporary Protected Status; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

109. Also, a petition of City and County of Honolulu, Hawaii, relative to Resolution No.

10-8 urging the Congress of the United States to support and pass S. 2757, the Military Families Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN MEMORY OF DARCY POHLAND

HON. KEITH ELLISON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 2010

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, it is with great sadness I rise today to mourn the passing of my friend and Minnesota news pioneer, Darcy Pohland.

Ms. Pohland was born in Mendota Heights, Minnesota and graduated from Sibley High School. She started her career as an intern at WCCO-TV's Washington, D.C. bureau while attending George Washington University.

In 1963 Pohland accidentally dove into the shallow end of her apartment's swimming pool and broke her neck, causing permanent paralysis from the chest down. After months of rehabilitation at the University of Minnesota, Pohland was hired by WCCO-TV in 1986 as a part-time dispatcher and quickly worked her way to the assignment desk in 1989. In August of 1994, she became one of the nation's first quadriplegic reporters when she was assigned as a full-time local news reporter. Soon she was covering top stories, making her one of WCCO's top reporters.

She will be remembered for being positive, opinionated, and smart. Her love of Minnesota sports was second to none. Most of all, Darcy will be remembered for being the friend you could always count on.

Madam Speaker, the world is a smaller place because of the passing of Darcy Pohland.

A TRIBUTE TO COLONEL ROBERT PURCELL

HON. KAY GRANGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 2010

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Air Force Colonel Bob Purcell who died in Fort Worth, Texas, on December 6, 2009.

He was born on February 14, 1931 in Louisville to the late William Tilden Purcell and Mary Baldwin Purcell. He was a 1949 graduate of St. Xavier High School in Louisville. Upon graduating from St. Xavier, he attended the University of Louisville, Speed Scientific School. He attended primary flight training at Marianna Air Base in Marianna, Florida. He received his basic training at Greenville Air Force Base in Mississippi. He graduated in December 1954 as a 2nd lieutenant and also received his pilot wings. He went to advanced training in the F-100, assigned to Kadena AFB in Okinawa. He subsequently upgraded to the F-105 and flew combat missions in Vietnam until he was shot down on July 27, 1965. He was the 17th American captured. He remained a prisoner of war for seven-and-a-half years. He repatriated on February 12th, 1973.

After repatriation, he returned to school and completed studies earning a BA from Bellarmine University and an MA in Political Science from Auburn University. He was also a graduate of the United States Air Force Air University Air War College at Maxwell Air Force Base. He finished a distinguished Air Force career as a full Colonel.

After he retired from the Air Force, Percy became a simulator pilot Instructor with American Airlines in Ft. Worth, Texas. He was a former member of St. Louis Bertrand Catholic Church in Louisville where he also attended elementary school.

He loved his family, his friends and his country. He was a true American hero, and I am honored that we live among such men of courage and character.

THE REPUBLICAN MYTH OF SOLVING HEALTH CARE WITH TORT REFORM

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 2010

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to debunk some of the health care myths we've heard from my friends across the aisle. Listening to my Republican colleagues, you'd think that lawyers were single handedly responsible for breaking our health care system. It's one of the major pillars of their health care proposal they recently unveiled and has long been one of their favorite talking points. They seem to have little else to talk about when it comes to health reform.

I have always believed that you can have your own opinion but you can't have your own facts. For years, Republicans have claimed that because patients are able to sue doctors at whim for inordinate sums of money, doctors have been forced to buy expensive malpractice insurance. This system, they say, is one of the major causes of the nation's beleaguered health care system. But it seems Republicans have been very inventive with their facts.

A new report from Public Citizen undercuts the Republican refrain that health care costs have skyrocketed because doctors have been forced to practice "defensive medicine." The report found that the value of malpractice payments is actually at its lowest since 1999, and when adjusted for inflation, malpractice payments are at their lowest since 1992. The report goes on to show that for five consecutive years, the number of medical malpractice payments has fallen and for six straight years, the value of malpractice payments has fallen. Have we seen a corresponding decrease in health care costs for the last five years? Absolutely not. Quite the opposite, in fact: health care spending rose a staggering 83 percent between 2000 and 2009, while malpractice payments actually fell 8 percent during the same period. Litigation costs were found to be

less than one-half of one percent of health care costs. Blaming our health care crisis on litigation costs is just baloney.

So instead of looking into how we can hold the insurance industry more accountable, my Republican colleagues have made a boogeyman out of devilish trial lawyers. But medical malpractice costs have been wholly stagnant and represent an inconsequential portion of our total health care spending. It's time the Republicans brought some new ideas to the table.

The rest of us know the real reasons why our health care costs are spiraling out of control. Medical inflation continues to outpace general inflation. Insurance companies are making record profits and rewarding their executives with jaw-dropping salaries. The third quarter net income for Humana was almost \$300 million, a 65 percent increase from the third quarter of 2008. The CEO of Aetna made almost \$24 million last year while the CEO of WellPoint made nearly \$10 million. In many areas of the country, people can only get health insurance from only one or two companies, and with such diminished market competition, those companies can charge whatever they want. And the list goes on and on. But my Republican colleagues have conveniently buried their head in the sand and have literally chosen to ignore 99.5 percent of the reasons for our nation's broken health care system.

Sure, it is easy to demonize the trial lawyers. But if we fail to address the true reasons for rapidly escalating health care costs, we will never fix the real problems we're facing and health care costs will continue to skyrocket. To do otherwise would force prevent us from taking this once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to get reform right. While I know the final health reform bill will be far from perfect, it will still include meaningful and enduring reforms that will drive down costs and help millions of Americans. In the meantime, I hope my Republican colleagues will find themselves a new theme song.

INTRODUCTION OF "THE NEXT GENERATION 9-1-1 PRESERVATION ACT OF 2010"

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 2010

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, I am here today to introduce "The Next Generation 9-1-1 Preservation Act of 2010." This bill represents the hard work of my colleague and E9-1-1 Caucus Co-Chair, ANNA ESHOO, as well as our Senate Co-Chair counterparts, Senators AMY KLOBUCHAR and RICHARD BURR.

Representative ESHOO and I have worked on 911 issues for many years and I appreciate her reaching across the aisle to work on these issues. As we both sit on the Commerce Committee, which has jurisdiction on these issues,

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

it was only logical that seven years ago we would work together to start this Caucus. This year we welcomed two new Senate Co-Chairs, Senator KLOBUCHAR and Senator BURR who are going to be shepherding this important legislation on the Senate side. I know they share our concerns with E911 service and understand the unique importance of ensuring this technology will expand to the areas that need it most.

Moving forward to "Next Generation 9-1-1" is one of the most important aspects of our legislation. Encouraging rural communities like Illinois' 19th district to invest in these critical technologies is what our Caucus and this legislation are hoping to achieve. My goal, along with my Caucus Co-Chairs is to bring attention for the need for true interoperability in these call centers and ensure that all Americans can have access to these critical emergency services.

Finally, one of the most important parts of our bill is to correct the problem of states diverting their 9-1-1 funds to support other programs. The Next Generation 9-1-1 Preservation Act prevents states that divert funds from receiving the grants in the legislation. In tough economic times I can see how it would be tempting for states to reach into 911 funds but we simply cannot allow these important tax dollars to be used for something other than critical 911 services.

I am proud to be an original sponsor of this legislation and look forward to working with my good friend Representative ESHOO and my Senate Co-Chairs on getting this legislation signed into law.

RECOGNIZING LESTER A. STUMPE

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 2010

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize Lester A. Stumpe, an engineer with the Northeast Ohio Regional Sewer District (NEORS) for nearly 3 decades. As an engineer, Lester played a key role in protecting the rivers and streams in northeast Ohio. I am saddened to learn that Lester died on Sunday, March 7 after a 5-year struggle with cancer.

Lester Stumpe had more than 30 years of experience designing and directing a variety of efforts to protect and enhance our water resources. He conducted numerous large-scale multifaceted facilities planning and watershed studies. In total, he directed or managed more than \$20 million in engineering and technical studies that have resulted in several hundred million dollars in constructed projects.

Lester served on a variety of boards and committees to further environmental and infrastructure goals in the Greater Cleveland area. Through his studies and activities, Lester has greatly contributed to our knowledge and protection efforts of both West Creek and Mill Creek, major tributaries to the Cuyahoga River.

Lester was passionately concerned for the streams and watershed areas of Northeast Ohio. His job title was NEORS's "Manager of Watershed Programs, Policy and Technical Support." But for Lester, this was much more than a job or title. Protecting our region's watersheds was Lester's life mission. Even while

battling cancer, Lester lit up with enthusiasm when he communicated his ideas about how to make the Cleveland area's watersheds cleaner and more habitable to the species meant to live there, including the human species.

Madam Speaker and colleagues, please join me in remembering Lester and expressing condolences to his wife, Marcia Mauter, his children Meagan, Melissa and Justin Mauter, his mother Dorothy, his sister Ruth Tofle, and the many friends, relatives, and colleagues who mourn his loss.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPRO- PRIATIONS ACT, 2010

SPEECH OF

HON. TODD TIAHRT

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 2010

Mr. TIAHRT. Madam Speaker, I was unable to make the vote on H.R. 2847 due to the untimely death and funeral of one of my staffers' father.

Had I been present for the vote, I would have voted "Nay." If there is one thing the American people agree upon it's that major changes are necessary in order to dig ourselves out of this spending quagmire. The American people want us to reform our spending practices so that our economy can be prosperous once again.

The irony of this "Jobs" bill is that it includes a net tax revenue increase of \$14.3 billion, which will force employers to cut jobs in order to pay more money to the federal government. Strangely, the Democrats attempt to give a tax break to small businesses on one hand but then take away with the other.

This legislation also includes another short-term extension of the highway authorization. Instead of continuing with short-term extensions of transportation funding, Congress needs to enact a meaningful, 6-year surface transportation funding bill.

Today, I introduced the Keeping American Businesses Competitive Act. This legislation would lower the top business tax rate from 35 percent to 22 percent. The United States currently has the second highest corporate tax rate of any industrialized nation, putting American workers and businesses at a huge competitive disadvantage. Rather than the Democrat "solution" of increasing taxes to address job loss, lowering the corporate tax rate will actually put people back to work. According to the Milken Institute, lowering the rate to 22 percent would "create an additional 350,000 manufacturing jobs and increase total employment by 2.13 million."

If this Congress is serious about getting Americans back to work, it should focus its efforts on proven, free-market principles that will level the playing field for our businesses to compete and keep capital and jobs here in the U.S.

For the above reasons, I oppose this bill.

HONORING DR. RITA BORNSTEIN'S CONTRIBUTIONS AS THE FIRST WOMAN PRESIDENT OF ROLLINS COLLEGE

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 2010

Mr. GRAYSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of Women's History Month. This month, I would like to recognize a few of the phenomenal women from central Florida who are making a distinguished contribution to my district, the great State of Florida, and to our nation as a whole. Today, I honor Dr. Rita Bornstein. Dr. Bornstein's commitment to education and her service as the first female president of Rollins College from 1990 to 2004 was trailblazing. Her distinguished leadership throughout her time at Rollins serves as a model to her unwavering dedication to her students, the university and her overall educational ideals.

Under President Bornstein's leadership, Rollins focused on strengthening its commitment to excellence, innovation, and community. Standards were raised for faculty evaluation, student selectivity, and all aspects of administration. Average SAT scores for entering arts and sciences students rose more than 65 points, and Rollins' place in U.S. News & World Report's annual rankings of "America's Best Colleges" climbed from No. 6 regional university in the South to No. 2, and No. 1 in Florida. That trajectory has continued—Rollins is currently No. 1 in the South. Innovation was encouraged and rewarded, and programs were added in film studies, international business, and sustainable development, as well as the signature Rollins College Conference for first-year students. The college's commitment to building strong communities was enhanced through programs of intellectual discourse, civic engagement, international study, and service learning.

In addition to raising the education standards and national acclaim of Rollins College, President Bornstein also oversaw Rollins' most ambitious fundraising effort. Widely considered to have transformed the college, The Campaign For Rollins secured \$160.2 million, providing support for academic programs, scholarships, faculty chairs, and facilities, and significantly strengthening the college's financial health. Thanks to the generosity of donors, including the largest gift in Rollins' history—alumnus George Cornell's \$93.3-million bequest—and astute financial management, the college's endowment more than quintupled during Bornstein's presidency.

In 2001, she was named to the George D. and Harriet W. Cornell Chair of Distinguished Presidential Leadership when Rollins received a \$10-million gift for the first endowment of a college presidency in the nation. At the conclusion of her 14-year presidency, she was named president emerita and appointed to the George D. and Harriet W. Cornell Chair of Philanthropy and Leadership Development. As a recognized leader in higher education, Dr. Rita Bornstein regularly consults on issues of leadership, governance, and fundraising in the nonprofit sector. She is also the author of numerous journal articles and book chapters and two books, including *Legitimacy in the Academic Presidency: From Entrance to Exit*, published in 2003.

Madam Speaker, during Women's History Month, it is my honor to recognize this remarkable woman whose enthusiasm for education and commitment to excellence can be shown through her great achievements during her time at Rollins College and after. I applaud her accomplishments to our central Florida community, our great State and our Nation.

A TRIBUTE TO RYAN BEDFORD AND TRAVIS JAYNER, SPEED SKATERS, MICHIGANDERS, AND OLYMPIANS

HON. DAVE CAMP

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 2010

Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Ryan Bedford and Travis Jayner on their performances in the 2010 Winter Olympics. These are two outstanding athletes from my district. Ryan and Travis are great athletes, who can truly be called "Olympians," and who we can be proud of as representatives of America in the 2010 Winter Olympics.

Ryan Bedford of Midland, Michigan, is an outstanding skater and represented the U.S. in the Olympics in the 10,000 meter speed skating event. In fact, Ryan is the reigning U.S. champion in that event. Ryan has a history of impressive skating accomplishments and in a one-week span last spring he won two world championship medals in two different events. Last year, Ryan was a member of the world champion short track relay team, and one week later, as part of the long track speed skating pursuit team, he earned a bronze medal at the 2009 Single Distance Worlds. He started skating at the age of 5, beginning his career at the Midland Speed Skating Club in Michigan.

I also congratulate Travis Jayner on winning the bronze medal in the 5000 meter relay for short track speed skating. Travis trains in Midland, Michigan. On Friday, February 26, Travis won his first Olympic medal when the American speed skating team crossed the finish line in 6:44.498. The 2010 Olympics were his first, but Travis has a long record of speed skating accomplishments: he was the 500 meter National Champion in 2008–09, he won bronze at the 2007 and 2009 World Team Championships, and won two gold medals in the relay at World Cup 5. Travis has become a versatile athlete competing in 500m, 1000m, 1500m, 3000m and 5000m relay teams. He got his start on the ice at the age of 5, after the encouragement and support of his father, who was also a speed skater.

Today I wish to congratulate Ryan Bedford and Travis Jayner for their participation in the 2010 Winter Olympics as true Olympians and athletes my district and our country can be proud to cheer for.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO THE LATE STUART DUNNINGS, JR.

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 2010

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor the accomplishments of the late

Stuart Dunnings, Jr., the first African-American attorney to practice law in Michigan's Capitol City of Lansing, and founder in 1950 of the city's first African-American owned law firm.

Mr. Dunnings, who passed away March 10, 2010, at age 85, was a champion of minorities from the beginning. President of the Lansing Chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People in 1951, he had been involved in the civil rights movement for half a century. He led the fight to get Lansing schools to hire more black teachers and successfully represented a Detroit basketball team's black student athletes when they were refused hotel rooms while in a Lansing tournament.

Mr. Dunnings was co-counsel in school desegregation lawsuits in several Michigan cities, and served on civil rights committees and in lawsuits seeking equality for minorities.

In 1992 he was honored by the Michigan State Bar Association as the "Champion of Justice." He was inducted into the National Bar Association Hall of Fame.

Mr. Dunnings and his late wife Janet had four children: Stuart III, Steven, Susan and Shauna. All four have law degrees, and one of eight grandchildren is attending law school. Stuart III is the Ingham County Prosecutor.

Born in Staunton, Virginia, Mr. Dunnings graduated from Lincoln University, then from the University of Michigan Law School. During college, he hitchhiked back and forth to the east coast to visit family and seek employment in places like Washington, D.C. before opening his Lansing practice. He often hitchhiked to the courthouse in Mason when his cases were before the court.

Facing the challenges of being the city's first black attorney, Mr. Dunnings practiced law until mid-afternoon, worked the Oldsmobile evening shift on the fender line, and spent weekends cleaning his office building to support himself and his family.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the late Stuart Dunnings, Jr., a man whose hard work, family commitment, and community spirit represent all that is good about our great nation and its people. Mr. Dunnings is truly deserving of our respect and admiration.

HAITI CHILDREN PROJECT
FOUNDER S. WADE MCGUINN

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 2010

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, S. Wade McGuinn, who has an extensive record of helping the people of Haiti, is a member of the Home Builders Association of Greater Columbia and is founder and President of McGuinn Construction Management, Inc. and Custom Home Construction Management Systems, Inc (MCM and CHCMS). McGuinn's Construction, which serves as the only full service residential construction management firm in the Midlands, has constructed 1,700 custom homes. He has built more homes in Columbia's metropolitan area than any other custom homebuilder in Columbia.

Taking his business success to the next level, Wade has six land development projects—four of which have shattered sales

records. All of the companies under Mr. McGuinn's business umbrella have overall sales exceeding 12 million dollars annually.

What is most captivating is what Wade has chosen to do with all of this success. He has led several overseas mission trips to Haiti, Mexico, Honduras, and Cuba, serving as a construction team leader for the United Methodist Volunteers in Missions. Known as "Father Wade" to children at a Haitian orphanage, Wade and his wife, Janet, have solely supported an orphanage comprised of 29 children and seven staff members.

Wade founded the Haiti Children Project with the purpose of providing food, shelter, clothing, health care and education through sponsorship, donations, and love. After the recent devastating earthquake in Haiti, Wade encouraged his fellow members in the Home Builders Association of Greater Columbia (HBA) to hold a charitable fundraiser for the Haiti Children project. Over 200 HBA members and their guests attended the event, raising over \$10,000 to send to help the children in Haiti.

I want to thank Wade and Janet for their selfless contributions in South Carolina and across the globe, especially Haiti in its time of extraordinary crisis.

TRIBUTE TO FALLEN OFFICERS

HON. DEVIN NUNES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 2010

Mr. NUNES. Madam Speaker, I rise today on behalf of myself and my colleagues GEORGE RADANOVICH and JIM COSTA, to extend my deepest condolences to the family and friends of Javier Bejar and Joel Wahlenmaier, who recently died in the line of duty in Minkler, California.

On February 25, 2010, Fresno County Deputy Sheriffs Wahlenmaier and Mark Harris were ambushed and shot while attempting to serve a search warrant. Sadly, Deputy Wahlenmaier died a short time later that day and Reedley Police Officer Bejar, who was critically wounded while providing backup, died on Monday, March 1.

Words are insufficient to convey the depth of pain and loss felt by the families, friends, and colleagues of these brave men. They displayed enormous courage and a true commitment to protecting the public. Their tragic loss will continue to be felt by many for years to come.

CONGRATULATING WINNERS OF
NOBEL PRIZE IN PHYSICS

SPEECH OF

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 2010

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 1069, congratulating Willard S. Boyle and George E. Smith for being awarded the 2009 Nobel Prize in physics. These two scientists invented the charge-coupled device, or CCD, while working at Bell Laboratories in Murray Hill, New Jersey. The development of

the CCD was a breakthrough in electronic image sensing that led to today's digital cameras and other recording devices. CCDs are now integral components of modern laboratory instruments and medical sensors. The field of astronomy, in particular, benefitted from the invention of the CCD: the Hubble space telescope, the Kepler satellite, and other major astronomical instruments rely on CCDs for their spectacular images. Myself, I have used CCD detectors in physics research. I am deeply pleased that the Nobel Committee chose to reward these researchers' transformative contribution.

It is worth noting that Drs. Boyle and Smith set out to create a new tool for electronic memory, not a new imaging device. The dramatic success of their design is a reminder that research and development is a non-linear process. New products often spring from unexpected discoveries or develop from innovations that were originally intended for a different purpose. That is why our future economic success is inextricably linked to a robust, sustained federal investment in basic scientific research and a true commitment to a healthy national innovation infrastructure.

The creativity and inventiveness of Willard Boyle and George Smith were nurtured in the Bell Labs of the 1960s. That environment was responsible, in large part, for the seven Nobel Prizes that have been awarded for work carried out at Bell Labs over the years. The freedom to pursue science to unpredictable ends was a pillar of our research and development system for decades. Yet this opportunity is far too rare in today's public and private research institutions, and American competitiveness is not a given. A recent study by the Information Technology and Innovation Foundation ranked the United States last among forty nations and regions in terms of national improvement in international competitiveness and innovation capacity over the last decade.

With that in mind, we should remember that a Nobel Prize is a lagging indicator of success. It can take decades for the importance of a scientific discovery to be fully understood. As we applaud Willard Boyle and George Smith, we should not forget that the work for which the Nobel Committee honored them in 2009 was completed 40 years earlier—in 1969. Perhaps the best tribute to their legacy—and the best way to ensure our collective success—is to make certain that the scientists and researchers working today in our universities and laboratories have the resources they need today to bring home the Nobel Prizes of 2050.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. G. K. BUTTERFIELD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 2010

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 103—H. Res. 1031; Article 2, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

IN HONOR OF GIRL SCOUT WEEK
AND THE 98TH ANNIVERSARY OF
GIRL SCOUTING

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 2010

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize and celebrate this week, March 7 through March 13, as Girl Scout Week and the 98th anniversary of Girl Scouting. In the state of Connecticut, we have approximately 44,000 Girl Scouts. I am pleased to see Girl Scouts' strong commitment to enriching the lives of young females, and contributing to our nation's communities, evolve over the past 98 years.

Juliette Gordon Low founded Girl Scouts in 1912. Since then, the organization's membership has grown from 18 members in Savannah, Georgia to 3.4 million members throughout the United States, including U.S. territories, and more than 90 countries through USA Girl Scouts Overseas. Today, there are over 2.4 million girl members, including my daughter, and 928,000 adult members working primarily as volunteers. Throughout history, more than 50 million American women enjoyed Girl Scouting during their childhood. That number continues to grow as Girl Scouts of the USA continues to inspire, challenge, and empower girls everywhere.

The Girls Scouts' mission includes building girls of courage, confidence, and character who make our country and the world a better place. The organization motivates these young women to have fun, create meaningful friendships, and discover the power of young women working together. Through enriching experiences such as extraordinary field trips, skill-building clinics, community service projects, cultural exchanges, and environmental stewardships, girls grow courageous and strong. Girl Scouting encourages girls to develop to their full individual potential; to relate to others with increasing understanding, skill, and respect; to develop values to guide their actions and provide the foundation for sound decision-making; and to contribute to the improvement of society through their abilities, leadership skills, and cooperation with others.

I know that Connecticut's young women will continue to benefit from the Girl Scouts program for generations to come. That is why we are thankful for the outstanding work they have done in eastern Connecticut communities. Girl Scouts' commitment to community and empowering women and girls is certain to continue to enrich our communities for many more years. I ask my colleagues to join with me and my constituents in recognizing and celebrating Girl Scout Week and the 98th anniversary of Girl Scouting.

COMMEMORATING THE 45TH ANNI-
VERSARY OF BLOODY SUNDAY

SPEECH OF

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 2010

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw attention to the 45th anniversary of the

"Bloody Sunday" massacre, the first of three attempted nonviolent marches from Selma to the State Capitol Building of Alabama. It played a tremendous role in shedding light on the evils of segregation and prejudice that pervaded the United States. I was there, marching from Selma to Montgomery, on March 7, 1965. Among 600 fellow protesters, we famously marched in support of an audacious dream—a march broken up by armed state troopers who brutally assaulted participants, including my dear friend and colleague Representative JOHN LEWIS, who was beaten unconscious and nearly left for dead.

The peaceful demonstrators intended to raise awareness of the brutal murder of Jimmie Lee Jackson by an Alabama State Trooper during a nonviolent demonstration supporting the Voting Rights Act. It only took six blocks into the march before protesters encountered a wall of state troopers. As the protesters attempted to pass, they were nefariously and unnecessarily attacked by nightsticks, fired at with tear gas, and charged at by troopers on horseback. Because of the vicious violence that ensued against the nonviolent protesters attempting to exercise their First Amendment right to freedom of speech, the event became known as "Bloody Sunday."

Images of the vicious massacre were broadcasted throughout the world, including that of the recently widowed Amelia Boynton, a Selma-native who played an integral role in the planning of the marches. "Bloody Sunday" served as veritable evidence of the terrorism against Blacks ingrained in the segregationist movement of the South. The succeeding events played a paramount role in the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and raising awareness of the saddening state of racism in this nation.

COMMENDING ROYAL CARIBBEAN
INTERNATIONAL FOR THEIR RE-
LIEF EFFORTS IN HAITI

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 2010

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the extraordinary relief efforts of Royal Caribbean International following the earthquake that devastated Haiti this past January.

Long before this latest tragedy brought the world's attention to Haiti, Royal Caribbean had been committed to bringing economic development and opportunities to the impoverished nation. Royal Caribbean has been partnering with Haiti's tourism industry for almost 30 years, employing a large number of Haitians and maintaining a resort at Labadee, a port off the northern coast of Haiti. Therefore, when the earthquake shook the country, they personally felt the effects of the tragedy before them and were compelled to find a way to assist the people of Haiti.

Royal Caribbean immediately set out to provide the people of Haiti with emergency relief. Using their cruise ships for delivery, Royal Caribbean has brought over 120 pallets of materials to Haiti. Additionally, they have provided monetary support to emergency assistance organizations, such as the Pan American Development Foundation, which also provide emergency supplies to the island.

I commend Royal Caribbean for their rapid response to this tragedy and the much-needed assistance and aid they have provided. Furthermore, I would like to express my support for their dedication to long-term rebuilding of Haiti.

Although many found it controversial, I believe that Royal Caribbean's decision to continue to dock at Labadee was the right decision. If the cruise line had bypassed Haiti, it would have worsened an already devastating situation. By continuing to bring guests to Labadee, Royal Caribbean kept Haitians working and brought tourist dollars to the country at a time when Haiti's already struggling economy was at a complete stand-still. This commitment to keeping the Haitian economy going is truly admirable.

I thank Royal Caribbean for their exemplary service to the people of Haiti, not simply in providing emergency aid in the immediate aftermath of the earthquake, but in their 30 years of work in Haiti and in their commitment to ensuring a sustainable recovery.

HONORING CHARLTON BOYD

HON. JOHN FLEMING

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 2010

Mr. FLEMING. Madam Speaker, I would like to congratulate and honor a young student from my district who has achieved national recognition for exemplary volunteer service in his community. Charlton Boyd of Shreveport is today being named one of the top two youth volunteers in Louisiana for 2010, in the 15th annual Prudential Spirit of Community Awards. This is an extraordinary honor; more than 21,000 young people across the country were considered for state-level recognition in this year's program.

Mr. Charlton Boyd of Shreveport is being recognized for being one of the top two youth volunteers for 2010 by The Prudential Spirit of Community Awards, a nationwide program honoring young people for outstanding acts of volunteerism. The awards program, now in its 15th year, is conducted by Prudential Financial in partnership with the National Association of Secondary School Principals, NASSP.

In light of numerous statistics that indicate Americans today are less involved in their communities than they once were, it's vital that we encourage and support the kind of selfless contribution this young citizen has made. People of all ages need to think more about how we, as individual citizens, can work together at the local level to ensure the health and vitality of our towns and neighborhoods. Young volunteers like Mr. Charlton Boyd are inspiring examples to all of us, and are among our brightest hopes for a better tomorrow.

The program that brought this young role model to our attention—The Prudential Spirit of Community Awards—was created by Prudential Financial in partnership with the National Association of Secondary School Principals in 1995 to impress upon all youth volunteers that their contributions will inspire other young people to follow their example. Over the past 15 years, the program has become the nation's largest youth recognition effort based solely on community service, and has honored nearly 100,000 young volunteers at the local, state and national level.

Mr. Charlton Boyd should be extremely proud to have been singled out from the thousands of dedicated volunteers who participated in this year's program. I heartily applaud Mr. Charlton Boyd for his initiative in seeking to make his community a better place to live, and for the positive impact he has had on the lives of others. He has demonstrated a level of commitment and accomplishment that is truly extraordinary in today's world, and deserves our sincere admiration and respect. His actions show that young Americans can—and do—play important roles in our communities, and that America's community spirit continues to hold tremendous promise for the future.

PERSONAL STATEMENT ON REMOVAL AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2499

HON. LYNN A. WESTMORELAND

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 2010

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Madam Speaker, I would like the RECORD to reflect my desire to be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 2499, the Puerto Rico Democracy Act of 2009. Due to H.R. 2499's placement on the Union Calendar, I am unable to officially remove myself from this legislation according to the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives.

RECOGNIZING THE 189TH ANNIVERSARY OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE

SPEECH OF

HON. SCOTT GARRETT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 2010

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, as a member of the Congressional Caucus on Hellenic Affairs, I am proud to congratulate the nation of Greece on its upcoming celebration of the 189th anniversary of independence. It's been one hundred and eighty-nine years since Greece obtained freedom from the oppressive Ottoman Empire.

On March 25, 1821, the Greek people rose up against Ottoman oppression and declared their independence. The Greeks had been under occupied rule by the Ottoman Turks for over 400 years. After years of war and negotiations, Greece was finally recognized as an independent nation in 1832.

As the birthplace of democracy, Greece has shared numerous self-government efforts across the world, including here in the United States. America's Founding Fathers were inspired by the political experiences and philosophies of ancient Greece in writing our Constitution and founding our representative democracy. Today, Greece is again a thriving democracy and an example of self-determination for other nations.

Greece has long been one of the United States' closest allies. Greece fought alongside America in every war of the 20th Century and continues to offer strong support in the current war on terrorism.

I am honored to cosponsor H. Res. 1107 which recognizes the 189th anniversary of the independence of Greece and am pleased that

this bill is being considered by the House of Representatives today.

I would again like to congratulate Greece for celebrating such a momentous occasion. This anniversary is a time to remember the sacrifices of the past, to take pride in your nation, and to look ahead to a future of promise.

INTRODUCING A RESOLUTION EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES REGARDING THE POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES ON WILD ANIMALS AT THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES OF THE CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN ENDANGERED SPECIES OF WILD FAUNA AND FLORA

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 2010

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to introduce a resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the policy of the United States on wild animals at the Conference of the Parties of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES).

CITES was created in 1973 to regulate international trade in endangered species to ensure that it does not threaten their survival. Launched with a few signatory nations, CITES has now 175 parties that have an international obligation and responsibility to protect our planet's endangered animals and plants. Adherence to these protective measures has proven to have benefited the conservation of animals and plants worldwide.

Unfortunately, more and more species are at risk of extinction and international trade, both legal and illegal, has exacerbated the dangers. International wildlife trade is estimated to be worth billions of dollars a year and to include hundreds of millions of live plants and animals and derived products such as food, leather, fur, ivory, and timber. Such high levels of exploitation of and trade in wild animals and plants, together with other factors such as habitat loss, are capable of bringing some species close to extinction.

Between 1979 and 1989 more than 600,000 African elephants were killed for their ivory, cutting the continent's population in half. Nevertheless, poaching has continued with an estimated 38,000 elephants killed annually and 23.2 tons of poached ivory seized since 2007. As sea ice declines, polar bears will not be able to adapt to a terrestrial-based life resulting in increased mortality, reduced reproduction, increased human-bear conflicts, and overall drastic decline of populations. Bobcats keep being poached for their skins. Several sharks are being severely depleted with declines as high as 99 percent in some areas as a result of the high demand for their fins and meat. Overfishing, increased consumer demand and inadequate enforcement of infractions have led to historically low populations of bluefin tuna.

This month, CITES' signatory nations will meet for the 15th Conference of the Parties to review the status of species in danger of extinction and establish trade restrictions. The

conference will consider proposals offered by several countries to either enhance protections of endangered species or to remove or downlist some animals from the endangered species listings and reauthorize international trade. Several countries which benefit from trade of animals' derived products, such as elephants' ivory, sharks' fins or bluefin tunas' meat, are putting economic interests before wild animals' survival, risking to bring species close to extinction. This is unacceptable.

My resolution will help preserve many endangered animals by urging CITES to accept proposals that protect these species and oppose those proposals that put them in greater danger.

Madam Speaker, the United States has a moral obligation to protect endangered species and their natural habitat. Wild animals are a very important part of our commonly held natural resources and contribute to the diversity and stability of our environment. We must continue to maintain a balanced and healthy ecosystem that allows for the coexistence of both human beings and the world's most incredible species.

I urge my colleagues to join me in protecting wildlife and environmental conservation across the globe by supporting this important resolution.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TIM MURPHY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 2010

Mr. TIM MURPHY OF PENNSYLVANIA. MADAM SPEAKER, ON ROLL CALL NO. 108, HAD I BEEN PRESENT, I WOULD HAVE VOTED "AYE".

AFGHANISTAN WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

SPEECH OF

HON. PATRICK J. KENNEDY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 2010

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam Speaker, as the tragic events of September 11, 2001, demonstrated, the continued existence of the Taliban and terrorists in Afghanistan poses a threat to the security of the American people. We need to be eliminating those who are organizing to strike at the American people.

That is why we can't afford to "double-down" on a bad policy that infringes on the ability of our troops to successfully execute their mission. Using the men and women of our armed forces to secure ground subjects them unnecessarily to risks that we should not be taking.

Several of my colleagues have stated that to end this conflict would fail to honor those who have fought and died in Afghanistan. Yet, we all acknowledge that there isn't a single American soldier who has laid down his or her life for this country that isn't a hero.

Instead, I think of families like that of Kyle Coutu. Kyle was 20 years old and had just graduated from William E. Tolman High School last June, when he was killed on February 18, 2010, in the Helmand Province dur-

ing combat operations. How many more mothers like Melissa Coutu will have to bury their son or daughter? For how much longer will we ask America's youth to risk their lives for the people of Afghanistan?

Rather than put our troops in harm's way, the best way to honor them is to take care of them when they return home, ending veteran homelessness and unemployment, and fully funding veterans' health care, particularly for the treatment of mental health and PTSD.

Additionally, with limited resources, we can't afford to continue a mission in Afghanistan that doesn't move us forward. There are places around the world, like the Horn of Africa, where our commitment and resources could be put to a greater good. More importantly, every dollar spent in Afghanistan is a dollar that can't be invested here at home to invest in our children's education, rebuild our country's infrastructure, and create jobs for American workers.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN B. LARSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 2010

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, on March 11, 2010, I missed roll call votes 102, 103 and 104. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on all.

BANKRUPTCY JUDGESHIP ACT OF 2010

SPEECH OF

HON. GRACE F. NAPOLITANO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 2010

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4506, the Bankruptcy Judgeship Act of 2010, will authorize the appointment of additional bankruptcy judges into the courts.

Personal bankruptcy filings have increased by 32 percent in 2009 due to the recent economic downturn and skyrocketing unemployment and home foreclosure rates. This unprecedented rise has put an increased strain on the legal system to respond to bankruptcy claims. This is the first piece of legislation that addresses the judicial problems caused by the economic turmoil of the past two years.

The U.S. Judicial Conference, whose membership includes the Chief Justice, provided the basis for this legislation which will create 13 new judgeships and make 22 currently temporary judgeships permanent. The bill will pay for these new appointments by increasing the cost for corporate bankruptcy.

The passing of H.R. 4506 would relieve considerable strain on the nation's bankruptcy courts through matching the increased workload with an expanded judiciary. American law exists to encourage economic growth and facilitate new business. The ability for the law to respond effectively and fairly is paramount to the turnaround of the country's economy.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 2010

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Madam Speaker, today our national debt is \$12,575,479,490,348.47.

On January 6, 2009, the start of the 111th Congress, the national debt was \$10,638,425,746,293.80.

This means the national debt has increased by \$1,937,053,744,054.67 so far this Congress.

This debt and its interest payments we are passing to our children and all future Americans.

HONORING WASHINGTON STATE REPRESENTATIVE SHARON TOMIKO SANTOS

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 2010

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Washington State Representative Sharon Tomiko Santos for receiving the 2010 Desjardin Financial Literacy Award.

The Desjardin Financial Literacy Award, given by the Credit Union National Association, annually recognizes one State lawmaker for their exemplary leadership and legislative efforts in the field of youth financial education.

Financial literacy is a crucial skill for all to have in today's society, from balancing a checkbook to budgeting for retirement. This skill allows us to make wise decisions about our finances and our financial future. The earlier that our youth attain this knowledge, the more successful and prepared they are later in life.

In Washington State, financial literacy training supports the goals of Washington's Basic Education Act. This Act seeks to provide students with the skills necessary to "understand the importance of work and finance and how performance, effort, and decisions directly affect future career and educational opportunities."

Washington State Representative Santos has exemplified the effort to provide financial literacy opportunities for our youth statewide since being elected to the Washington State House of Representatives in 1998. Representative Santos led the campaign to establish the Financial Education Public Private Partnership (previously the Financial Literacy Public Private Partnership) in 2003, as well as to secure public funding for the project.

The Partnership works to increase students' financial education, provide financial education information for school districts, and provides financial education instructional materials. Additionally, the Partnership has grown because of Representative Santos' enduring support and her legislative work throughout the years.

The work of Representative Santos stands as a model for all States in the effort to promote fiscal responsibility and literacy. I commend her for her efforts and congratulate her again on this tremendous achievement.

RECOGNIZING CONTRIBUTIONS OF
KOREAN AMERICANS

SPEECH OF

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 2010

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 1036, recognizing the contributions of Korean Americans to the United States. I am pleased to cosponsor this resolution, introduced by my colleague from New Jersey, Mr. GARRETT. For over a century, the

United States has prospered from the many contributions of Korean Americans to our society. Korean immigrants first arrived in Hawaii, but they quickly moved from the West Coast across the continent, establishing vibrant, productive communities across the Nation, including in my home State of New Jersey.

I recently had the opportunity to sit down with a small group of Korean Americans from my congressional district, as I frequently do, to hear their thoughts and learn about their needs. It impresses me that Korean Americans have clear interest in fully utilizing the intellectual capital and entrepreneurial spirit prevalent in their community to invest in the

future of Korean American youth and, for example, to contribute to the fields of science and technology—particularly green technology. It is the kind of future-oriented perspective that has distinguished the Korean American community and contributed to their accomplishments in the arts, sciences, government, education, sports, and so much more. I am confident that the Korean American community will continue to flourish and enhance the character of our Nation, and I look forward to future opportunities to support the goals of Korean Americans in New Jersey's 12th congressional district.

Friday, March 12, 2010

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

The Senate was not in session today. It will next meet at 2 p.m. on Monday, March 15, 2010.

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 7 public bills, H.R. 4835–4841; 7 resolutions, H. Res. 1175–1181, were introduced. **Page H1396**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page H1397**

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:
H. Res. 1125, supporting the goals and ideals of National Public Works Week (H. Rept. 111–440). **Page H1396**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Edwards (MD) to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H1361**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by a yea-and-nay vote of 203 yeas to 144 nays with 1 voting "present", Roll No. 110. **Pages H1361, H1375**

Harmful Algal Blooms and Hypoxia Research and Control Amendments Act: The House passed H.R. 3650, to establish a National Harmful Algal Bloom and Hypoxia Program, to develop and coordinate a comprehensive and integrated strategy to address harmful algal blooms and hypoxia, and to provide for the development and implementation of comprehensive regional action plans to reduce harmful algal blooms and hypoxia, by a yea-and-nay vote of 251 yeas to 103 nays, Roll No. 109. **Pages H1368–75**

H. Res. 1168, the rule providing for consideration of the bill, was agreed to by voice vote after the previous question was ordered without objection. **Pages H1363–68**

Suspension—Proceedings Resumed: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure which was debated on Wednesday, March 10th:

Bankruptcy Judgeship Act of 2010: H.R. 4506, amended, to authorize the appointment of additional bankruptcy judges, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ yea-and-nay vote of 345 yeas to 5 nays, Roll No. 111. **Pages H1375–76**

Meeting Hour: Agreed that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday, March 15th for morning hour debate. **Page H1380**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H1374, H1375, and H1375–76. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 2:25 p.m.

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRAM AHEAD

Week of March 15 through March 20, 2010

Senate Chamber

On *Monday*, at approximately 3 p.m., Senate will resume consideration of motion to concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to H.R.

2847, Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, and vote on the motion to invoke cloture thereon at 5:30 p.m.

Senate will also resume consideration of H.R. 1586, Tax Bonuses Received From Certain TARP Recipients.

During the balance of the week, Senate may consider any cleared legislative and executive business.

Senate Committees

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Committee on Appropriations: March 17, Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2011 for the United States Forest Service, 9:30 a.m., SD-124.

March 18, Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government, to hold hearings to examine proposals for addressing the current financial situation facing the United States Postal Service, 2:30 p.m., SD-192.

Committee on Armed Services: March 16, to hold hearings to examine U.S. Special Operations Command and U.S. Central Command in review of the Defense Authorization request for fiscal year 2011 and the Future Years Defense Program; with the possibility of a closed session in SVC-217 following the open session, 9:30 a.m., SH-216.

March 17, Subcommittee on SeaPower, to hold hearings to examine Navy shipbuilding programs in review of the Defense Authorization request for fiscal year 2011 and the Future Years Defense Program, 9:30 a.m., SR-222.

March 17, Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, to hold hearings to examine strategic forces programs in review of the Defense Authorization request for fiscal year 2011 and the Future Years Defense Program; with the possibility of a closed session in SVC-217 following the open session, 2:30 p.m., SR-232A.

March 18, Full Committee, to resume hearings to examine the "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy, 9:30 a.m., SH-216.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: March 17, Subcommittee on Consumer Protection, Product Safety, and Insurance, to hold hearings to examine financial services and products, focusing on the role of the Federal Trade Commission in protecting consumers, part 2, 3 p.m., SR-253.

March 18, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Robert J. Papp, Jr., to be a Commandant of the United States Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, Larry Robinson, of Florida, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere, Earl F. Weener, of Oregon, to be a Member of the National Transportation Safety Board, Michael F. Tillman, of California, and Daryl J. Boness, of Maine, both to be a Member of the Marine Mammal Commission, and Jeffrey R. Moreland, of Texas, to be a Director of the Amtrak Board of Directors, 10 a.m., SR-253.

March 18, Subcommittee on Science and Space, to hold hearings to examine assessing commercial space capabilities, 2:30 p.m., SR-253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: March 16, Subcommittee on Water and Power, to hold an oversight hearing to examine the Bureau of Reclamation's implementation of the SECURE Water Act, (Title 9501 of Public Law 111-11) and the Bureau of Reclamation's WaterSMART program which includes the WaterSMART Grant Program, the Basin Study Program and the Title XVI Program, 10 a.m., SD-366.

March 17, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Jeffrey A. Lane, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of Energy for Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs, 9:30 a.m., SD-366.

March 17, Subcommittee on National Parks, to hold hearings to examine S. 553, to revise the authorized route of the North Country National Scenic Trail in north-eastern Minnesota to include existing hiking trails along Lake Superior's north shore and in Superior National Forest and Chippewa National Forest, S. 1017, to reauthorize the Cane River National Heritage Area Commission and expand the boundaries of the Cane River National Heritage Area in the State of Louisiana, S. 1018, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an agreement with Northwestern State University in Natchitoches, Louisiana, to construct a curatorial center for the use of Cane River Creole National Historical Park, the National Center for Preservation Technology and Training, and the University, S. 1537, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the National Park Service, to designate the Dr. Norman E. Borlaug Birthplace and Childhood Home in Cresco, Iowa, as a National Historic Site and as a unit of the National Park System, S. 1629, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of the archaeological site and surrounding land of the New Philadelphia town site in the state of Illinois, S. 2892, to establish the Alabama Black Belt National Heritage Area, S. 2933, 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, S. 2951, to authorize funding to protect and conserve lands contiguous with the Blue Ridge Parkway to serve the public, and H.R. 3804, to make technical corrections to various Acts affecting the National Park Service, to extend, amend, or establish certain National Park Service authorities, 2:30 p.m., SD-366.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: March 17, to hold hearings to examine the Government Accountability Office's investigation of the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) efforts to protect children's health, 10 a.m., SD-406.

March 18, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine mobility and congestion in urban and rural America, 10 a.m., SD-406.

Committee on Foreign Relations: March 16, to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Robert Stephen Ford, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Syrian Arab Republic, 9:30 a.m., SD-419.

March 17, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Mari Carmen Aponte, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of El Salvador, Department of State, 10 a.m., SD-419.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: March 17, to hold hearings to examine the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) reauthorization, focusing on the Obama Administration's ESEA reauthorization priorities, 10 a.m., SH-216.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: March 16, Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, the Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia, to hold hearings to examine assessing foster care and family services in the District of Columbia, focusing on challenges and solutions, 2 p.m., SD-342.

March 17, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the lessons and implications of the Christmas day attack, focusing on intelligence reform and interagency integration, 10 a.m., SD-342.

Committee on Indian Affairs: March 18, to hold an oversight hearing to examine Bureau of Indian Affairs and tribal police recruitment, training, hiring, and retention, 2:15 p.m., SD-628.

Committee on the Judiciary: March 17, Subcommittee on Administrative Oversight and the Courts, to hold hearings to examine bankruptcy reform, focusing on small business jobs, 10 a.m., SD-226.

March 18, Full Committee, business meeting to consider S. 148, to restore the rule that agreements between manufacturers and retailers, distributors, or wholesalers to set the minimum price below which the manufacturer's product or service cannot be sold violates the Sherman Act, S. 2960, to exempt aliens who are admitted as refugees or granted asylum and are employed overseas by the Federal Government from the 1-year physical presence requirement for adjustment of status to that of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence, S. 2974, to establish the Return of Talent Program to allow aliens who are legally present in the United States to return temporarily to the country of citizenship of the alien if that country is engaged in post-conflict or natural disaster reconstruction, S. 1624, to amend title 11 of the United States Code, to provide protection for medical debt homeowners, to restore bankruptcy protections for individuals experiencing economic distress as caregivers to ill, injured, or disabled family members, and to exempt from means testing debtors whose financial problems were caused by serious medical problems, S. 1765, to amend the Hate Crime Statistics Act to include crimes against the homeless, and the nominations of Josephine Staton Tucker, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California, Mark A. Goldsmith, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan, Brian Anthony Jackson, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Louisiana, Elizabeth Erny Foote, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Louisiana, Marc T. Treadwell, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Georgia, Wifredo A. Ferrer, to be United States Attorney for the Southern District of Florida, and William N.

Nettles, to be United States Attorney for the District of South Carolina, 10 a.m., SD-226.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: March 18, to hold hearings to examine legislative presentations from AMVETS, National Association of State Directors of Veterans Affairs, Non Commissioned Officers Association, Gold Star Wives, The Retired Enlisted Association, Fleet Reserve Association, Vietnam Veterans of America, and Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America, 9:30 a.m., SDG-50.

Select Committee on Intelligence: March 16, closed business meeting to consider pending calendar business, 2:30 p.m., SH-219.

March 18, Full Committee, to hold closed hearings to consider certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH-219.

Special Committee on Aging: March 17, to hold hearings to examine seniors, focusing on rising drug prices and the Part D program, 2:30 p.m., SD-562.

House Committees

Committee on Appropriations, March 15, Select Intelligence Oversight Panel, executive, on CIA Compartmented Programs, 5 p.m., H-405 Capitol.

March 16, full Committee, on FY 2011 Budget and Economic Outlook, 10 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

March 16, Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies, on Department of Justice FY 2011 Budget Overview, 2 p.m., 2359 Rayburn.

March 16, Subcommittee on Defense, executive, on U.S. Central Command, 1:30 p.m., H-140 Capitol.

March 16, Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies, on Department of Energy: Environmental Management, Legacy Management, 2011 Budget, 2 p.m., 2362-B Rayburn.

March 16, Subcommittee on Homeland Security, on FY 2011 Citizenship and Immigration Services Budget, 2 p.m., B-318 Rayburn.

March 16, Subcommittee on Interior, Environment and Related Agencies, on Preserving America's Culture and National Treasures: The National Park Service FY 2011 Budget Request, 3 p.m., B-308 Rayburn.

March 16, Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies, on Strengthening Intermodal Connections and Improving Freight Mobility: An Outside Perspective, 2 p.m., 2358-A Rayburn.

March 17, Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies, on NOAA FY 2011 Budget, 10 a.m., H-309 Capitol, and on FBI FY 2011 Budget, 2 p.m., 2359 Rayburn.

March 17, Subcommittee on Defense, on Contingency Contracting, 1:30 p.m., H-140 Capitol.

March 17, Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies, on Department of Energy: Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Fossil Energy, Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability 2011 Budget, 10 a.m., 2362-B Rayburn.

March 17, Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government, on FY 2011 Budget for the SEC, 10 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

March 17, Subcommittee on Homeland Security, on Coast Guard FY 2011 Budget, 10 a.m., 2362–A Rayburn.

March 17, Subcommittee on Interior, Environment and Related Agencies, on Bridging Cultures: The National Endowment for the Humanities FY 2011 Budget Request, 9:30 a.m., on Holocaust Memorial Museum, Eisenhower Memorial Commission, 10:30 a.m., and on FY 2011 Budget for the Fish and Wildlife Service: Sustainable Conservation; Species, Partnerships and Science, 3:00 p.m. B–308, Rayburn.

March 17, Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies, on Public Witnesses: Labor and Education Priorities/ESEA Reauthorization, 9:45 a.m., 2358–C Rayburn.

March 17, Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, on FY 2011 Budgets of the Government Accountability Office, the Congressional Budget Office and the Office of Compliance, 10:15 a.m., on FY 2011 Budget of the Architect of the Capitol and Infrastructure Needs 2:00 p.m., H–144 Capitol.

March 17, Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans' Affairs, and Related Agencies, on Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC), 10 a.m., and on U.S. Central Command, 2:30 p.m., H–143 Capitol.

March 17, Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies, on Strengthening Intermodal Connections and Improving Freight Mobility (Including the FY 2011 Budget for FHWA, FMCSA, MARAD, and FRA), 10 a.m., 2358–A Rayburn.

March 18, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, on FY 2011 Budget for Food and Nutrition Service, 1 p.m., 2362–A Rayburn.

March 18, Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies, on FY 2011 Budget for the Bureau of Prisons, 9 a.m., H–310 Capitol, and on Major Challenges facing Federal Prisons: A View from the Inside, 2 p.m., H–309 Capitol.

March 18, Subcommittee on Defense, on U.S. Transportation Command, Air Mobility, and Mobility Acquisition, 10 a.m., H–140 Capitol.

March 18, Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies, on Department of Energy: 2011 Budget for Science and ARPA–E, 10 a.m., 2362–B Rayburn.

March 18, Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government, on FY 2011 Budget for the Judiciary, 10 a.m., 2220 Rayburn.

March 18, Subcommittee on Homeland Security, on U.S. Secret Service FY 2011 Budget, 10 a.m., 2358–C Rayburn; and on FY 2011 Budget for ICE, 2:00 p.m., B318 Rayburn.

March 18, Subcommittee on Interior, Environment and Related Agencies, on Conserving America's Land and Heritage: Department of the Interior FY 2011 Budget, 2:30, 2359 Rayburn.

March 18, Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies, on FY 2011

Budget: Department of Education, 10 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

March 18, Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans' Affairs, and Related Agencies, on U.S. Air Force Budget, 10 a.m., H–143 Capitol.

March 18, Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations and Related Programs, on FY 2011 Budget Request for the Peace Corps, 1:30 p.m., room to be announced.

March 18, Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies, on Maintaining a Safe and Viable Aviation System (Including the FY 2011 Budget Request for the FAA), 10 a.m., and on Maintaining a Safe and Viable Aviation System: Priorities from Aviation Stakeholders, 2 p.m., 2358–A Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, March 15, Subcommittee on Military Personnel, hearing on legislative priorities in support of families, 5:30 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

March 16, Subcommittee on Readiness, hearing on FY 2011 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for the military services' operation and maintenance funding, 2 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

March 16, Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, hearing on status of United States strategic forces, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

March 17, full Committee, hearing on FY 2011 National Defense Authorization Budget Requests from the U.S. Central Command, the U.S. Special Operations Command, and the U.S. Transportation Command, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

March 17, Subcommittee on Military Personnel, hearing on military personnel legislative priorities, 2 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

March 17, Subcommittee on Seapower and Expeditionary Forces and Subcommittee on Air and Land Forces, joint hearing on force protection equipment programs for operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, 2:30 p.m., 210 HVC.

March 18, full Committee, hearing on FY 2011 National Defense Authorization Budget Requests from the U.S. Southern Command and U.S. Northern Command, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

March 18, Subcommittee on Readiness, hearing on FY 2011 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for military construction, family housing, base closure, facilities operation and maintenance, 2 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on the Budget, March 15, to mark up the Reconciliation Act of 2010, 3 p.m., 210 Cannon.

Committee on Education and Labor, March 16, Subcommittee on Workforce Protections, hearing on Protecting America's Workers Act: Modernizing OSHA Penalties, 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

March 17, full Committee, hearing with the U.S. Secretary of Education on "The Obama Administration's Elementary and Secondary Education Act Reauthorization Blueprint," 2:30 p.m., 2175 Rayburn.

March 18, Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary and Secondary Education, hearing on Elementary and Secondary Education Act Reauthorization: Addressing the Needs of Diverse Students, 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, March 16, Subcommittee on Health, to mark up H.R. 847, James

Zadroga 9/11 Health and Compensation Act of 2009, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

March 18, Subcommittee on Commerce, Trade, and Consumer Protection, hearing on the following bills: H.R. 1796, Residential Carbon Monoxide Poisoning Prevention Act; and H.R. 4805, Formaldehyde Standards for Composite Wood Products Act, 10 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

March 18, Subcommittee on Energy and Environment, hearing entitled "HomeStar: Job Creation through Home Energy Retrofits," 9:30 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, March 16, Subcommittee on International Monetary Policy, and Trade, hearing entitled "Rebuilding Haiti's Competitiveness and Private Sector," 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

March 17, full Committee, hearing entitled "The Administration's Proposal to Revitalize Severely Distress Public and Assisted Housing: The Choice Neighborhoods Initiative," 10 a.m., and a hearing entitled "Examining the Link Between Fed Bank Supervision and Monetary Policy," 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

March 18, Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Insurance, and Government Sponsored Enterprises, hearing entitled "Insurance Holding Company Supervision," 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, March 17, hearing on Transatlantic Security in the 21st Century: Do New Threats Require New Approaches? 9:30 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

March 17, Subcommittee on Asia, the Pacific and the Global Environment, hearing on U.S.-Japan Relations: Enduring Ties, Recent Developments, 2:30 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

March 18, Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation and Trade, hearing on National Strategy for Countering Biological Threats: Diplomacy and International Programs, 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

March 18, Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, hearing on the Next Steps for Honduras, 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, March 16, Subcommittee on Emergency Communications, Preparedness and Response, hearing entitled "Ensuring Strong FEMA Regional Offices: An Examination of Resources and Responsibilities," 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

March 16, Subcommittee on Emerging Threats, Cybersecurity, and Science and Technology, to mark up a measure to authorize appropriations for the Directorate of Science and Technology of the Department of Homeland Security for fiscal years 2011 and 2012, 2 p.m., 311 Cannon.

March 17, Subcommittee on Intelligence, Information Sharing and Terrorism Risk Assessment, hearing entitled "Working with Communities to Disrupt Terror Plots," 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

March 17, Subcommittee on Transportation Security and Infrastructure Protection, hearing entitled "An Assessment of Checkpoint Security: Are Our Airports Keeping Passengers Safe?" 2 p.m., 311 Cannon.

March 18, Subcommittee on Border, Maritime and Global Counterterrorism, and the Subcommittee on Management, Investigations, and Oversight, joint hearing en-

titled "SBI-net: Does it Pass the Border Security Test?" 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on the Judiciary, March 16, Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law, hearing on Federal Rulemaking and the Regulatory Process, 11 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

March 16, Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights, and Civil Liberties, hearing on H.R. 3335, Democracy Restoration Act of 2009, 2 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

March 18, Subcommittee on Courts and Competition Policy, hearing on Legal Issues Concerning State Alcohol Regulation, 1 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, March 16, Subcommittee on Insular Affairs, Oceans and Wildlife, oversight hearing on Catch Shares as a Management Option: Criteria for Ensuring Success, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

March 17, full Committee, hearing on H.R. 2099, Southeast Alaska Native Land Entitlement Finalization Act, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

March 17, Subcommittee on Insular Affairs, Oceans and Wildlife, oversight hearing on the Proposed Virgin Islands Constitution from the Fifth Constitutional Convention, 2 p.m., 1324 Longworth.

March 18, Subcommittee on Water and Power, hearing on the following bills: H.R. 4349, Hoover Power Allocation Act of 2009; and H.R. 4579, South San Diego County Water Reclamation Project of 2010, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, March 16, Subcommittee on Federal Workforce, Postal Service, and the District of Columbia, hearing entitled "Federal Employee Workplace Security," 2 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

March 16, Subcommittee on National Security and Foreign Affairs, to continue hearings entitled, "U.S. Aid to Pakistan (Part II): Planning and Accountability," 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

March 17, Subcommittee on Federal Workforce, Postal Service, and the District of Columbia, hearing entitled "Legislative Hearing on H.R. 4735, To amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that persons having seriously delinquent tax debts shall be ineligible for Federal employment," 2 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

March 18, full Committee, hearing entitled "Rewarding Bad Actors: Why Do Poor Performing Contractors Continue to Get Government Business?" 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

March 18, Subcommittee on Information Policy, Census, and National Archives, hearing entitled "Administration of the Freedom of Information Act: Current Trends," 2 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Science and Technology, March 16, Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight, hearing on Rare Earth Minerals and 21st Century Industry, 2 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.

March 16, Subcommittee on Research and Science Education, hearing on Broadening Participation in STEM, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

March 17, full Committee, hearing on the Future of Manufacturing: What is the Role of the Federal Government in Supporting Innovation by U.S. Manufacturers? 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

March 18, hearing on Geoengineering III: Domestic and International Research Governance, 12 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, March 17, hearing entitled “Business Incubators and Their Role in Job Creation,” 1 p.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, March 17, Subcommittee on Aviation, hearing on FAA’s Oversight of On-Demand Aircraft Operations, 2 p.m., 2167 Rayburn.

March 17, Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation, hearing on Capacity of Vessels to Meet U.S. Import and Export Requirements, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, March 16, executive, hearing on National Reconnaissance Program/National Reconnaissance Organization Budget for FY 2011, 2 p.m., 304 HVC.

March 17, executive, hearing on CIA Programs Budget for FY 2011, 10 a.m., 304 HVC.

March 17, executive, briefing, on Department of Defense Quarterly Update, 3 p.m., 304 HVC.

March 18, Subcommittee on Intelligence Community Management, executive, briefing, Management Challenges in the Intelligence Community, 1:30 p.m., 304 HVC.

March 18, Subcommittee on Terrorism, Human Intelligence, Analysis and Counterintelligence, executive, briefing on Hot Spots, 3:30 p.m., 304 HVC.

Select Committee on Energy Independence and Global Warming, March 16, hearing entitled “Clearing the Smoke: Understanding the Impacts of Black Carbon Pollution,” 10 a.m., 1310 Longworth.

Joint Meetings

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: March 16, to hold hearings to examine Ukraine, focusing on the new challenges and prospects they face domestically and internationally and implications for U.S. policy, 10 a.m., SVC-201/200.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

2 p.m., Monday, March 15

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12:30 p.m., Monday, March 15

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 3 p.m.), Senate will resume consideration of motion to concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to H.R. 2847, Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, and vote on the motion to invoke cloture thereon at 5:30 p.m.

House Chamber

Program for Monday: To be announced.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Butterfield, G.K., N.C., E370
Camp, Dave, Mich., E369
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E372
Courtney, Joe, Conn., E370
Ellison, Keith, Minn., E367
Fleming, John, La., E371
Garrett, Scott, N.J., E371

Granger, Kay, Tex., E367
Grayson, Alan, Fla., E368
Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E370, E371
Holt, Rush D., N.J., E369, E373
Kennedy, Patrick J., R.I., E372
Kucinich, Dennis J., Ohio, E368
Larson, John B., Conn., E372
McDermott, Jim, Wash., E367
Murphy, Tim, Pa., E372

Napolitano, Grace F., Calif., E372
Nunes, Devin, Calif., E369
Rangel, Charles B., N.Y., E370
Rogers, Mike, Ala., E369
Shimkus, John, Ill., E367
Smith, Adam, Wash., E372
Tiahrt, Todd, Kans., E368
Westmoreland, Lynn A., Ga., E371
Wilson, Joe, S.C., E369



Congressional Record

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.